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# Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [Post122][402][POS] SLPP session handling (Intel)

 Scope: Discuss the management of sessions in SLPP, including:

* whether a session identifier is explicitly needed in SLPP signalling;
* how the session is managed at the endpoints;
* how the session is managed among multiple UEs (target UE(s), anchor UE(s), and server UE); and
* the relation to groupcast cases.

 Consider MO-LR and MT-LR scenarios, focussing on the UE-to-UE cases and taking into account SA2 status.

 Intended outcome: Report to next meeting

 Deadline: Thursday 2023-08-10 1000 UTC

Rapporteur would like to split the discussion into two phases:

**Phase 1: Companies are invited to provide comments on the questions listed in the document by Friday 2023-08-04 1000 UTC**

Rapporteur will generate the questions for second round of discussion based on companies’ input.

**Phase 2: Companies are invited to provide comments on the questions of second phase by Thursday 2023-08-10, 1000 UTC**

Rapporteur will provide the final summary based on companies’ input.

**Note**: LMF involved case is not in the scope of the email discussion. Rapporteur would like to ask simple question on this, see the questions in section 3.2.1.

# Contact Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
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| Intel | Yi Guo | Yi.guo@intel.com |
| OPPO | Yang Liu | liuyangbj@oppo.com |
| vivo | Xiang Pan | panxiang@vivo.com |
| Nokia | Stepan Kucera | stepan.kucera@nokia.com |
| Ericsson | Ritesh Shreevastav | Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com |
| LG | Jonggil Nam | jonggil.nam@lge.com |
| ZTE | Yu Pan | pan.yu24@zte.com.cn |
| CEWiT | Jishnu Ponnappan | jishnup@cewit.org.in |
| Samsung | June Hwang | June77.hwang@samsung.com |
| CATT | Jianxiang Li | lijianxiang@catt.cn |
| SONY | Anders Berggren | Anders.Berggren@sony.com |
| Spreadtrum communications | Huifang Fan  | Huifang.fan@unisoc.com |
| Lenovo | Hyung-Nam Choi | hchoi5@lenovo.com |
| InterDigital | Jongwoo Hong | jongwoo.hong@interdigital.com |
| Fraunhofer | Birendra Ghimire | birendra.ghimire@iis.fraunhofer.de  |
| Xiaomi | Xiaowei jiang | jiangxiaowei@xiaomi.com |
| Apple | Sasha Sirotkin | ssirotkin@apple.com |
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# Discussion-Phase 1

## The need of session ID in Uu based positioning

The need of session ID has been discussed for several meetings. As summarized in [1], there are two purposes of explicit session ID:

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose 1:** The purpose to indicate session ID is to differentiate concurrent sessions between two end points. For LPP, concurrent session is supported, but session ID (except *periodicSessionID*) is not introduced in LPP message, the reason is that a routing ID is included in the NAS transport help identifying the serving LMF as well as session. While for periodic assistant data delivery session, LMF may change during the periodic assistant data delivery procedure, *periodicSessionID* is included in the LPP message to help maintaining one session during the whole assistant data delivery procedure. For SLPP, the transport layer is PC5-U, it is not possible to transmit a routing ID through PC5-U transport. Therefore, session ID has to be carried in the SLPP layer itself to distinguish different SLPP sessions.**Purpose 2**: Session ID is needed to support multiple UEs in the same session or same UE in different sessions. Different from Uu positioning, A SL positioning session involves multiple UEs (target UE(s), anchor UEs and/or server UE). And an UE may be in parallel SL positioning sessions simultaneously. Therefore, introduce session ID in the SLPP messages is needed to identify sessions. |

Rapporteur would suggest looking at the usage of session ID in Uu based positioning first.

**As described in TS23.271:**

|  |
| --- |
| 9.3a.1 UE Assisted and UE Based Positioning and Assistance DeliveryThe following procedure depicts a positioning service transaction that is used by the E-SMLC to support UE based positioning, UE assisted positioning and delivery of assistance data. A single location request from the MME may invoke one or more transactions, in which each transaction may perform a single positioning service (e.g. UE assisted positioning, UE capability retrieval). RAN positioning procedures related to E-SMLC and UE communication are specified in TS 36.355 [47].Figure 9.8e: UE Assisted and UE Based Positioning and Assistance Delivery Procedure**Precondition:** A Correlation identifier allocated by MME had been passed to the E‑SMLC when the location session (i.e. EPC‑MT‑LR, EPC‑MO‑LR, or ECP‑NI‑LR) was initiated. The Correlation identifier must be assigned such that it can be used to identify the E‑SMLC serving the location session.1. The E-SMLC sends a Location Information message to the MME carrying a Downlink Positioning Information and the Correlation identifier which may request location information from the UE, provide assistance data to the UE or query for the UE capabilities.2. If the UE is not using Control Plane CIoT EPS Optimisation and if the UE is in ECM-IDLE state (e.g. if the S1 connection was previously released due to data and signalling inactivity), the MME performs a network triggered service request as defined in TS 23.401 [41] in order to establish a signalling connection with the UE. If the UE is using Control Plane CIoT EPS Optimisation, procedures for Mobile Terminated Data Transport in Control Plane CIoT EPS optimisation as defined in TS 23.401 [41] are performed by the MME to establish a signalling connection with the UE.3. The MME forwards the Downlink Positioning Information to the serving eNodeB in a NAS Transport message conveyed by the S1-AP Transport Message. The MME includes a Routing identifier, in the NAS transport message, representing the Correlation identifier associated with the location session between the MME and E-SMLC.4. The eNodeB forwards the Downlink Positioning Information and Routing identifier to the UE by NAS Transport Message.5. The UE stores any assistance data provided in the Downlink Positioning Information and performs any positioning measurements and location computation requested by the Downlink Positioning Information. NB-IoT UEs may perform measurements for some positioning methods only when in ECM-IDLE state. In this case, the UE delays performing positioning measurements in step 5 until after the UE enters ECM-IDLE state.6. If the UE is not using Control Plane CIoT EPS Optimisation and if the UE is in ECM-IDLE state, the UE instigates a UE triggered service request or, when User Plane CIoT EPS optimization applies, the Connection Resume procedure as defined in TS 23.401 [41] in order to establish a signalling connection with the MME. If the UE is using Control Plane CIoT EPS Optimisation, procedures for Mobile Originated Data Transport in Control Plane CIoT EPS optimisation as defined in TS 23.401 [41] are performed by the UE to establish a signalling connection with the MME.7. The UE returns any location information obtained in step 5 or returns any capabilities requested in step 4 to the eNodeB in an Uplink Positioning Information included in the NAS Transport message. The Uplink Positioning Information may alternatively carry a request for further assistance data. The UE shall also include the Routing identifier in the NAS Transport Message received in step 4.8. The eNodeB forwards the Uplink Positioning Information and Routing identifier to the MME in a NAS Transport message.9. The MME forwards the Uplink Positioning Information and the Correlation identifier to the E-SMLC, based on the received Routing identifier, in a Positioning Response. Steps 6 to 9 may be repeated if the UE needs to send multiple messages to respond to the request received in Step 4. Steps 1 to 9 may be repeated to send new assistance data, and to request further location information and further UE capabilities.NOTE: The DL Positioning Information messages can be asynchronous. Once the E-SMLC sends at least one DL Positioning Information message towards the UE (steps 1-4), the UE can then send zero or more UL Positioning Information messages towards the E-SMLC (steps 6-9). The UE includes the same Routing identifier in each subsequent message. |

**As described in TS23.273**

|  |
| --- |
| 27. If a location estimate is needed for event reporting, the LMF may perform one or more of the positioning procedures described in clauses 6.11.1, 6.11.2, 6.11.3 and 6.11.4 and as described for step 8 in clause 6.1.1 and step 12 in clause 6.1.2. The LMF then determines the UE location using the location measurements and/or location estimate(s) obtained at this step and/or received at step 25. The LMF may also determine the timestamp of the location estimate.NOTE 11: A precondition for the procedure in clause 6.11.1 is that an LCS Correlation identifier assigned by the serving AMF has been previously passed to the LMF. The LCS Correlation identifier is used in steps 1, 3, 6 and 7 in clause 6.11.1 to ensure that during a positioning session between the LMF and UE, positioning response messages from the UE are returned by the AMF to the correct LMF and carrying an indication (the LCS Correlation identifier) which can be recognized by the LMF. To retain this capability in step 27, the LMF shall assign a Correlation identifier indicating the LMF (and optionally a positioning session) for use at step 1 in clause 6.11.1. To enable an AMF to distinguish a Correlation identifier assigned by an LMF (used in this procedure) from a Correlation identifier assigned by the AMF (used otherwise for clause 6.11.1), the two types of Correlation identifier could be selected from different ranges, with or without a flag.**Precondition:** A LCS Correlation identifier and the AMF identity have been passed to the LMF by the serving AMF. In the case of PRU, LCS Correlation identifier is generated by LMF and provided to AMF during PRU Registration Accept message. |

**As described in TS29.171:**

|  |
| --- |
| The Correlation ID is assigned by the MME and enables association of the location response with the location request when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing for the UE with the same E-SMLC. |

Based on above descriptions, Rapporteur has following observations:

**Observation 1:** Correlation identifier is used by the AMF to identify the correct LMF for a particular UE during a positioning session, i.e. routing purpose;

**Observation 2:** Correlation identifier is used by the LMF to associate the location response with the location request when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing for the UE with the same positioning server since there is no transaction ID concept in these messages;

**Observation 3:** Correlation identifier is assigned by the AMF and forwarded to the LMF except PRU and MT-LR for periodic, triggered Location Events, i.e. it is unrelated to MO-LR, MT-LR or NI-LR;

**Observation 4:** The serving AMF forwards the Routing identifier equal to the LCS Correlation identifier to UE using a DL NAS TRANSPORT message.

**Observation 5:** The serving AMF forwards the LPP message to the LMF indicated by the Routing identifier received from UE and includes a LCS Correlation identifier equal to the Routing identifier.

In summary, from core-network perspective, the purposes of session ID for Uu based positioning are:

**Purpose 1**: Correlation identifier is used by the AMF to identify the correct LMF for a particular UE during a positioning session, i.e. routing purpose;

**Purpose 2**: Correlation identifier is used by the LMF to associate the location response with the location request when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing for the UE with the same positioning server since there is no transaction ID concept in these messages.

**Purpose x**:?

**Question 3.1-1: For Uu based positioning (from core-network perspective), regarding the need of explicit session ID which of the purposes above do companies support? Please add if anything is missing.**

**Note: the session ID used in the messages between the LMF and the AMF is under SA2 scope.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Purpose 1****Purpose 2****Others?** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | All of these | The Correlation ID identifies the location session between AMF and LMF (the messages exchanged between AMF and LMF for location services for the UE). An AMF may have a location session with an LMF and maintains state information for this location session. For an immediate location request, the AMF assigns a correlation ID that is used to identify messages exchanged between AMF and LMF for this location session.The LMF and UE may exchange LPP messages via AMF during the location session. However, the AMF does not need to maintain state information for communication with the UE. The AMF assigns a routing ID (also referred to as session ID) that is used to associate messages exchanged between AMF and UE with the location session between AMF and LMF. This routing ID is used to identify messages exchanged between AMF and UE whereas the correlation ID is used to identify messages exchanged between AMF and LMF for location services for the UE. The AMF is able to associate each NAS message received from the UE with the location session between the AMF and the LMF based on the routing ID included in the NAS message by the UE.This enables the Correlation ID (or Routing identifier) to identify an LPP session between an LMF and UE even though not included at the LPP level. |
| OPPO | At least Purpose 1 is found | The proof of Purpose 1: (TS 23.273) the LCS Correlation identifier is used in steps 1, 3, 6 and 7 in clause 6.11.1 to ensure that during a positioning session between the LMF and UE, positioning response messages from the UE are returned by the AMF to the correct LMF and carrying an indication (the LCS Correlation identifier) which can be recognized by the LMF. |
| vivo | 1,2 and others | In general, an LPP session is used between LMF, AMF and the target UE to manage the positioning procedures for one specific location request.In addition to purposes 1 and 2, the following purposes are valid:Purpose 3: The session ID can be used by the AMF to associate the location response with the location request.Purpose 4: For Deferred MT-LR, the session ID can be used by the LMF to associate the Event Report with the LCS Periodic-Triggered Invoke Request. |
| Nokia | Both 1 + 2 | The Routing ID and the Correlation ID uniquely identify an LPP positioning session between UE-AMF and AMF-LMF respectively, as well as allow correct matching between positioning requests and responses within the LMF. In other words, the combined usage of Routing and Correlation IDs implements an implicit LPP “session ID” to support Purposes 1 and 2. Consequently, there is no need to introduce an explicit “session ID” in LPP. |
| Ericsson | Needs SA2 guidance; pls check comment | In order for the Observation 2 to be true:***Observation 2:****Correlation identifier is used by the LMF to associate the location response with the location request when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing for the UE with the same positioning server since there is no transaction ID concept in these messages;*This would imply that AMF must create multiple correlation IDs for the same end points. If UE initiates 2 MO-LR session; then AMF shall create 2 correlation IDs between AMF and LMF. AMF will not be able to combine or use one correlation ID. It would be good to confirm if that AMF behavior is must from SA2.Similarly, UE shall use 2 unique routing identifiers when multiple session exists. It would be good to confirm both AMF and UE behavior.[Moderator] To our understanding, the AMF shall maintain different session/different correlation IDs for the same end points if different positioning session is created between the same end points.The intention of this discussion is not to change anything for corenetwork side. We can check SA2 if there is common understanding from RAN2.  |
| LG | All | In Uu based positioning, NAS between UE and AMF/LMF can distinguish multiple LPP sessions with multiple routing/correlation IDs associated with multiple location service requests. We do not see the need of explicit LPP session ID. |
| ZTE | 1 and 2 | Correlation ID is used between AMF and LMF, and routing ID is used between AMF and UE. AMF can manage the association between Correlation ID and routing ID to track the LMF in one positioning session. |
| CEWiT | All | Explicit session ID is not required for Uu-based positioning since correlation ID/routing ID is sufficient to identify LPP sessions uniquely. |
| Samsung  | Both 1 and 2 | We observe from rapporteurs investigation and QC’s comment that the correlation ID and routing ID are jointly used for identifying each message exchanged between AMF and the UE, and the association between these messages and the LMF. So finally, each LPP messages can be routed into the correct LMF, and message level identification even under the same target UE can be possible. |
| CATT | Both 1 and 2 | The Correlation ID identifies the location session between AMF and LMF. The Routing ID identifies the LPP positioning session between UE and AMF. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Both 1 and 2 | It identifies a certain UE as the role of “correlation ID” and also has routing purpose as the “routing ID” |
| SONY | See comment | The existing use of Correlation ID and routing ID works fine and there is no need to introduce a new explicit session ID.As mentioned, the AMF assigns the Correlation ID after receiving a location request from a LCS client, GMLC or UE. In our view the Correlation ID is unique for that LCS Session between the UE, LMF, and AMF.In the case deferred MT-LR (event triggered or periodic) the routing ID is used by the serving AMF (could be a different AMF then the one that assigned the routing ID) to derive the serving LMF for that LCS session and forwards the LPP message to that serving LMF. |
| Spreadtrum communications | Both 1+2 | Correlation ID and Routing ID identify an LPP positioning session between UE-AMF and AMF-LMF. Thus there is not necessary to introduce an explicit LPP session ID. |
| Lenovo | Both 1 + 2 | Further comments:Purpose 1: Correlation ID is also used by the AMF to uniquely identify a positioning session.Purpose 2: Correlation ID is also used by the LMF when there is only a single location service request procedure ongoing for the UE. |
| InterDigital | Both 1 and 2 |  |
| Fraunhofer | Both 1 and 2 | Routing to the LMF and associating the measurements pertaining to a particular target UE.  |
| Xiaomi | 1+2 | We agree with the obeservation, it is aligned with 23.273 & 29.171.  |
| Apple | Both |  |
| Intel | All |  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

Purpose 1: 17 companies agreed the purpose.

Purpose 2: 16 companies agreed the purpose.

2 company suggested additional purposes:

Purpose 3: The session ID can be used by the AMF to associate the location response with the location request.

Purpose 4: For Deferred MT-LR, the session ID can be used by the LMF to associate the Event Report with the LCS Periodic-Triggered Invoke Request.

Purpose 5:In the case deferred MT-LR (event triggered or periodic) the routing ID is used by the serving AMF (could be a different AMF then the one that assigned the routing ID) to derive the serving LMF for that LCS session and forwards the LPP message to that serving LMF.

1 company suggested to confirm the purposes from SA2;

**Based on companies’ inputs, there is large majority on the purposes of session ID/correlation ID used between the AMF/LMF and UE for Uu based positioning (from core-network perspective).**

**As described in TS 37.355:**

|  |
| --- |
| Multiple LPP sessions can be used between the same endpoints to support multiple different location requests (as required by TS 23.271 [3]).* Reliable transmission
	+ Duplicate detection: A receiver shall record the most recent received sequence number for each location session. If a message is received carrying the same sequence number as that last received for the associated location session, it shall be discarded.
	+ NOTE: For LPP control-plane use, a target device can be aware of a location session from information provided at the NAS level for downlink transport of an LPP message.
	+ Retransmission: When an LPP message which requires acknowledgement is sent and not acknowledged, it is resent by the sender following a timeout period up to three times. If still unacknowledged after that, the sender aborts all LPP activity for the associated session.
	+ Segmentation: If the receiver receives a subsequent LPP message for the same session and transaction ID, the receiver shall assume that the new LPP message continues the segmentation of the earlier message and may store the new message if the new message indicates that more messages are on the way.
* Periodic Assistance Data Transfer
	+ *periodicSessionID*
* Error Detection
	+ 4> discard all stored LPP message segments for this session and LPP-TransactionID;
 |

In summary, from LPP management perspective, the purposes of session ID for Uu based positioning are:

**Purpose 3**: Routing ID/correlation ID is used to identify a session since reliable transmission is handled per positioning session;

**Purpose 4**: Routing ID/correlation ID is used to identify a session since error detection is handled per positioning session;

**Purpose 5**: Routing ID/correlation ID is used to identify a session since Periodic Assistance Data Transfer could be handled as separate session for different LMF;

**Purpose x**:?

**Question 3.1-2: For Uu based positioning (from LPP perspective), regarding the need of explicit session ID which of the purposes above do companies support? Please add if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Purpose 3****Purpose 4****Purpose 5****Others?** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | None | The question is not completely clear, but we assume it refers to LPP Uu positioning as stated. In that case, as commented in our response to Question 3.1-1, the Correlation ID and Routing ID enable an LPP session between a UE and LMF to be identified by the LMF and UE. A new session ID in LPP is thus not needed.[Moderator] intention of this question is to discuss the purpose of session ID. It is true, correlation ID and the routing ID are used to identify the LPP session, i.e. explicit session ID is not needed. I added the clarification in the question.  |
| OPPO | all | As clearly stated in the TS 37.355, all the mentioned functionalities are handled per positioning session. We think the explicit session ID is not needed to be introduced to the LPP protocol. In the current implementation, the routing ID included in the NAS message serves as the session ID. |
| vivo | 3.4.5. Others See comments | LPP Session is used to associate positioning procedures within a session for one specific location request. That is, the LPP transport also associate with a positioning session, not just for Purpose 3-5. Purpose 6. Associate different transactions. For example, the UE is performing two parallel positioning. When receiving a Request Location Information message after receiving two Provide Assistant Data messages separately for two sessions, the UE needs to associate the Request Location Information message with the corresponding Provide Assistant Data message, not another Provide Assistant Data message. The association is done via the session ID.[Moderator] same positioning methods should not be used simultaneously in different positioning session with different assistance data. And therefore the UE only needs to link assistance data with corresponding positioning method. Purpose 7. The LMF and UE will perform the lifecycle management per location session. The UE could delete all the stored parameters when the location session terminates, e.g., sequence number.

|  |
| --- |
| TS 37.355Sending and receiving sequence numbers shall be deleted in a server when the associated location session is terminated and shall be deleted in a target device when there has been no activity for a particular location session for 10 minutes. |

 |
| Nokia | See comments | The possibility of uniquely identifying an LPP positioning session with the Routing / Correlation IDs can be applied also to the implementation of session-specific management tasks such as de-duplication and error handling. So in general, there is no need to introduce an explicit “session ID” in LPP to support Purposes 3-5. |
| Ericsson | None; if (pls see comments) |  if it is confirmed that multiple correlation IDs and routing identifiers are used between the same end points |
| LG | All | Same as Question 3.1-1.  |
| ZTE | All +others | The Duplicate detection, Retransmission, Segmentation, Periodic Assistance Data Transfer and error detection are performed per LPP session. UE can maintain multiple LPP sessions simultaneously.UE should also track the transaction per session. The transaction ID in different session may be allocated the same. So UE should use ‘session + transaction ID’ to uniquely identify a transaction. |
| CEWiT | None | Explicit session ID is not needed. Above mentioned purposes can be supported using correlation/routing ID. |
| Samsung  | 3.4.5 | We see rather usage than purpose of session is appropriate for these cases. In LPP , we agree those 3,4,5 cases clearly using the session ID for their own purpose. But unclear that this means the need of new session ID in LPP. |
| CATT | See comments | For legacy Uu based positioning, no explicit “session ID” in LPP. And there is no need to introduce “session ID” in LPP.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Purpose 3Purpose 4Purpose 5 | Our understanding of what the rapporteur is trying to ask is that these LPP procedures (duplication detection, retransmission, segmentation, etc.) are per LPP session. Then, if it is per LPP session, whether it is necessary to project the same idea to sidelink positioning. For the question, we agree that these LPP procedures are per LPP session.  |
| SONY | All, 3, 4, 5 | The existing use of Correlation ID and routing ID works fine and there is no need to introduce a new explicit session ID. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | All | This question is not completely clear. I understand that what this question asks is whether the session ID (Routing ID and correction ID of Uu link) has the purpose of 3-5? For this question, we think that all of the above purposes are supported. And it is very clear in TS 37.355 that all the mentioned functionalities are handled per positioning session.  |
| Lenovo | 3 + 4 | Description of Purpose 5 is not fully clear to us. We understood that the "periodic session ID" is used to identify a particular periodic assistance data delivery session within an established positioning session. |
| InterDigital | All |  |
| Fraunhofer | None |  |
| Xiaomi | 3,4,5 | We understand the intention of the question is to clarify the motivation of introducing session ID, i.e. to support per session operation. To support per session operation, as discussed in previous question, correlation ID + routing ID can already serve the purpose. So, there is no need to introduce explicit session ID for Uu positioning. |
| Apple | See comments | The question is not clear, is the intention to introduce a new session ID for “legacy” positioning? |
| Intel | All | The question is whether purpose 3/4/5 are handled per positioning session instead of introducing a new explicit session ID.  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

Based on companies’ comments, most companies agreed that the reliable transmission, error detection and periodic Assistance Data Transfer are handled per positioning session based on routing ID/correlation ID.

2 company suggested additional purposes:

Purpose 6: track the transaction per session.

Purpose 7: perform the lifecycle management per location session.

**Based on companies’ inputs, there is large majority on the purposes of session ID/correlation ID used between the LMF and UE for Uu based positioning (from LPP perspective) since some LPP procedures are handled per positioning session.**

## Session management for Sidelink positioning

### 3.2.1 LMF involved case

RAN2 has agreed that

SLPP carried over NAS is used between UE and LMF. FFS on how to manage the session/transaction.

SA2 has agreed the procedure for SL-MO-LR in [3] and SL-MT-LR in [4], and has captured them in TS 23.273-i20, as

6.20.1 Procedures of SL-MO-LR involving LMF

|  |
| --- |
| Omitted unrelated parts:9. The serving AMF selects an LMF serving UE1 (e.g. an LMF that supports Sidelink positioning/ranging) and sends an Nlmf\_Location\_DetermineLocation service operation towards the LMF with the information from the SL-MO-LR Request. The service operation includes a LCS Correlation identifier. |

6.20.3 Procedures of SL-MT-LR involving LMF

|  |
| --- |
| Omitted unrelated part:9. The serving AMF selects an LMF serving UE1 (e.g. an LMF that supports Ranging/Sidelink Positioning) and sends an Nlmf\_Location\_DetermineLocation service operation towards the LMF with the information received at step 5 e.g. required location results (e.g. relative locations or ranges and directions between pairs of UEs), SL reference UE(s) in case of relative locations, Application layer IDs of the UEs if received in step 5. The service operation includes a LCS Correlation identifier.10. The LMF sends an SL-MT-LR request to the serving AMF as a supplementary services message, using the Namf\_Communication\_N1N2MessageTransfer service operation, and the session ID parameter is set to the LCS Correlation identifier.11. The serving AMF forwards the SL-MT-LR request and a Routing identifier equal to the LCS Correlation identifier to UE1 using a DL NAS TRANSPORT message.14. UE1 returns a supplementary services SL-MT-LR response to the serving AMF in an UL NAS TRANSPORT message and includes the Routing identifier received in step 11.15. The serving AMF forwards the SL-MT-LR response to the LMF indicated by the Routing identifier received at step 14 and includes a LCS Correlation identifier equal to the Routing identifier. |

6.20.4 Procedures of SL-MT-LR for periodic, triggered Location Events

|  |
| --- |
| 11. The SL-MT-LR request from AMF is Periodic-Triggered, and the Routing identifier is immediate Routing identifier.NOTE 2: The deferred routing identifier may be global (e.g. an IP address, UUID or URI) or may be local. The deferred routing identifier is used for routing in steps 24 and 25. The immediate routing identifier included by the AMF in step 11 is used for routing in steps 14 and 15.14. The SL-MT-LR response from UE1 is Periodic-Triggered, and Routing identifier is immediate Routing identifier. The supplementary services Periodic-Triggered SL-MT-LR response indicates whether UE1 and other UEs 2 to m accept the periodic or triggered location request and which of UEs 2 to m were discovered by UE1 at step 12.15. The SL-MT-LR response forwarded by AMF is Periodic-Triggered, and Routing identifier is immediate Routing identifier.24. UE1 sends a supplementary services event report message to the serving AMF using the Namf\_Communication\_N1N2MessageTransfer service operation, and includes the deferred Routing ID received in step 11. The event report indicates the type of event being reported (e.g. whether a normal event or expiration of the maximum reporting interval) and may include location results obtained at step 21. UE1 also includes the (H)GMLC contact address, the LDR reference number, whether location results are to be reported and if so the location QoS in the event report.25. The AMF forwards the event report to the LMF indicated by the deferred Routing ID received at step 24 and includes a Correlation ID equal to the deferred Routing ID.26. When the LMF receives the event report and if it can handle this event report, the LMF updates the status of event reporting (e.g. the number of event reports so far received from UE1 and/or the duration of event reporting so far) and returns a supplementary services acknowledgment for the event report to the serving AMF using the Namf\_Communication\_N1N2MessageTransfer service operation, and a Correlation ID identifying the LMF. The acknowledgment may optionally include a new deferred routing identifier indicating a new serving LMF or a default (any) LMF.27. The serving AMF forwards the event report Ack and an immediate Routing ID equal to the Correlation ID to UE1 using a DL NAS TRANSPORT message. If UE1 does not receive any response from the LMF after a predefined time, i.e. the current LMF does not support the deferred location request (for temporary or permanent reasons) or due to some radio access failures, UE1 may re-send the report one or more times.NOTE 5: Inclusion of a new deferred routing identifier in the event report acknowledgment at step 26 may be used to change the serving LMF (e.g. if a UE moves into an area that is better supported by a different LMF or if the serving LMF is overloaded) or to enable a default LMF to become a serving LMF. |

Based on the descriptions in TS 23.273 on LMF involved SL-MO-LR and SL-MT-LR, the handling on session is same as Uu based positioning, i.e.:

**Handling 1:** Correlation identifier is assigned by the AMF and forwarded to the LMF regardless of SL-MO-LR, or SL-MT-LR, except SL-MT-LR for periodic, triggered Location Events (the LMF may include a new correlation identifier in order to change a new LMF).

**Handling 2:** The serving AMF forwards the Routing identifier equal to the LCS Correlation identifier to UE using a DL NAS TRANSPORT message.

**Handling 3:** The serving AMF forwards the SLPP message to the LMF indicated by the Routing identifier received from UE and includes a LCS Correlation identifier equal to the Routing identifier.

**Question 3.2.1-1:** **For LMF involved SL based positioning (from core-network perspective), do companies agree to follow SA2, i.e. the above handlings (1-3)? Please add if anything is missing.**

**Note: the session ID used in the messages between the LMF and the AMF is under SA2 scope.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The SA2 procedures mainly describe interactions between an LMF and one particular UE in a group of UEs. That allows existing Correlation ID and Routing ID conventions to be reused for messages (e.g. LPP or SLPP) exchanged between the LMF and the one particular UE. [Moderator] So far, SA2 did not specify how to support multiple target UEs, and how to support UEs within the SLPP session..  |
| OPPO | Yes | Ok to follow the SA2. |
| vivo | Yes with comments | Handling 2 is duplicated with Handling 1.[Moderator] Good catch. Has deleted handling 2.  |
| Nokia | Yes with comments | Fine to follow SA2 by reusing Correlation and Routing ID to identify data transfers between UE and AMF / LMF across both LPP and SLPP that are associated with a given (unique) positioning process.Agree with Vivo. |
| Ericsson | Not really | As mentioned by QC it is only between one UE and LMF; it does not provide any information on how Sidelink measurements between two UEs can be uniquely identified and retrieved by LMF. This would be LMF involved SLPP procedure (RAN2 procedure) which we will have to define.Is the thinking here that the same correlation ID would be then used among group of UEs for step 16?[Moderator] SA2 only defined procedure between UE1 who has connection with network, LMF and AMF. For UEs within SLPP session, that should be same as how to handle the session ID for LMF not involved case discussed in the clause 3.2.2.**Precondition:** UE1 is in coverage and registered with a serving PLMN. UEs 2 to n may or may not be in coverage and, if in coverage, may or may not be registered with the same serving PLMN as UE1. |
| LG | Yes | It’s fine to follow SA2 |
| ZTE | Yes | The group of UEs in step 16 works for a same positioning purpose and should belong to the same positioning session, i.e., the session defined by the Correlation ID and Routing ID |
| CEWiT | No | Not convinced about how same correlation ID/routing ID can uniquely identify SLPP communication among multiple UEs 1 to n in step 16. |
| Samsung  | Yes  |  |
| CATT | Not sure | There isn’t any agreement on SLPP procedures for network-based operation. The existing Correlation ID and Routing ID can be reused between UE and LMF. But they can’t be used between UEs. Even in network-based operation, there are SLPP exchange procedures between UEs. We prefer to use a common ID in SLPP message which can be used in both UE-only and network-based operations. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | OK to follow SA2 |
| SONY | Yes | Ok to follow the SA2. |
| Spreadtrum communications | Yes | Ok to follow SA2 |
| Lenovo | Yes with comment | We wonder what the key difference is between Handling1 and Handling2. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer |  Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Agree with QC that SA2 has only described the case of one target UE, where only the target UE communicates with LMF. And agree to follow SA2, even if SA2 defines new handling when multiple target UEs are introduced.  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with xiaomi to follow SA2.  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

So far, SA2 only defined procedure between UE1 who has connection with network, LMF and AMF. For UEs within SLPP session, that should be same as how to handle the session ID for LMF not involved case discussed in the clause 3.2.2.

**Precondition:** UE1 is in coverage and registered with a serving PLMN. UEs 2 to n may or may not be in coverage and, if in coverage, may or may not be registered with the same serving PLMN as UE1.

16 companies agreed to follow SA2 on how to handle session between UE who has connection with network, LMF and AMF.

3 companies commented that the handling of UEs within the SLPP session should be discussed in RAN2. Moderator think it should be similar to the questions in the clause 3.2.2

**Based on companies’ inputs, for LMF involved SL based positioning (from core-network perspective), there is clear majority to follow SA2 on how to handle session between UE who has connection with network, LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session.**

Considering RAN2 already agreed that “SLPP carried over NAS is used between UE and LMF.”, therefore from SLPP perspective, explicit session ID is not needed for the SLPP between UE and LMF, i.e. same as LPP, since the routing ID is contained in NAS message.

**Question 3.2.1-2: For LMF involved SL based positioning, do companies agree that for the SLPP between UE (who has direct connection with network) and LMF, explicit session ID in SLPP message is not needed, i.e. same as LPP.**

**Note: the session ID used in the messages between the LMF and the AMF is under SA2 scope.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Yes, with comments | While we agree that a new session ID is not needed between a UE and LMF, it would be useful for the LMF to see the SLPP session ID used to exchange SLPP messages between UEs. That could avoid error cases – e.g. where an LMF is supporting an SLPP session for 2 or more UEs (e.g. for SL-MO-LR) in that session to avoid duplicate LMF activity and providing conflicting assistance data (e.g. for SL PRS) to the UEs.[Moderator] It is related to how to support UEs under the same SLPP session. Note that a new ID for SLPP is also needed in the 'Payload Container Type' in the UL/DL NAS TRANSPORT message specified in TS 24.501.[Moderator] Yes, a new ID for SLPP is needed in NAS spec.  |
| OPPO | Yes | Similar with the LPP, the SLPP between UE and LMF should be located on the top of the NAS layer, so the explicit session ID is not needed for the SLPP as well. |
| vivo | not in the scope of this email. | In Uu positioning, the LMF only needs to communicate with one UE, i.e., target UE. But for sidelink positioning, the LMF may need to communicate with multiple UEs (e.g., target UE, one or more anchor UEs). It is unclear how to manage the session ID/correlation identifier for multiple UEs. We prefer to wait for SA2’s further progress before making a decision.Besides, we suppose the LMF related LPP session handlings are for information/reference. LMF involved SLPP session handling is not in the target scope of this email. |
| Nokia | Yes with comments | In general, we see the need to uniquely identify a given positioning process independently of the used transport protocol (LPP / SLPP) and its end points (target UE / anchor UE / server UE / LMF). Only then the associated data can be successfully and/or efficiently routed in all possible coverage and configuration scenarios. In the specific case of UE - AMF / LMF and SLPP communications, we can reuse Routing and Correlation IDs to identify the positioning process in accordance with current design and SA2 recommendation.However, we should not isolate the related case of inter-UE and SLPP communications where an identification mechanism compatible with said Correlation / Routing ID approach is needed. Reusing Correlation / Routing IDs to implement “SLPP session ID” is one option, another option is to use stand-alone “SLPP session ID” together with an appropriate mapping onto the associated Correlation / Routing ID (if needed).[Moderator] Clarified, the question is only for the SLPP between UE (who has direct connection with network) and LMF. |
| Ericsson | No, however | If the intention is that the correlation ID/Routing ID used among UE, AMF and LMF would also be used among multiple UEs for SL operation then we agree that there can be one to one mapping/binding. Or there should be some identifier that should be assigned by LMF which can uniquely distinguish the different SL operations that a target UE could be involved in.[Moderator] Clarified, the question is only for the SLPP between UE (who has direct connection with network) and LMF. |
| LG | Yes, but | Agree with Qualcomm. Although there is no strong need of session ID between UE and LMF, SLPP session ID would be useful for LMF to exchange SLPP message with anchor UEs. For example (at step 15 of SL-MO-LR procedure in TS 23.273), UEs 2 to n transfer their sidelink positioning measurements to UE1 and/or LMF according to positioning mode. If LMF receives SLPP messages (MR) from UEs for different SLPP sessions, it may be useful for LMF to distinguish SLPP session with SLPP session ID. [Moderator] I assume the scenario is for the same UE1, there are multiple sessions between UE1 and LMF involving multiple UEs. But SLPP session and positioning session should be one by one mapping, therefore routing ID/correlation ID still work well?For example (at step 13 of SL-MO-LR procedure in TS 23.273), UE1 forwards the assistance data received from LMF to UE2/.../UEn. But, we think that the AD data can be provided to UE2/.../UEn via SLPP by LMF in in-coverage scenario. In this case, it may be useful for LMF to distinguish SLPP session with SLPP session ID. [Moderator]Let’s wait SA2 on this. |
| ZTE | Yes | SLPP is between UE and LMF via NAS signaling, AMF can allocate different correlation ID/routing ID to distinguish LPP sessions/SLPP sessions |
| CEWiT | Yes | Explicit session ID in SLPP may not be needed. However, there should be some provision in LMF to coordinate positioning activity involving multiple UEs. |
| Samsung  | Yes  | We see that the same logic can be applied to the SLPP signaling between a UE and LMF, but as QC said, within multiple UE involvement cases, not a single target UE but other UEs also needs to be identified for the appropriate signaling by LMF. So still there would be a possibility to introduce new ID on this purpose, but the details should be discussed.  |
| CATT | No | As comments in Question 3.2.1-1, we prefer to use a common solution for UE-only and network-based operations. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes, but see comments | Session id does not seem necessary. But another ID to identify the different UEs within the SLPP session seems necessary, e.g., to identify different measurement and different assistance data, etc such that LMF can differentiate them.We think the current Application layer ID in the SA2 spec servs this purpose. |
| SONY | Yes | For the case when SLPP between the endpoints UE and LMF, then no explicit session ID is needed. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes with comments | For SL positioning between UE and LMF, LMF may communicate with multiple UEs (e.g. Target UE and multiple anchor UEs). SLPP session between LMF and target UE can be distinguished by routing ID and correction ID. But how to distinguish SLPP session between target and multiple anchor UEs is a question. We prefer to wait for SA2’s further progress before making a decision. |
| Lenovo | Yes | Existing framework of using Routing ID/LCS correlation ID is sufficient for the SLPP message exchange between UE and LMF. |
| InterDigital |  | We have same view with VIVO. In SL positioning, an LMF may connect with one or more UEs (e.g., target UE, anchor UE), we need to consider how to manage session ID between UEs. E.g., whether to manage as the same session ID between LMF and target (between LMF and target UE) |
| Fraunhofer | No | If we are talking about the target UE, then we agree. But the LMF talks to more than one UE for positioning the same target UE. So, to associate the signalling (AD transfer, measurement request, measurement report), we see the need of session ID to associate the configuration/measurement/request associated with a certain target UE from multiple anchor UEs.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | At least for one target UE case, from the current SA2 specs, there is no need of explicit session ID between UE and LMF.For now, we can assume this also for multiple target UE case. We can revist this when SA2 finishes the procedure for multiple target UEs case. |
| Apple | Yes | The existing framework seems to be sufficient |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Xiaomi, for multiple target UEs case, we can revise when SA2 finish the procedure. Regarding how to support multiple UEs within the same SLPP session, we may follow LMF not involved case.  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

14 companies agreed that for LMF involved SL based positioning, same as LPP, the SLPP between UE (who has direct connection with network) and LMF, explicit session ID in SLPP message is not needed.

However we still need to discuss how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session.

**Question 3.2.1-3: Any other issues to be discussed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issues** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | SLPP Session ID between UEs | It has been forgotten that even when an LMF is involved, a group of UEs will still exchange SLPP messages within the group. For this, an SLPP session ID is essential as commented below for later questions.[Moderator] for UEs within the same SLPP session, I did not add question on this. The intention was to discuss LMF not involved case first.  |
| Nokia | Mechanism for “global” identification of a positioning process independently of protocol- and endpoint, applicable to all coverage scenarios | As mentioned in previous answer, we see the need to uniquely identify a given positioning process independently of the used transport protocol (LPP / SLPP) and its end points (target UE / anchor UE / server UE / LMF). If Routing and Correlation IDs is reused in the specific case of UE - AMF / LMF for both SLPP and LPP, we need a compatible identification mechanism applicable to the case of inter-UE and SLPP communications.Few options are possible and should be discusses, one of them being an SLPP-specific “session ID” associated with, or equal to said Routing / Correlation IDs. |
| Ericsson | Agree with QC | Agree with QC |
| LG | Agree with QC | Agree with QC |
| Samsung  | SLPP session ID between UEs | Same view with QC |
| CATT | Agree with QC | Agree with QC |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |   | Same view as QC. There might be multiple positioning sessions between two UEs, thus a session ID is needed to differentiate different sessions. |
| SONY | SLPP Session ID linkage to Routing ID | For SLPP over PC5 unicast or groupcast a SLPP Session ID could be useful. In the case the LMF is involved a UE may need to associate the Routing ID with the SLPP Session ID. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with QC | As we commented in the email reflector, we also need to consider the SLPP session among UEs when LMF is involved. |
| Intel | Agree with QC | We can focus OoC first, and then discuss whether same mechanism can be reused for in coverage scenario.  |

**Summary:**

10 companies provided inputs, and all companies agreed that further discussion is needed on how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session.

Moderator would like to prioritize the discussion for Out of coverage scenario first since similar solution might be used for in coverage scenario.

**Proposal 1: For LMF involved SL based positioning, follow SA2 on how to handle session between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID (see UE only operation).**

### 3.2.2 UE only operation (LMF not involved case)

#### 3.2.2.1 Session management

SA2 has agreed the general principles on how to support UE only operation in TS23.586, as

|  |
| --- |
| When LMF is not involved for SL Positioning/Ranging, e.g. the LMF in the serving network does not support SL Positioning, UE-only Operation SL Positioning is used, including Target UE as SL Positioning Server UE and Target UE not as SL Positioning Server UE.When Target UE as SL Positioning Server UE, the following principles applies:- The Target UE performs the Located UE's discovery and selection.- The Target UE obtains the location of the Located UE(s), and the Located UE(s) may trigger a 5GC-MO-LR to retrieve its location. The Target UE uses the location of Located UE(s) together with the Ranging/SL positioning measurement data or result to estimate its own location.- The Ranging/Sidelink positioning and the positioning of the Located UE(s) can be scheduled with the same scheduled location time (as per TS 23.273 [8]) to improve the Target UE positioning accuracy.NOTE: Security and privacy aspects require confirmation from SA WG3.When Target UE not as SL Positioning Server UE, the following principles applies:- The Target UE performs the SL Positioning Server UE's discovery and selection.- The SL Positioning Server UE can optionally determine to use the location of Located UE(s) together with the Ranging/SL positioning measurement data or result to estimate the location of Target UE.- The Ranging/Sidelink positioning and the positioning of the Located UE(s) can be scheduled with the same scheduled location time (as per TS 23.273 [8]) to improve the Target UE positioning accuracy. |

**In summary**:

* Target UE may or may not act as SL positioning server UE.
* It is target UE to select the SL positioning server UE;
* The SL positioning server UE may use the location of anchor UE together with Ranging/SL positioning measurement results to estimate the location of target UE;

SA2 also agreed the general procedure for UE-only operation as

|  |
| --- |
| 6.8 Procedures of Ranging/Sidelink Positioning controlEither UE-only Operation or Network-based Operation is applied in the Ranging/Sidelink Positioning control procedures.UE-only Operation as specified in this clause is applied for the following cases:- Neither Target UE nor SL Reference UE is served by NG-RAN.- Network-based Operation is not supported by the 5GC network:- When Network-based Operation is not supported by the 5GC network, indication on whether the UE is allowed to use UE-only operation to perform Ranging/ SL Positioning is included in the Policy/Parameter provisioned to UE as defined in clause 5.1.1.2, and is provisioned to the UE as defined in clause 5.1.1.1. The Target UE will take it into account to initiate UE-only operation procedure.- SL-MO-LR request is rejected by the network.For any other cases, Network-based Operation as specified in clauses 6.20 of TS 23.273 [8] is applied.Figure 6.8.1-1 Procedures for Ranging/Sidelink Positioning control (UE-only operation)1. UE1 (i.e. Target UE) may receive a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from:1a. SL Positioning Client UE over PC5 during procedures for Ranging/SL Positioning service exposure though PC5 as defined in clause 6.6.1.1. For absolute location, the service request includes the SL Positioning Client UE's user info and Target UE's user info, and required positioning QoS. For relative location or ranging information, the service request includes the SL Positioning Client UE's user info, Target UE's user info, SL Reference UE's user info(UE2/.../UEn), and Ranging/SL Positioning QoS information.1b. RSPP application layer. The service request includes type of the result (i.e. absolute location, relative location or ranging information) and the required QoS. 2. UE1 discovers UE2/.../UEn (i.e. SL Reference UEs/Located UEs) as defined in clause 6.4, if needed.NOTE 1: Details of security related procedures during UE discovery are developed by SA WG3.3. If none of UE1/.../UEn are served by NG-RAN or the serving network does not support Ranging/SL Positioning, , UE-only Operation is applied.4. UE1 and UE2/.../UEn perform capability exchange. Step 4 may be performed during step 5 and step 6 with coordination of SL Positioning Server UE.5. If UE1 does not support SL Positioning Server functionalities, a SL Positioning Server UE (either co-located with a SL Reference UE/Located UE, or operated by a separate UE) is discovered (if not yet discovered in step 2) and selected. If a SL Positioning Server UE that is co-located with a SL Reference UE/Located UE or operated by a separate UE, UE1 discovers and selects the SL Positioning Server UE as described in clause 6.4 and requests SL Positioning Server UE to participate in the Ranging/Sidelink positioning.NOTE 2: Details of security and privacy related procedures during SL Positioning Server UE discovery and operation are developed by SA WG3.6. Sidelink Positioning assistant data is transferred among UE1/ .../UEn and the SL Positioning Server UE.7. SL-PRS measurement is performed between UE1 and UE2/.../UEn and possibly also amongst UE2/.../UEn.8. SL-PRS measurement data is transferred to the SL Positioning Server UE or is transferred to UE1 if it supports SL Positioning Server functionalities, in order to perform result calculation. Based on the type of the result received in step 1, absolute location, relative location or ranging information is calculated at the UE.NOTE 3: Details of step 4-8 are developed by RAN WGs.9. Ranging/SL Positioning result is transferred to:9a. SL Positioning Client UE over PC5 during procedures for Ranging/SL Positioning service exposure though PC5 as defined in clause 6.6.1.1;9b. RSPP application layer. |

Based on the procedure described in TS 23.586, there is no clear MO-LR, MT-LR concept for UE-only operation. Target UE is the node who handles the Ranging/SL Positioning service request that from application layer (similar to MO-LR) or SL Positioning Client UE (Similar to MT-LR).

**Observation 6**: The Ranging/SL Positioning service request from SL Positioning Client UE can be treated as MT-LR, and the request from SLPP application layer can be treated as MO-LR;

SA2 did not define the procedure for multiple target UEs, i.e. it is unclear how an LCS Client can trigger the Ranging for multiple target UEs.

**Observation 7**: SA2 did not define the dedicated procedure on ranging for multiple target UEs;

It is difficult for RAN2 to start the discussion on how to support ranging for multiple target UEs without the information on how LCS Client triggers the session. Therefore Rapporteur would suggest to postpone the discussion on this. The main purpose of group cast is to support multiple target UEs, therefore it can also be postponed.

**Question 3.2.2.1-1: Do companies agree to postpone the discussion on the support of multiple target UEs and the group cast until SA2 defines the procedure for it?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | See comment | We do not see that SLPP session handling depends on the UE role. Groupcast remains valid when one UE has information to send (e.g., capabilities, SL PRS configuration(s), location results) to multiple other UEs. It does not matter what roles these other UEs have.We also don't think that SA2's definition of "LCS Request" is a prerequisite for RAN2 defining SLPP procedure support for multiple target UEs. RAN2 agreed that "SLPP can support multiple target UEs in the same session when LCS requests". The LCS Request/Trigger mechanism seems not dependent on the number of target UEs. However, if there should be anything specific to multiple target UEs which depends on SA2, fine to wait for SA2.  |
| OPPO | No | According to the updated 23.273(i20 version), support of multiple target UEs has been already solved by SA2 themselves. For example, in the section 6.20.1 Procedures of SL-MO-LR involving LMF, in the step 19, if absolute locations of located UEs (could be target UE2…N) are not received at step 18, the LMF can triggers 5GC-MT-LR to acquire the absolute locations of these target UEs using Application Layer ID, and using their locations to derive the position of the target UE1. In such a way, all the target UEs locations could be retrieved, and such kind of implementation does not enforce any RAN2 impact. [Moderator] Cannot find target UE in step 19, only located UEs. Located UE is not target UE, see the definition**Located UE:** A SL Reference UE of which the location is known or is able to be known using Uu based positioning. A Located UE can be used to determine the location of a Target UE using Sidelink Positioning.19. If Target UE's absolute location information is required at step 8 and if absolute location of Located UE(s) is not received at step 18, LMF can either retrieved the location of the Located UE(s) locally or triggers 5GC-MT-LR procedure to the GMLC to acquire the absolute location of the Located UE(s) using Application Layer ID or GPSI of the Located UE(s). LMF includes the QoS requirement received at step 8 in the request, which is used to derive the QoS for Located UE(s) positioning. If scheduled location time is used, LMF includes the scheduled location time in the request to GMLC. |
| vivo | See comments | RAN2 should focus on a single target UE first and further study RAN2 impact to support multiple target UEs and the group cast. |
| Nokia | See comments | Agree with Vivo. |
| Ericsson | No | We think multiple target UE is important use case that needs to be solved. |
| LG | See comments | We think groupcast mode is independent from multiple target UEs service even though it is useful for group positioning. Anyway, RAN2 can wait for SA3 until secured groupcast is resolved.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with Vivo |
| Samsung  | See comments | We also have similar view with QC that groupcast operation itself not critically related to the UE role, and scenarios. However, it seems there is not sufficient information from SA2 on the LCS service handling involving multiple target UEs. So, it is ok to postpone the discussion on the multiple target UE’s scenario. |
| CATT | See comments | Agree with Vivo. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | For SLPP broadcast and groupcast, it should be pointed out that currently SA3 has no progress on this. |
| SONY | See comments | Groupcast mode could be an efficient way for a UE to interact with multiple UEs. However, SA3 have not concluded any solution to support secure groupcast mode. We should wait until SA3 concludes and defines secure communication for groupcast mode. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes | Agree with Vivo |
| Lenovo | Yes | Officially, SA2 has completed their work so we are not sure whether SL positioning of multiple target UEs in UE-only operation will be supported in Rel-18 or not.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We would be better to focus on single target UE case. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Let’s focus first on the single target UE case.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with multiple target UE, maybe no for groupcast | Regarding multiple target UE and groupcast, SA2 has already support the case of 1:M SL positioning(i.e. ranging between one target UE and M reference UEs). However, SA2 considers this case as one target UE instead of multiple target UE, which is a little bit different with RAN2 understanding agreed in RAN2 #121bis below. According to TS23.273 SL-MO-LR procedure with LMF involvement, the groupcast/broadcast is already supported for 1:M case. Thus, we suggest that RAN2 can still discuss groupcast for the 1:M case.WA: RAN2 understand that group positioning is to acquire location estimates of multiple target UEs (absolute positioning) or multiple UE pairs (Ranging/relative positioning) per LCS request, in line with the guidance already received from SA2. |
| Apple | Comments | OK to focus on the single target UE case first, while keeping in mind the multiple target UEs scenario.  |
| Intel | Yes | Prioritize the discussion on single target UE case until SA2 completes the work on multiple target UEs. |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

13 companies agreed to focus on the support of single target UE until SA2 complete their work on multiple target UE:

1 company commented that “We also don't think that SA2's definition of "LCS Request" is a prerequisite for RAN2 defining SLPP procedure support for multiple target UEs. RAN2 agreed that "SLPP can support multiple target UEs in the same session when LCS requests". The LCS Request/Trigger mechanism seems not dependent on the number of target UEs. However, if there should be anything specific to multiple target UEs which depends on SA2, fine to wait for SA2.”.

3 companies mentioned “SA3 have not concluded any solution to support secure groupcast mode. We should wait until SA3 concludes and defines secure communication for groupcast mode.”

Moderator would suggest focusing on single target scenario in this discussion, and RAN2 can continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once SA2/SA3 provide further inputs.

**Proposal 2: RAN2 should focus on single target scenario and will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once SA2/SA3 provide further inputs.**

**Following discussion is only for single target UE scenario.**

In the procedure, UE1 (target UE) acts the important role as the AMF:

* The Target UE shall discover and select a SL Positioning Server UEs that are in the same or different serving PLMN of the Target UE and the Reference UE(s) (section 5.2.3 of TS23.586).
* The Target UE is the node that handles the Ranging/SL Positioning service request and provides the Ranging/SL Positioning service response back;
* Target UE shall establish PC5 connection with each SL Positioning server UE, Anchor UEs (reference UE in SA2)

So far, for Uu based positioning procedure, AMF is responsible for the session management, e.g. start a session when receive the LCS request, and release the session upon the completion of the positioning procedure or upon error case, e.g. HO. There is not separate session management procedure, e.g. establishment/modification/release in other entities (LMF, gNB and UE).

If we follow Uu based positioning procedure, same as AMF, the target UE should be in the best position to be responsible for the session management, and the session management should be transparent to other UEs except the release of PC5 connection.

**Question 3.2.2.1-2: Which UE should be responsible for the session management? Target UE, one of Anchor UE (reference UE/located UE in SA2), or SL Positioning Server UE? Please add if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Target UE****Anchor UE****Server UE****Others?** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Other | The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session (which should be independent of the UE role). Note that an SLPP session (or, more generically, an SLPP positioning activity) must be initiated or triggered by a UE when no LMF is involved. It cannot happen without such an event. The UE which performs the initiation or triggering is in the best position to perform the session management. |
| OPPO | Target UE first and then the SL positioning server UE | 1. We wonder what’s the meaning of establishment/modification/release in the context of the session management, Especially the ‘modification’? does it imply the change of involved UEs, e.g., anchor UEs, for the SL positioning?

[Moderator] this was mentioned in companies’ contributions, e.g. R2-23064221. According to the section 4.2 Common LPP Session Procedure in the TS 373.55, the LPP session could be initiated by the target or the server, and is terminated by a final transaction N in which LPP msgs will be exchanged between two endpoints.

we could accept that target UE or server UE to take the responsibility of the session management, and should be captured in the TS 38.355. |
| vivo | See comments | The UE acts as a positioning server should be responsible for session management, i.e., target UE if target UE acts as server UE, or server UE if target UE does not act as server UE. |
| Nokia | Server UE | It is rather unclear what exactly constitutes an SLPP session (eg, usage of bi-directional communications, commitment to perform certain tasks, de/encryption capability?). In our understanding, the key aspect of an SLPP session is the distribution of assistance data that explicitly define SL PRS transmissions and their measurements, and can be used also for implicit (re)-definition of session members (see next answer). So our preference would that the server UE manages the SLPP “session” as it implements the positioning method, configures SL PRS and ultimately consumes the SL PRS measurements. |
| Ericsson | Other | Same as LPP; the instigator should manage. |
| LG | Server UE | Server UE can coordinate between target UE and anchor UEs. Of course, we think that it is simple and feasible for target UE to take a role of server UE. If target UE could not support the role of server UE, target UE will discover/find server UE.  |
| ZTE | Target UE | This is under the UE-only scenario and only one target UE involved. So the session type can only be SL-MO-LR, target UE initiates the procedure. So the target UE should manage the session. |
| CEWiT | Server UE | SL Positioning server which can be either target UE or any other anchor UE is best suited for session management in both SL-MO-LR and SL-MT-LR cases not involving LMF. |
| Samsung  | Both UE can be possible | We still don’t know whether this session management is dependent on the UE role, so basically either target or server UE can be one of them to manage the session. And the usage of session in UE-only case and LMF-involved case is a bit different in that mapping of the target UE and correct LMF (and further differentiation of LCS request/response within the same LMF) would be the purpose of LMF-involved case while unifying a group of involved UEs per specific LCS request/and identifying each msg within the group is the one of UE-only case. So, we don’t have strong need to stick to the AMF role in LMF-involved case (session creation and management) for the UE-only case. i.e., server UE can do that directly. |
| CATT | Target UE first and then the SL positioning server UE | An SLPP session is triggered by the target UE received a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from the client UE or application layer. Therefore, the target UE is the instigator of SLPP session. If SLPP session is initiated or triggered after step 5, SL positioning server UE can be the instigator of SLPP session. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Target UE | The issue is that the session ID needs to be unique between UEs and target UE is in the central role that performs the discovery procedure. The session ID can be carried in the discovery message. |
| SONY | See comments | Each SLPP session in the SL positioning server UE needs to be uniquely identifiable. This suggests that it is the SL positioning server UE that is responsible for the session management. But may depend on the different roles the UE can take, e.g. the Target UE can also be a server UE. Further it could also be the initiator of the session that should be responsible. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Target UE or Server UE | In LPP, either the target UE or server UE can initiate an LPP session. So we think target UE or server UE to take the responsibility of the session management. But we also have a concern that why we need separate session management for SL positioning e.g. establishment/modification/release?  |
| Lenovo | Target UE and Server UE  | Referring to current SA2 status it looks ok to us that the target UE is responsible for the session management. But it may be useful to check with SA2 why SL-MT-LR is triggered by Client UE via Target UE1 and not via Server UE. We think triggering SL-MT-LR by separate Server UE entity is a valid use-case.[Moderator] We can conclude in RAN2 first, and then check SA2 whether they have any concern.  |
| InterDigital | Server UE |  |
| Fraunhofer  | Server UE  | However (server UE and target UE) , (server UE and anchor UE) could be same physical device. This should be the UE which coordinates (basically meaning LMF like functionality) the anchor UEs for a given target UE.  |
| Xiaomi | Other | The UE who initiates the SLPP session should performs the session management.Currently, according to SA2 spec, it is the target UE who initiates the SLPP session. It is not clear whether SA2 will also support reference UE initiating the SLPP session. To be safe, it is better to use the wording “the UE who initiates the SLPP session”. |
| Apple | Comments | If we follow the same principles as in legacy, it should be the SL Positioning Server UE. However, maybe we can assume that all the UEs supporting SL positioning also support SL Positioning server UE functionality, in which case it can be the target UE. |
| Intel | The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session | Agree with QC and Xiaomi that the UE which initiates an SLPP session is in the best position for session management, e.g. assign the session ID, e.t.c. |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session:4 companies ( Qualcomm, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel)

Target UE: 7 companies (OPPO, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Lenovo)

Server UE: 12 companies (OPPO, vivo, Nokia, LG, CEWiT, Samsung, SONY, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, InterDigital, Fraunhofer, APPLE)

Some companies who support target UE mentioned “An SLPP session is triggered by the target UE received a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from the client UE or application layer. Therefore, the target UE is the instigator of SLPP session”, therefore seems they can also support “The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session”.

Considering it is the fundamental issue for session management, Moderator would suggest to check companies’ view again in Phase 2 discussion.

**Question 3.2.2.1-3: Do companies agree that the session management, e.g. establishment/ release is transparent to other UEs than the UE who is responsible for session management except the release of PC5 connection? Please elaborate your reason if you have different view.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | No | Each UE in a session needs to be aware of each other UE in the session and when the session has started and ended, e.g., to assign and later release resources, state information, etc. If UEs are not aware of this, the following problems could arise:* a UE continues (trying to) transmit and/or measure SL PRS after a session has ended
* a UE continues trying to measure SL PRS that was transmitted by another UE which has now left the session
* a UE does not measure SL PRS or obtain SL PRS measurements from another UE which has recently joined the session
* a UE does not know which other UEs are transmitting SL PRS or providing location results which could not only prevent location determination for these other UEs but also impede a UE locating itself
* some V2X and PS use cases might not be supported – where UEs are expected to know which other UEs they are interacting with
 |
| OPPO | Yes | For the LPP, the session is initiated when either the target or the server sends an LPP for an initial LPP transaction j to the other endpoint B, and is further ended by a final transaction N LPP msg. If the SLPP follows such rule, it is hard to let UEs other than the transmitting/reception UE of the initial/final SLPP msg to know the start/end of the SLPP. To achieve such goal, we need to introduce a lot of redundant notification signaling msgs in the SLPP signaling procedure, which is unnecessary.On the other hand, we think the anchor UE should just perform according to the received signaling msg and that’s it. For example, regarding the case of time-frequency resource allocated by the network, the UE should perform positioning measurement according to the SL-PRS configuration received from the location server; regrading the case of UE autonomous time-frequency resource determination case, a positioning measurement window could be set, and the UE only needs to perform the positioning measurement of the target SL-PRSs informed by the location server. Regarding the 4th bullet mentioned by Qualcomm, we don’t understand the point. Why a UE does not know which other UEs are transmitting SL PRS or providing location results could prevent location determination for these other UEs |
| vivo | Yes | Similar to Uu positioning, explicit session management is not needed. A UE may release the positioning session when there has been no activity for a particular location session for a specific time. |
| Nokia | Yes | Explicit session member management involving every single session member implies excessive overhead in terms of operational messaging (eg, “add / remove member, start / end session”) as well as SLPP specification (dedicated message types). Transparent light-weight management where only specific UE(s) may be aware of full session extent and state (eg, only the server UE) is preferable. Technically, the transparent approach can be implemented based on coordination of SL PRS transmissions and measurements via appropriate assistance data. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Prefer light weight. |
| LG | No | We think that implicit LPP session operation is not suitable for SL positioning due to the nature of UE dynamic movement. Although somewhat redundant of explicit signaling, explicit SLPP session operation is clear to all participated UEs in an SLPP session. Instead of explicit signaling, session operation command can be included in SLPP common section in order to reduce signaling overhead.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree that the SLPP session management does not need explicit signaling. The target UE and multiple anchor UEs will set up many source-destination ID pairs(one-to-many positioning or many-to-one positioning). all of the source-destination ID pairs together form a SLPP session. Each source-destination ID pair already has the unicast link establish/modify/release procedure. |
| CEWiT | See comment | We have some queries regarding transparency of session management.Is session ID indicated to the participating UEs if session handling is transparent? [Moderator] the question is only related to session management procedure, i.e. whether explicit session setup/modification/release is needed or not. It is unrelated to whether session ID should be included in SLPP message. Do the participating UEs in SL positioning activity get assigned same session ID by the UE handling session management? |
| Samsung  | Slightly prefer “Yes” | We think this issue is rather related to the how much of functional flexibility of anchor UE needs to be considered in the session design. We understand both sides that if there is transparent session management, then there would be unnecessary or errorneous operations as QC commented, but signaling overhead seems inevitable at the same time. If we have rather conservative view that anchor UE’s SL-PRS transmission/reception operation is some static ones just like TRP operation in Uu positioning, then target UE might not need to consider the anchor UE’s every situation but follow the given assistance data.  |
| CATT | Yes | There is no need to introduce explicit SLPP session establishment/ release operation. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | No need for explicit SLPP session management, just like LPP |
| SONY | See comment | This may depends on scenario and use case. One case is when a UE participates in the SLPP Session and leaves the session intentionally or another case is when the session is dropped out for other reasons, e.g. like out of range/coverage. All cases needs to be handled by the UE, so not sure if explicit signaling is needed or not. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes | Similar to Uu, explicit session management is not necessary. When the UE cannot receive data from the session for a specific time, it will be considered that the session has released. When UE receives data identified by previous session ID, it will consider it to be previous session. |
| Lenovo | No | We think also UEs other than the UE that initiates a SL positioning session should be aware of the sessions in which they are involved. Reason: SL positioning introduces additional complexity for the UE so that the number of simultaneous SL positioning sessions that a SL positioning capable UE supports may be limited. And in case of overload such UE may need to abort ongoing session(s). |
| InterDigital | No | Explicit SLPP session is clear to all UEs. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | The server UE should handle this. The assistance data provided to UEs can be updated if another UE has left the session.  |
| Xiaomi | May be no | There may no need for explicit session setup, session modification, but explicit session release may be needed for all the other UEs to know when the session is terminated. It can avoid UEs performing SL-PRS transmission/reception unnecessarily after session is terminated.  |
| Apple | Comments | If the question is about explicit SLPP session management then we don’t see the need for this. [Moderator] Yes, the question is for explicit SLPP session management.  |
| Intel | Yes | Same as legacy LPP procedure, there is no explicit session setup/modification/release procedure. |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

No explicit session management procedure :12 companies ( OPPO, vivo, Nokia, Ericsson, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer, APPLE, Intel)

Explicit session management procedure: 5 companies (Qualcomm, LG, Lenovo, InterDigital, xiaomi, )

Qualcomm mentioned “If UEs are not aware of this, the following problems could arise:

* a UE continues (trying to) transmit and/or measure SL PRS after a session has ended
* a UE continues trying to measure SL PRS that was transmitted by another UE which has now left the session
* a UE does not measure SL PRS or obtain SL PRS measurements from another UE which has recently joined the session
* a UE does not know which other UEs are transmitting SL PRS or providing location results which could not only prevent location determination for these other UEs but also impede a UE locating itself
* some V2X and PS use cases might not be supported – where UEs are expected to know which other UEs they are interacting with”

However companies who preferred to follow legacy LPP procedure believed the issue mentioned by Qualcomm can be resolved by assistance data management procedure as today.

Considering it is the fundamental issue for session management, Moderator would suggest to check companies’ view again in Phase 2 discussion.

**Question 3.2.2.1-4: Any other issues to be discussed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issues** | **Remark** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### 3.2.2.2 The need of explicit session ID for UE-only operation

As discussed in the section 3.1, the purposes of session ID for Uu based positioning are:

|  |
| --- |
| From core-network perspective, the purposes of session ID for Uu based positioning are:* **Purpose 1**: Correlation identifier is used by the AMF to identify the correct LMF for a particular UE during a positioning session, i.e. routing purpose;
* **Purpose 2**: Correlation identifier is used by the LMF to associate the location response with the location request when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing for the UE with the same positioning server since there is no transaction ID concept in these messages.
 |

**[Rapporteur] For purpose 1 and 2,** it is unclear whether the session ID is needed for UE only operation since the LCS client has direction connection with the target UE. The target UE can associate the location response with the location request even if there is concurrent positioning session for the same target UE since target UE is responsible for the selection of anchor UEs and server UE for the Location request.

**Question 3.2.2.2-1: For UE only operation, regarding the need of explicit session ID which of the purposes above do companies support? Please add if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Purpose 1****Purpose 2****Others?** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | Other | LMF/AMF Correlation ID and Routing ID are not relevant to SLPP interactions between UEs.The SLPP Session ID is used to identify a sidelink positioning location/ranging session (i.e., all SLPP transactions and SLPP messages belonging to this session). It allows endpoints (i.e. UEs) to distinguish SLPP messages for one session from SLPP messages for other sessions. One UE may simultaneously participate in multiple SLPP sessions. Each separate SLPP session may be with a different individual UE, with a different group of UEs, or with overlapping groups of UEs. The UE must maintain knowledge and status of each distinct SLPP session it is engaged in, including the session participants and session requirements. The UE may have the same or a different role within each location/ranging session it is involved in and there may be different QoS, different SL-PRS configurations and different measurements. Not distinguishing different sessions in a multi-session scenario risks being unable to support the unique requirements of each session.  |
| OPPO |  | Not convinced by Qualcomm. For example, regarding the measurement, the UE could simply act according to the received SL-PRS configuration and the signaling msg received such as the SL Location Information Request informing the UE of which type of positioning measurement is requested and the response time required. All required is to associate the response signaling msg with the request signaling msg. |
| vivo | Others | Similar to Uu positioning, an SLPP session can be used between UEs to manage the positioning procedures for one specific location request. - SLPP session can be used to associate different transactions. For example, the UE is performing two parallel positionings. When receiving a Request Location Information message after receiving two Provide Assistant Data messages separately for two sessions, the UE needs to associate the Request Location Information message with the corresponding Provide Assistant Data message, not another Provide Assistant Data message. The association is done via the session ID.- UEs can manage the AD/ variables per SLPP session. |
| Nokia | See comments | In general, we agree that individual positioning processes (“sessions”) must be distinguished irrespective of transitioning between in LPP and SLPP as well as various coverage conditions (involvement of LMF or server UE; note also that the LMF may delegate a positioning process to a server UE, eg when OOC condition is upcoming or for load-balancing / latency purposes. Vice versa, a handover from server UE to LMF is plausible too, eg target UE or its anchor UE move back to IC conditions).So while it is agreeable to introduce a session ID in SLPP, we should do so with an understanding of how to connect the SLPP identifiers with LPP Routing / Correlation ID. For example, these can be all equal (eg, used to initialize each other). Alternatively, if stand-alone SLPP session IDs are used, then we need to discuss how to configure and preserve their association with the Routing / Correlation ID. |
| Ericsson | See Comments | If NRPPa transaction ID alike solution could work for SL UE only operation, then we agree explicit session ID is not needed. |
| LG | Other | See below answer (Question 3.2.2.2-2).  |
| ZTE | others | This is UE-only scenario. One UE can be simultaneously in different SLPP sessions, e.g., the UE acts as a target UE in session 1(receive SL-PRS and make measurements), and the UE acts as a anchor UE in session 2(send SL-PRS to other UEs). we think session ID is used to differ different SLPP sessions of one UE |
| CEWiT | Other | Explicit session ID handled by server UE is preferable in the case of UE-only operation. |
| Samsung  | Other  | As our answer in Question 3.2.2.1-2, session ID in UE-only case and LMF-involved case is not exactly same. We concern the involvement of other UEs in different session could make problematic cases, which is the different purpose than LPP case. Regarding transition between LPP session ID (e.g., routing and correlation ID combination) and SLPP session ID, we think one of two or both can be used effectively according to the cases. Don’t have strong motivation to have a common structure between SLPP session ID and Uu based IDs (correlation and routing ID combination) |
| CATT | Other | Introduce session ID in SLPP messages to identify the SLPP session which is used to instead of Routing ID + Correlation ID solution for SL positioning. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Agree with QC’s comment | The two purposes are not relevant here, since there is no LMF in the UE-only case. Nevertheless, the session ID is still needed between two UEs to differentiate multiple positioning sessions |
| SONY | Other | Same solution shall be selected for UE-only mode as for non-UE-only mode. Whether this is a SLPP Session ID or other implicit solution we need to conclude. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Others | Explicit session ID can be used to identify concurrent LCS requests for the same UE. And session ID can also be used to manage SLPP session. For example, session ID is used to associate different transactions. Because in PC5-only case, there is not routing ID and correction ID.  |
| Lenovo | See comments | We think an explicit session ID in SLPP is needed for UE-only operation since Routing ID/LCS correlation ID is not applicable in this case and a UE may be involved in multiple SL positioning sessions. We think relying on transaction IDs is not sufficient and may result in collisions. |
| InterDigital |  | Explicit session ID in an SLPP is needed for UE-only operation. |
| Fraunhofer  | Other | We see session ID to identify signalling messages associated with a single target UE, so that AD, measurement reports and requests (from different anchor UEs) can be associated with the location request for this particular target UE.  |
| Xiaomi | Other | Session ID is used by the target UE to differentiate SLPP messages for different location service requests when more than one location service request procedure is ongoing among the target UE and anchor UEs/server UE. |
| Apple | Comments | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Intel | None | Purpose 1 and 2 are not applied for SLPP OoC scenario.  |

**Summary:**

19 companies provided inputs.

Need of session ID (same as purpose 6 in Question 3.2.2.2-2) :15 companies ( Qualcomm, vivo, Nokia, LG, ZTE, CEWiT, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, InterDigital, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi, Apple); Qualcomm commented that “The UE may have the same or a different role within each location/ranging session it is involved in and there may be different QoS, different SL-PRS configurations and different measurements. Not distinguishing different sessions in a multi-session scenario risks being unable to support the unique requirements of each session.”

OPPO commented that the UE can link location information request, assistance information based on requested positioning method, and therefore explicit session ID is not needed.

Ericsson commented that “If NRPPa transaction ID alike solution could work for SL UE only operation, then we agree explicit session ID is not needed.”.

SONY preferred the common solution for UE only mode and non-UE-only mode.

Considering the purposes mentioned by companies are same as purposes listed in Question 3.2.2.2-2, these two issues can be discussed together.

|  |
| --- |
| * Reliable transmission
	+ Duplicate detection: A receiver shall record the most recent received sequence number for each location session. If a message is received carrying the same sequence number as that last received for the associated location session, it shall be discarded.
	+ NOTE: For LPP control-plane use, a target device can be aware of a location session from information provided at the NAS level for downlink transport of an LPP message.
	+ Retransmission: When an LPP message which requires acknowledgement is sent and not acknowledged, it is resent by the sender following a timeout period up to three times. If still unacknowledged after that, the sender aborts all LPP activity for the associated session.
	+ Segmentation: If the receiver receives a subsequent LPP message for the same session and transaction ID, the receiver shall assume that the new LPP message continues the segmentation of the earlier message and may store the new message if the new message indicates that more messages are on the way.
* Periodic Assistance Data Transfer
	+ *periodicSessionID*
* Error Detection
	+ 4> discard all stored LPP message segments for this session and LPP-TransactionID;

From LPP management perspective, the purposes of session ID for Uu based positioning are:* **Purpose 3**: session ID is used to identify a session since reliable transmission is handled per positioning session;
* **Purpose 4**: session ID is used to identify a session since error detection is handled per positioning session;
* **Purpose 5**: session ID is used to identify a session since Periodic Assistance Data Transfer could be handled as separate session for different LMF;
 |

**Rapporteur’s understanding:**

**For purpose 3**

* **duplicate detection,** session ID may not be needed if sequence number (size 256) can be unique for messages between same pair of UEs among different sessions.
* **Retransmission:** Session ID may not be needed since if still unacknowledged after the condition, the UE shall aborts all SLPP activity for the pair of UEs for all sessions involved;
* **Segmentation:** session ID may not be needed if transaction id (size 256) can be unique for messages between same pair of UEs among different sessions.

**For purpose 4:** See the comments on the purpose 3.

**For purpose 5:** Not applied since SLPP does not support GNSS;

During offline discussion, some companies commented that session ID is needed to support multiple UEs in the same session or same UE with different/same role in different session.

|  |
| --- |
| **Purpose 6**: Session ID is needed to support multiple UEs in the same session or same UE in different sessions. Different from Uu positioning, A SL positioning session involves multiple UEs (target UE(s), anchor UEs and/or server UE). And an UE may be in parallel SL positioning sessions simultaneously. Therefore, introduce session ID in the SLPP messages is needed to identify sessions. |

**Rapporteur’s understanding:**

**For purpose 6:** so far RAN2 has agreed following messages

1. SL Positioning Capability Transfer

2. SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange

3. SL Location Information Transfer

4. Error handling

5. Abort

* Messages “Positioning Capability Transfer” and “Abort” are not session specific procedure.
* Message “Error handling” is related to purpose 4;
* Message “SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange” and “SL Location Information Transfer” can be session specific. However the UE can know the relationship between assistance data and requested location information based on positioning method since both assistance data and requested location information are contained as positioning method specific IEs.
* For a positioning session involving multiple UEs, e.g. ranging, the Tx UE does not need to know for which session the SL PRS is transmitted to. The Rx UE only needs to know which positioning method should be done based on the received assistance data (it can be reflected based on positioning method specific IE for both assistance data and measurement results). According to SA2 procedure, target UE is responsible for reference UEs selection based on the input from LCS service request, and therefore it can know which pair of ranging results should be sent back to the LCS client.
* For a UE involving in multiple positioning session simultaneously, same as above, the information should be maintained by target UE. If the UE acts as anchor UE, the UE may not need to know the session information.

**Question 3.2.2.2-2: For UE only operation, regarding the need of explicit session ID which of the purposes above do companies support? Please add if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Purpose 3****Purpose 4****Purpose 5****Purpose 6****Others?** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | All and Others | As noted in our response to Question 3.2.2.2-1, the Session ID is principally used to identify a location/ranging session (i.e., all SLPP transactions and all SLPP messages belonging to this session). It allows endpoints to distinguish messages for one session from messages for other sessions. One UE may be involved in multiple location/ranging sessions (and with the same or different roles in these sessions). The other purposes (Purposes 3-6) are also all supported.We believe the concept has already been agreed in RAN2:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement: Sidelink positioning supports a session-based concept in SLPP, in which signalling messages within a session can be associated with one another by the involved UEs. The relationship to upper-layer designs from SA2 can be discussed during normative work.FFS if there is also sessionless operation and what aspects of session-based operation would not be included. |

The remaining question seems to be how this can be realized in SLPP, and we think a Session ID in each SLPP message is a rather obvious/simple realization. |
| Vivo | All and others | See comments to Question 3.2.2.2-1.The rapporteur seems to imply that explicit session ID is not needed, and sequence number & transaction id are enough. But we think they are not sufficient. For instance, the rapporteur says “the UE can know the relationship between assistance data and requested location information based on positioning method since both assistance data and requested location information are contained as positioning method specific IEs”. However, there is no strict one-to-one mapping between AD and positioning methods, e.g., different SL sessions may use the same method but the reference UEs for ranging are not the same, and the corresponding ADs may include different anchor UEs.Besides, this approach is not aligned with the previous RAN2 agreement that for session-based SLPP, a single SLPP session is created to support a single location request. And the UE cannot perform the lifecycle management per location sessionTherefore, we think that explicit SLPP session ID is needed. |
| Nokia | All and others | As already noted above, said Purposes are based on the ability to identify individual positioning processes (“sessions”). Introducing a “session ID” in SLPP domain to this end should be however discussed in conjunction with the identification mechanisms of the LPP domain, ie the connection to Routing / Correlation ID.  |
| Ericsson |  | It appears there can be two different approaches:1. Use explicit Session ID
2. Use implicit Session ID by using transaction ID

We could see the solution for both and decide. |
| LG | All and others | It may not be feasible to distinguish SLPP session only using transaction ID. One anchor UE can be involved in multiple sessions to support one and more target UEs, where different target UEs may use valid transaction ID within its own session. Moreover, multiple session can be triggered from one target UE. In complicated situation, it is difficult for anchor UE to distinguish each session from mixed transaction IDs. We think explicit SLPP session ID is necessary for sidelink positioning. |
| ZTE | All  | We think explicit session ID is needed to better serve one-to-many/man-to-one positioning, which contains multiple source-destination ID pairs.Also agree with vivo that only session+transaction can let a UE(which is in 2 sessions)know what to do next. In LPP, the session is identified by Routing / Correlation ID; in SLPP UE only scenario, the session ID should be explicitly provided. |
| CEWiT | All | Explicit session ID in SLPP message can support all the above mentioned purposes.  |
| Samsung  | All and others | We have the same view with QC, and vivo that there is the case where Ad and pos method is not mapped one-to-one, and the involved UE’s might be different. In general, session ID in SLPP has more aspects to be considered than LPP session ID.  |
| CATT | All and others | Agree with QC, vivo and LG. AD and positioning method is not one-to-one mapping, and an anchor UE may participant in multiple sessions to position one or multiple target UEs. Explicit session ID can be used to distinguish each session from mixed transaction IDs.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All | The SLPP procedures should be per SLPP session |
| SONY | other | We support explicit SLPP Session ID for PC5 and Correlation/routing ID for Uu. A UE may need to associate the SLPP Session ID (PC5) with the routing ID for Uu (LMF). |
| Spreadtrum communications | All | Explicit session ID in SLPP message can support all the above mentioned purposes. |
| Lenovo | 3 + 4 + 6 | We think an explicit session ID is needed in UE-only operation to allow the UE to distinguish the SLPP transactions of different SL positioning sessions. Furthermore, we prefer to strive for a common solution where a session ID is included in all SLPP messages which are exchanged in the context of an session.Purpose 5 can be supported if A-GNSS is supported for SL positioning. |
| InterDigital | All |  |
| Fraunhofer  | All |  |
| Xiaomi | All & others | A possible mapping between SLPP sessions and SL-PRS resources in a UE are given below:Excepts the purpose listed by the rapporteur, session ID also helps:- correlates a SL-PRS resource as well as positioning method with a session.SL-PRS resources is provided in assistant information per positioning method.If session ID is not explicitly included, SLPP request location information message needs to include the SL-PRS ID to correlates the SL-PRS with the location request. Currently, there is no PRS ID in LPP location request message.Besides, Rapporteur says to use transaction ID for differentiation different sessions. It will limit the number of parallel sessions one UE can support and also the number of transactions in one session. For example, if the size of transaction ID is 256, if hard split of 64 is specified per session, then only 4 parallel sessions can be supported. If larger transaction IDs (>246) are introduced, it would be the same as having explicit session ID and with more complexity.  |
| Apple |  | Agree with E/// |
| Intel |  | We are fine to go for majority |

**Summary:**

18 companies provided inputs.

Need of session ID (purpose 3-6 and tt allows endpoints to distinguish messages for one session from messages for other sessions.) :15 companies ( Qualcomm, vivo, Nokia, LG, ZTE, CEWiT, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Sony, Spreadtrum, Lenovo (except 5), InterDigital, Fraunhofer, Xiaomi); vivo/Samsung commented that “there is the case where Ad and pos method is not mapped one-to-one, and the involved UE’s might be different.”

Ericsson/Apple commented that “

|  |
| --- |
| It appears there can be two different approaches:1. Use explicit Session ID
2. Use implicit Session ID by using transaction ID

We could see the solution for both and decide. |

”.

Considering there is clear majority on the need of explicit session ID. Rapporteur would suggest:

**Proposal 3: Introduce explicit field “sessionID” in SLPP, and put it under message header of SLPP message.**

**Question 3.2.2.2-3: Any other issues to be discussed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issues** | **Remark** |
| Qualcomm | - how the session is managed at the endpoints;- how the session is managed among multiple UEs (target UE(s), anchor UE(s), and server UE); and- the relation to groupcast cases (managed groupcast and unmanaged groupcast). | It seems Phase 1 covers only the first item of the email discussion scope:**-** whether a session identifier is explicitly needed in SLPP signalling; |
| Nokia  | * delivery of data associated with a given positioning process in all possible coverage and configuration scenarios
* applicability / differences w.r.t session-less positioning
 | * the email discussion focuses on SLPP and LPP aspects in isolation without studying seamless delivery across SLPP and LPP as well as independently of source and destination and their coverage conditions
* what are implications session-less positioning on SLPP if some baseline messaging is needed (eg, request to process measurements at remote server UE)
 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussion-Phase 2

Based on the discussion in phase 1, following proposals are made:

Proposal 1: For LMF involved SL based positioning, follow SA2 on how to handle session between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID (see UE only operation).

Proposal 2: RAN2 should focus on single target scenario and will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once SA2/SA3 provide further inputs.

Proposal 3: Introduce explicit field “*sessionID*” in SLPP, and put it under message header of SLPP message. FFS how session ID

Rapporteur would like to check companies whether they are agreeable or not:

**Question 4-1: Do companies agree the proposal 1-3 listed above? Please provide your comments if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **P1-3 (yes or no)** | **Remark** |
| Apple | Yes, with comments | Regarding the issue of multiple target UEs, we don’t necessarily need much additional inputs from SA2 – the issue is primarily time and prioritization, so suggest rephrasing as follows “…will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once the basic functionality has been defined”. The rest is fine. |
| Vivo | Yes for all, comments on P3 | Add ‘for UE-only operation’ in P3, otherwise, the FFS in P1 is not clear. |
| Ericsson | P1 is unclear, and additionally pls see comments for P2, P3 | For P1: There may be only one session/correlation ID between LMF and UE whereas there may be multiple UE-only SL sessions. Hence, one cannot associate the correlation ID with UE-only session ID; unless UE informs to LMF of the session ID including UEs those are involved for SL-MO-LR and for SL-MT-LR LMF need to assign the SL session ID to target UE to be used for SL-only operation.The principle that instigator assigns the session ID should prevail. So, if LMF initiates SLPP session then LMF should assign the session ID.Agree with Apple and Vivo for P2 and P3.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | For P1, fails to understand the FFS part. For UE only mode, we assume there is no routing ID/correlation ID.Ok with P2.P3 to clarify with UE only mode. |
| OPPO | P3 | If really need the session ID, at least a unified design between SLPP and LPP should be pursued. For the LPP, the session ID is embodied in the NAS layer, the layer below the LPP layer. For SLPP session ID, it could be located in the V2X/Prose Layer.  |
| Nokia  | Yes | Group positioning can be de-prioritized, end-to-end signalling for single UE is an important baseline. |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree to add UE-only operation in P3 |
| Spreadtrum communications | Yes for all, comments on P1 | For P1, FFS is not clear. We think there are two questions. One question is whether there are multiple UE-only SLPP session between UEs associating with a SLPP session (identifying by routing ID/correlation ID) between UE and LMF to locate the target UE? Other is that who will associates UE only SLPP session ID with the routing ID/correlation ID?For question one, we have agreed that “for session-based SLPP, a single SLPP session is created to support a single location request at least in case of a single target UE”. So we think that for a single location request, there is only one UE-only SLPP session to be used. For question two, we can discuss further.P2 is fine. P3 to clarify with UE only mode. |
| SONY | Yes, with comments | For P1 not totally clear what is the FFS. For P2. Think we need to be aligned with SA3 on security. |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | The FFS part in P3 is incomplete. We suppose it should say “FFS how session ID is defined.” Furthermore, we disagree to add “for UE-only operation” in P3. We think the session ID is needed in the procedures with LMF involvement for the SLPP message exchange between the involved UEs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | P1; P3 yes | For P2, We don’t need to specify in meticulous details for multiple target UEs in stage2. While for stage3, we are not sure what are the needed spec impacts. Maybe no spec impacts are needed?? |
| Philips | Yes, with comments. | Agree with Apple on P2 and Lenovo on P3 |
| CEWiT | Yes | P1: Fine to follow SA2 for LMF involved SL-based positioning.P2: Agree with Apple.P3: Explicit *sessionID* field inside SLPP message for UE-only cases. |
| InterDigital | Yes | For P1, we are fine to follow SA2 decision.For P3, for UE-only case. |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comments for P1.No for P2Yes for P3 | P1: Should probably be: "...follow SA2 on how to handle an SPP session between UE (who has connection with network) and LMF.RAN2 should not discuss AMF behavior. It is unclear what "same SLPP session" in the 2nd sentence means. LMF can only talk to one UE.P2: "multiple target UEs" and "broadcast/groupcast" are not necessarily connected. It is unclear why the RAN2 work on multiple target UEs depends on SA2. According RAN2 agreement "SLPP can support multiple target UEs in the same session when LCS requests." RAN2 should continue to work under this assumption. In addition, SA2 has limited support for multiple target UEs already in TS 23.273. E.g., in clause 6.20.4 (Procedures of SL-MT-LR for periodic, triggered Location Events), step 10 includes "The LCS Periodic-Triggered SL-MT-LR request also includes the identities of the target UEs. The requested location results (e.g. absolute locations, relative locations, ranges, directions, velocities and relative velocities) for the target UEs and QoS". It is unclear why the RAN2 work depends on SA3. SA3 has agreed that security can be implemented for sidelink ranging and positioning signaling sent over groupcast or broadcast and is actively designing a security solution to do so. We can not see why RAN2/SLPP work depends on SA3 input. |
| CATT | Yes, with comments. | Agree with Ericsson on P1, Apple on P2 and Lenovo on P3 |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Agree the comments from Apple and Lenovo |

**Summary: 18 companies provided inputs**

**Regarding “Proposal 1: For LMF involved SL based positioning, follow SA2 on how to handle session between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle UEs involved in the same SLPP session and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID (see UE only operation).”**

* **2 companies (Ericsson, CATT) commented** that the P1 is unclear, and would like to agree the principle that instigator assigns the session ID and therefore, if LMF initiates SLPP session then LMF should assign the session ID. **[Rapporteur comments]** it has been covered by the FFS part. Therefore would suggest to agree the proposal 1 as it is.
* **1 company (xiaomi) commented** that there is no sourting ID/correlation ID for UE only mode. **[Rapporteur comments]** the intention was to follow the principle for UE only operator on SLPP session part, but would be fine to remove “see UE only operator” in order to avoid the congusion.
* **1 company (Spreadtrum) commented** that “there are two questions. One question is whether there are multiple UE-only SLPP session between UEs associating with a SLPP session (identifying by routing ID/correlation ID) between UE and LMF to locate the target UE? Other is that who will associates UE only SLPP session ID with the routing ID/correlation ID**”. [Rapporteur comments]** agree the comments, but would like to no spend much time on open issues considering there were different proposals in last meeting for question 1.
* **1 company (Qualcomm) commented** that “P1: Should probably be: "...follow SA2 on how to handle an SPP session between UE (who has connection with network) and LMF. RAN2 should not discuss AMF behavior. It is unclear what "same SLPP session" in the 2nd sentence means. LMF can only talk to one UE. **[Rapporteur comments]** It is ok to add “LMF involved SL based positioning” in the first session as “follow SA2 on how to handle ~~session~~ LMF involved SL based positioning between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF”, but would suggest to keep AMF since it is part of the procedure. For second comments, the intention was to say “multiple UEs involved in the SL positioning are handled in the same SLPP session”, but would be ok to change it as “FFS on how to handle session for UEs involved in the same ~~SLPP session~~ LMF involved SL based positioning and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID (see UE only operation).”
* **”**

**Regarding “Proposal 2: RAN2 should focus on single target scenario and will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once SA2/SA3 provide further inputs. “**

* **5 companies (APPLE, Ericsson, Philips, CEWiT, CATT, Intel) commented** that “Regarding the issue of multiple target UEs, we don’t necessarily need much additional inputs from SA2 – the issue is primarily time and prioritization, so suggest rephrasing as follows “…will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once the basic functionality has been defined”.**” [Rapporteur comments]** ok with the change.
* **1 company (SONY) commented that “**we need to be aligned with SA3 on security.**”. [Rapporteur comments]** agree that we should align with SA3.
* **1 company (huawei) commented that “**For P2, We don’t need to specify in meticulous details for multiple target UEs in stage2. While for stage3, we are not sure what are the needed spec impacts. Maybe no spec impacts are needed??**” [Rapporteur comments]** The impact to stage 3 is unclear. There was discussion in last meeting on whether a single session is applied or multiple sessions.

**Regarding “Proposal 3: Introduce explicit field “sessionID” in SLPP, and put it under message header of SLPP message. FFS how session ID “**

* **6 companies (vivo, Ericsson, xiaomi, ZTE, Spreadtrum, InterDigital) commented that “**Add ‘for UE-only operation’ in P3.**” 1 company (Lenovo,** **Philips, )“**disagree to add “for UE-only operation” in P3. We think the session ID is needed in the procedures with LMF involvement for the SLPP message exchange between the involved UEs.**” [Rapporteur comments]** Tend to agree with Lenovo, but would be ok to accept the change considering anyway we need to resolve open issues for proposal 1.
* **1 company (OPPO) commented** that “If really need the session ID, at least a unified design between SLPP and LPP should be pursued. For the LPP, the session ID is embodied in the NAS layer, the layer below the LPP layer. For SLPP session ID, it could be located in the V2X/Prose Layer. **” [Rapporteur comments]** It would be good to limit the changes for SLPP, i.e. no involve other group as much as possible.
* **4 companies (Lenovo, Philips, CATT, Intel) commented** that “The FFS part in P3 is incomplete. We suppose it should say “FFS how session ID is defined.” **[Rapporteur comments]** ok with the change.
* **”**

Based on the inputs from companies, there is clear majority on the proposals although companies had comments on the wording of proposals. Rapporteur would suggest to agree the following updated Proposals:

**Proposal 1: For LMF involved SL based positioning, follow SA2 on how to handle LMF involved SL based positioning between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle session for UEs involved in the same LMF involved SL based positioning and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID.**

**Proposal 2: RAN2 should focus on single target scenario and will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once the basic functionality has been defined.**

**Proposal 3: For UE-only operation, introduce explicit field “sessionID” in SLPP, and put it under message header of SLPP message. FFS how session ID is defined**

If proposal 3 is agreeable, another question is whether it is applied for all cast type, unicast, groupcast and broadcast?

Considering there should not be session concept for broadcast message, Rapporteur think “*sessionID*” is applicable for unicast and groupcast.

**Question 4-2 If proposal 3 is agreeable, do companies agree that the** **sessionID” is applicable for the messages for unicast and groupcast? Please provide your comments if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes for unicast, no for groupcast | Agreements:Proposal 1 (modified): RAN2 agrees to support unicast SLPP/RSPP session-based operation and to study the applicability of groupcast/broadcast to SLPP/RSPP group operation. FFS if groupcast/broadcast operation, if supported, would be session-based or sessionless.RAN2 only agreed to support unicast session-based operation in SI. To our understanding, the groupcast/broadcast SLPP message can be sessionless, which is an one-shot exchange of the capability or assistance data. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with vivo. Session concept is useful when we have unicast. Groupcast is more a variant of broadcast which can be session-less; we do not see as how or why multiple sessions would be running in a groupcast. Besides there may be groupcast ID that could be used (implicitly as session ID) and thus different groupcast ID can be assigned per groupcast session.So for now lets only stick to unicast for explcit session ID. |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comment | From specification impact point of view, unicast/groupcast/broadcast actually has pretty much the same impact. We kind of think session based operation is applicable to unicast, groupcast and broadcast. We should try to design a SLPP spec that can accommodate as much scenario as possible if the spec impact doesn’t go high.  |
| OPPO | Yes for unicast | So far let’s stick to unicast for explicit session ID |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes, for all scenarios | Broadcast/groupcast SLPP message can be session-based or session-lessed. It seems no harm to put session ID also in the Broadcast/groupcast SLPP message(AD tranfer or capability transfer) and make this session ID field as optional. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes |  |
| SONY | Yes, for unicast | Groupcast may have to be further discussed- |
| Lenovo | Yes for unicast | We have not discussed yet the session concept for groupcast and broadcast. Furthermore, we fail to see why session id is not applicable in broadcast messages. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For all the session-based positioning procedures, session ID will be needed. It is only not needed for autonomous self-location for the session-less case. |
| Philips | Yes | Session ID can also be useful for groupcast, since groupcast can be used for more efficient exchange of SLPP messages between UEs involved in the same SLPP session. |
| CEWiT | Yes | Explicit *sessionID* field is needed for unicast.Okay to add optional *sessionID* field for groupcast/broadcast. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Explicit session ID is focused on unicast now. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, but with broadcast included | An SLPP session may be initiated to support an SLPP positioning activity, no matter which cast-type is used for message transport. Groupcast use of sessionID is particularly necessary when all group members are included in the session. Otherwise, Ues would not know which session a received SLPP message was part of.  |
| CATT | Yes for unicast | RAN2 only agreed to support unicast SLPP/RSPP session-based operation. For groupcast and broadcast, no any discussion and agreement on SLPP/RSPP session-based operation. It needs to be further discussed. When the session is setup between members in one group for SLPP message (e.g. one to many SL-TDOA), the session ID is required.But broadcast is not included because broadcast is the session-less in my understanding. SLPP broadcast is something like posSIB. |
| LG | Yes, but | In session-based operation, SLPP messages can be exchanged between/among Ues using unicast as well as groupcast/broadcast. We don’t need to have a restriction on relationship between session ID and cast type at least for now. If it is decided to use broadcast is only for session-less operation in future, SLPP messages with session ID will be not exchanged between Ues.  |
| Intel | Postpone | We can focus unicast first, and then decide if it can be applied for broadcast/groupcast.  |

**Summary: 18 companies provided inputs**

**SessionID for Groupcast/Broadcast:**

- 10 companies (Apple, xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Huawei, Philips, CEWiT, Qualcomm, LG) supported sessionID for groupcast, xiaomi considers the impact is similar for unicast/groupcast and broadcast;

- 8 companies (vivo, Ericsson, OPPO, SONY, Lenovo, InterDigital, CATT, Intel) are negative and vivo/Ericsson commented that session-less is more suitable for groupcast and broadcast; CATT, SONY think further discussion is needed.

There is no clear majority on this issue, and therefore the proposal 2 above can also be applied here.

**Proposal 4: (10 vs 8) For UE-only operation, RAN2 will continue the discussion on whether “sessionID” is applied for groupcast/broadcast once the basic functionality has been defined.**

**Following discussion is only for single target UE scenario.**

**As discussed in phase 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3.2.2.1-2: Which UE should be responsible for the session management? Target UE, one of Anchor UE (reference UE/located UE in SA2), or SL Positioning Server UE? Please add if anything is missing.** **Summary:**19 companies provided inputs.The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session:4 companies ( Qualcomm, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Intel)Target UE: 7 companies (OPPO, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Lenovo) Server UE: 12 companies (OPPO, vivo, Nokia, LG, CEWiT, Samsung, SONY, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, InterDigital, Fraunhofer, APPLE)Some companies who support target UE mentioned “An SLPP session is triggered by the target UE received a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from the client UE or application layer. Therefore, the target UE is the instigator of SLPP session”, therefore seems they can also support “The UE which initiates or triggers an SLPP session”. Considering it is the fundamental issue for session management, Moderator would suggest to check companies’ view again in Phase 2 discussion.  |
|  |

Before the discussion, it would be good to clarify the meaning of session management. Based on the procedure defined in TS 23.586

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6.8.1-1 Procedures for Ranging/Sidelink Positioning control (UE-only operation)1. UE1 (i.e. Target UE) may receive a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from:1a. SL Positioning Client UE over PC5 during procedures for Ranging/SL Positioning service exposure though PC5 as defined in clause 6.6.1.1. For absolute location, the service request includes the SL Positioning Client UE's user info and Target UE's user info, and required positioning QoS. For relative location or ranging information, the service request includes the SL Positioning Client UE's user info, Target UE's user info, SL Reference UE's user info(UE2/.../UEn), and Ranging/SL Positioning QoS information.1b. RSPP application layer. The service request includes type of the result (i.e. absolute location, relative location or ranging information) and the required QoS. 2. UE1 discovers UE2/.../UEn (i.e. SL Reference UEs/Located UEs) as defined in clause 6.4, if needed.NOTE 1: Details of security related procedures during UE discovery are developed by SA WG3.3. If none of UE1/.../UEn are served by NG-RAN or the serving network does not support Ranging/SL Positioning, , UE-only Operation is applied.4. UE1 and UE2/.../UEn perform capability exchange. Step 4 may be performed during step 5 and step 6 with coordination of SL Positioning Server UE.5. If UE1 does not support SL Positioning Server functionalities, a SL Positioning Server UE (either co-located with a SL Reference UE/Located UE, or operated by a separate UE) is discovered (if not yet discovered in step 2) and selected. If a SL Positioning Server UE that is co-located with a SL Reference UE/Located UE or operated by a separate UE, UE1 discovers and selects the SL Positioning Server UE as described in clause 6.4 and requests SL Positioning Server UE to participate in the Ranging/Sidelink positioning.NOTE 2: Details of security and privacy related procedures during SL Positioning Server UE discovery and operation are developed by SA WG3.6. Sidelink Positioning assistant data is transferred among UE1/ .../UEn and the SL Positioning Server UE.7. SL-PRS measurement is performed between UE1 and UE2/.../UEn and possibly also amongst UE2/.../UEn.8. SL-PRS measurement data is transferred to the SL Positioning Server UE or is transferred to UE1 if it supports SL Positioning Server functionalities, in order to perform result calculation. Based on the type of the result received in step 1, absolute location, relative location or ranging information is calculated at the UE.NOTE 3: Details of step 4-8 are developed by RAN WGs.9. Ranging/SL Positioning result is transferred to:9a. SL Positioning Client UE over PC5 during procedures for Ranging/SL Positioning service exposure though PC5 as defined in clause 6.6.1.1;9b. RSPP application layer. |

Based on the procedure, it is the UE who receives the LCS request (Target UE in the figure) needs to:

* Action 1: determine the UE only operation;
* Action 2: Discover and select a SL Positioning Server UEs that are in the same or different serving PLMN of the Target UE and the Reference UE(s) (section 5.2.3 of TS23.586).
* Action 2: Handles the Ranging/SL Positioning service request and provides the Ranging/SL Positioning service response back to LCS Client;
* Action 4: Establish PC5 connection with each SL Positioning server UE, Anchor UEs (reference UE in SA2)

All of these 4 actions are out of SLPP scope. Action 1-3 should belong to SA2 scope, and for action 4, existing PC5 establishment procedure can be reused.

Based on RAN2 agreed SLPP procedure

1. SL Positioning Capability Transfer

2. SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange

3. SL Location Information Transfer

4. Error handling

5. Abort

Regarding session management, from SLPP perspective, the UE who receives the LCS request (Target UE in the figure) at least needs to:

* Initiate the SLPP procedure;
* Assign the sessionID, and include it in the SLPP messages (Rx side should use the received sessionID for messages in the same positioning session);

**Question 4-3: Do companies agree that for session management from SLPP perspective, the UE who receives the LCS request (target UE in the figure) at least needs to:**

**- Initiate the SLPP procedure;**

**- Assign the sessionID, and include it in the SLPP messages (Rx side should use the received sessionID for messages in the same positioning session);?**

**Please provide your comments if any, e.g. any other functions is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Apple | Yes, with comments | We generally agree, but wonder whether it is always the target UE? Suggest removing “target UE” from the proposal. |
| vivo | No | In step 5, UE1 discovers and selects the SL Positioning Server UE as described in clause 6.4 and requests SL Positioning Server UE to participate in the Ranging/Sidelink positioning.To our understanding, the above request is an LCS request message from target UE to positioning server UE. In this sense, the UE who receives the LCS request is server UE rather than target UE. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | If target UE receives the LCS request, it is straightforward that the target UE initiates the SLPP session. |
| OPPO | Yes, with comments | The step 5, i.e., the SL Positioning Server UE discover & selection procedure is to be performed only when the target UE does not support SL Positioning Server functionalities, therefore, it is better for the target UE, the UE who receives the LCS request, to perform session management.  |
| Nokia | Yes, with comments | Agree with Apple.  |
| ZTE | Yes | The thing is target UE may not support server UE functionalities, but target UE should support assigning the session ID. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes | We are fine with that if UE who receives LCS request, the UE initiates the SLPP session. |
| SONY | Yes with comments | Basically is depends on how the roles/functionalities are implemented and supported, potentially the server UE is requested to initiate positioning of the target UE. |
| Lenovo | Yes | This is aligned with the UE-only procedure as specified by SA2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The UE1 in the figure, who is the target UE, should initiate the procedure. The target/initiating UE needs to assign the ID and ensure that it is unique between the two UEs.  |
| Philips | Partially | Agree that the UE receiving the LCS request should initiate the SLPP procedure by discovering and selecting a server UE. Agree with Apple that this first UE is not necessarily a target UE. sessionID presumably has to be locally unique. The SL Positioning Server UE might be more aware of other active sessions and therefore be in a better position to assign a non-clashing sessionID. |
| CEWiT | No | SL Positioning Server UE is best suited for session management. If target UE can act as server, it may initiate the SLPP procedures. |
| InterDigital | No | We think that a target UE may not receive an LCS request from a client UE. For example, if the client UE detect only SL reference UE, the SL reference may receive the LCS request (from the client UE) then contact to a server UE. It would be better the session is managed by a server UE.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with Apple comment. This should also resolve the vivo comment. |
| CATT | Yes | As the UE-only procedure specified by SA2, target UE receives the LCS request and it can assign the session ID and trigger an SLPP session. |
| LG | No | Agree with CEWiT. We, of course, think it is best for target UE to take a role of server UE. But, strictly speaking, server UE (not target UE) can initiate SLPP session and assign session ID. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm that Apple’s comment could address the concern from vivo.  |

**Summary: 17 companies provided inputs**

**The UE who receives the LCS request (target UE in the figure) performs the session management, e.g. assign SessionID:**

* **Yes 13 companies(Apple, xiaomi, OPPO, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, SONY, Lenovo, Huawei, Philips, Qualcomm, CATT, Intel)**
	+ **Apple/Nokia** wondered whether it is always the target UE, and would suggest removing it from the proposal; **[Rapporteur comments]** ok with the suggested change.
	+ **Philips** think SL Positioning server might be in better position to assign a non-clashing sessionID. **[Rapporteur comments]** ok it depends on how sessionID is structed, e.g. we may avoid clashing if we add target UE ID together with sessionID, i.e. sessionID only needs to be unique or the same target UE.
* **No 4 companies (vivo, CEWiT, InterDigital, LG)**
	+ **Vivo** agreed that the entity who receives the LCS request should perform the session management, but they think it is server UE who receives the request in the figure. **[Rapporteur comments]** It is clearly mentioned in step 1 (figure 6.8.1-1), the UE1 may receive a Ranging/SL Positioning Service request from LCS client or RSPP AP; But they did not mention whether UE1 will provide LCS request to server UE or not. Rapporteur assume the suggestion from Apple can address the concern from vivo, i.e. to remove target from the proposal.
	+ **CEWiT** thought server is in the best positioning for session management.
	+ **InterDigital** think that a target UE may not receive an LCS request from a Client UE. A Client UE may contact a reference UE instead, and then contact to a server UE. **[Rapporteur comments]** It is related to SA2 procedure, and should be agreed in SA2. So far they did not add this procedure in the specification. Therefore we have to focus on what SA2 has agreed for now.

Considering there is large majority (13 vs 4), Rapporteur would suggest to agree

**Proposal 5: (13 vs 4 ) from SLPP perspective, the UE who receives the LCS request at least needs to:**

**- Initiate the SLPP procedure;**

**- Assign the sessionID, and include it in the SLPP messages (Rx side should use the received sessionID for messages in the same positioning session);**

The details of SLPP procedure should be defined in RAN2. (step 4-8 in the figure Figure 6.8.1-1 of TS23.586)

There are two scenarios:

**Scenario 1:** If the UE who receives the LCS request (target UE in the figure) can act as the SL Positioning Server UE, then the UE shall trigger following procedures with each of UEs (UE2-UEn in the figure) in the SLPP session:

* SL Positioning Capability Transfer procedure,
* SL Location Information Transfer (decide positioning method) and
* SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange (depends on RAN1 discussion on how to select the PRS resources)

**Scenario 2:** If the UE who receives the LCS request (target UE in the figure) can’t act as the SL Positioning Server UE, i.e. separate SL Positioning Server UE is needed, then there are multiple options. There was similar discussion in last meeting in [1] as

|  |
| --- |
| Thus, rapporteur suggest RAN2 first to discuss whether the server UE functionalities are distributed or centralized, and whether target UE can always support the server UE functionality of positioning method determination, anchor UE selection, and assistant data distribution.1. RAN2 to discuss whether all the functionalities of server UE should be located at the same UE.
2. **RAN2 to discuss which of the following functionalities can always be supported by target UE:**
	1. **positioning method determination**
	2. **anchor UE selection**
	3. **assistant data distribution**
	4. **Location calculation**

Summary of the offline discussion:MediaTek and OPPO, Nokia, huawei thinks there is no gain to distribute server UE functionalites. Intel and QC thinks it only impacts stage 2 signalling flow, no impact to stage 3 design, so no need to discuss this. The concept of who is considered as the server UE is confusing.**No conclusion on Proposal 4 and 5.** From contribution input, 5 companies (Nokia, CATT, spreatrum, xiaomi, CEWiT) express the view of supporting separate server UE, 2 companies (intel, Lenovo) suggest either target UE or anchor UE as server UE. Rapporteur thinks SA2 majorly considers about location calculation function may be performed by a separate server UE, whether to support this in RAN2 depends on how much additional complexity is needed. Rapporteur thinks it might not be easy to answer at this stage. It would be better to postpone the discussion until the basic signalling flow is clear.1. Postpone the discuss on whether to support server UE as a separate entity from target and anchor UE until the basic signalling flow is clear.

Summary of the offline discussion:**No discussion on Proposal 6.** |

Therefore Rapporteur would suggest to focus on scenario 1, i.e. target UE can act as the SL Positioning Server UE first.

**Question 4-4: Do companies agree that if the UE who receives the LCS request (target UE in the figure) can act as the SL Positioning Server UE, then the UE shall trigger following procedures with each of UEs (UE2-UEn in the figure) in the SLPP session:**

**- SL Positioning Capability Transfer procedure,**

**- SL Location Information Transfer (decide positioning method) and**

**- SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange (depends on RAN1 discussion on how to select the PRS resources)**

**Please provide your comments if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Apple | Yes, with comments | 1. Suggest removing “target UE in the figure” from the proposal
2. Which UE(s) and how decide the positioning method to be used should be discussed separately (so suggest removing this too from the proposal)
3. The rapporteur raises a good point which we think should be discussed in the coming meeting: whether we can assume all SL positioning capable UEs can also support SL positioning server functionality. Suggest having this as a separate proposal with the intention to have the discussion in the meeting.
 |
| vivo | No | See the above comments in Q4-3. |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | If all the server UE functionalities are located in target UE who initiates the SLPP session, it of course can trigger all the procedure. But from spec flexibility point of view, there is no need to restrict other UEs from triggering these operations.  |
| Nokia  | Yes, with comments | At least this signalling shall be supported by a server UE, FFS the scope of internal decision making for the UEs such as method selection. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | Agree with Xiaomi that if all the functionalities are located in the same target UE then the proposal can be agreed. If not, there would be two server UEs, one is target UE, the other is a separate server UE. Both server UEs can initiates the procedure. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Yes with comments | Agree with xiaomi. From flexibility point of view, there is no need to restrict other UEs from triggering these operations. |
| SONY | Yes | Seems reasonable for this arrangement |
| Lenovo | Yes with comment | At least from SA2 perspective the support of server UE functionality is a NAS capability, i.e. a UE indicates to AMF during NAS registration procedure whether it can act as server UE, see "SLPSPC5" bit in the 5GMM capability IE in TS 24.501. That means the support of server UE functionality it's mainly a question of UE capability. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Philips | Yes, but… | Don’t understand the need to focus on scenario 1. The UE that receives the LCS request (not necessarily a target UE) selects a SL Positioning Server. This can be internal to the UE (scenario 1) or external (scenario 2). The selected SL Positioning Server then triggers the procedures. |
| CEWiT | Yes | If the target UE is capable of SL positioning server functionalities, it may trigger the above mentioned procedures. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes, with comments | Agree Apple comment (1).Also propose that any initiating UE can act as a server UE and any server UE can act as an initiating UE. This will immensely simplify SLPP procedures and seems to make sense for implementation. |
| CATT | Yes, with comments | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Xiaomi |

**Summary: 16 companies provided inputs**

* **Yes 15 companies (Apple, xiaomi, OPPO, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, SONY, Lenovo, Huawei, Philips, CEWiT, InterDigital, Qualcomm, CATT, LG, Intel)**
	+ **Apple/ Qualcomm** suggested removing it from the proposal; **[Rapporteur comments]** ok with the suggested change.
	+ **Apple/Nokia** would suggest to remove “decide positioning method” since separate discussion is needed; **[Rapporteur comments]** ok with the suggestion.
	+ **Apple** also suggested to have further discussion in the upcoming meeting on whether all SL positioning capable UEs can also support SL positioning server functionality; **[Rapporteur comments]** not quite sure whether it is a RAN2 issue.
	+ **Xiaomi/spreadtrum/** raised a good point which is similar to Question 4-5, i.e. from spec flexibility point of view, there is no need to restrict other UEs from triggering these operations. **[Rapporteur comments]** agree with xiaomi on this.
	+ **Philips** wonder the need to focus on scenario 1. The UE that receives the LCS request (not necessarily a target UE) selects a SL Positioning Server. This can be internal to the UE (scenario 1) or external (scenario 2). The selected SL Positioning Server then triggers the procedures. **[Rapporteur comments]** It is related to open issue in SA2 on how to handle the capability exchange procedure, should target UE provide capabilities of all involved UEs to server UE on behalf of all UEs or server UE should contact all involved UE to obtain the capability. The issue does not exist If target UE is also the server UE.
* **No 1 company (vivo)**
	+ **Vivo** agreed that the entity who receives the LCS request should perform the session management, but they think it is server UE who receives the request in the figure. **[Rapporteur comments]**  Rapporteur assume the suggestion from Apple can address the concern from vivo, i.e. to remove target from the proposal.

Considering there is clear majority on the proposal although some changes are needed. Rapporteur would suggest to agree:

**Proposal 6: (15 vs 1 ) if the UE who receives the LCS request can act as the SL Positioning Server UE, then the UE shall trigger following procedures with each of UEs (UE2-UEn in the figure) in the SLPP session:**

**- SL Positioning Capability Transfer procedure,**

**- SL Location Information Transfer (FFS on who decide positioning method) and**

**- SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange (depends on RAN1 discussion on how to select the PRS resources)**

To make stage 3 procedure simple, similar to Abort procedure in the TS37.355, we may not need to mention target UE/server UE/anchor UE, and could use end point instead, e.g.



**Question 4-5: Do companies agree that do not show target UE, anchor UE and server UE in stage 3 procedure, only use Endpoint concept?**

**Please provide your comments if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Apple |  | No strong view, but perhaps there is some value in showing “SL Positioning Server UE” in the diagram (even though we don’t do this in “legacy”). Happy to go with the majority view on this.  |
| vivo | No | The roles of the entities are reflected in the stage 3 procedure. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | LPP is a point-to-point protocol based on target-server model between a location server (E-SMLC, LMF or SLP) and a target device (UE or SET). There is only one target UE and one server.For SLPP, there can be multiple target UEs, multiple anchor UEs, and multiple servers (e.g. multiple server UEs) in one session. Not only the target UE will communicate with server, but also the anchor UEs. Since we have already defined the term of target UE, it may be difficult to extend the term of target UE to include anchor UEs to fit the target-server mode description without introducing ambiguity. Besides, when we talks about a server, it often means that there will only one entity serving as the server. For SLPP, as there can be multiple server UEs in one session, using the concept of server may introduce ambiguity, since two UE entities can be server of each other for different operations or in different context.Perhaps a good way is to use the term of endpoint instead of using ‘target’ or ‘server’. For example, for capability exchange:As shown in the figure above, endpoint A can request capabilities from multiple endpoints (B/C/D/...). As there is no role about the endpoint any more, endpoint B can also request capabilities from endpoints A/C/D/..., which is different from LPP, where only server can request capability from target. |
| Nokia | Yes | It would be good to differentiate “Server” and “UE” whereby “server” can be either server UE or LMF. “Endpoint” terminology is fine as well.  |
| ZTE | Yes | In stage-3 spec, only endpoint is enough since the concrete stage-3 signalings are eventually one-to-one, sending and receiving by 2 endpoints. |
| Spreadtrum communications |  | No strong view. We can follow the majority view on this.  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Considering the fact that multiple entities may be involved in a SL positioning session it’s recommended to specify the procedures in a generic fashion. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon  | Yes | No need to show the UE’s role  |
| Philips | No | Agree with Apple and vivo. |
| CEWiT | Yes | Generic approach is preferable. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comments | Instead of "A" and "B" it may be more perspicuous to use "Tx Endpoint" and "Rx Endpoint(s)". With the initiator/server UE assumption (see Q4-4), procedures will imply the server UE – but no harm in this. |
| CATT | Yes with comments | Using the term of endpoint in the figure, and the roles of the entities can be reflected in the description of procedure.  |
| LG | Yes | It’s fine. No need to show UE role in diagram. SLPP messages can be exchanged between server UE and target UE, and between server UE and anchor UE. In some case, target UE is co-located with server UE. Also, capability exchange procedure would be performed before anchor UE selection. Some comment can be inserted in description part.  |
| Intel | Yes | This can make specification simpler. |

**Summary: 15 companies provided inputs**

* **Yes 11 companies (xiaomi, Nokia, ZTE, Lenovo, Huawei, CEWiT, InterDigital, Qualcomm, CATT, LG, Intel)**
	+ **Qualcomm** raised a good point “Instead of "A" and "B" it may be more perspicuous to use "Tx Endpoint" and "Rx Endpoint(s)".”. **[Rapporteur comments]** ok with the suggestion from Qualcomm.
	+ **CATT** think the role may be reflected in the description of the procedure.
* **Neutral 2 companies (Apple, Spreadtrum,**), would like to go with the majority view.
* **No 2 companies (vivo, Philips,)**
	+ **Vivo** would like to reflect the role in the stage 3 procedure.

Considering there is large majority on the proposal although some changes are needed. Rapporteur would suggest to agree:

**Proposal 7: (11 vs 2 ) In stage 3 specification, use "Tx Endpoint" and "Rx Endpoint(s) to describe the procedure instead of target UE, anchor UE and server UE concept, e.g.**



As discussed in Phase 1:

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3.2.2.1-3: Do companies agree that the session management, e.g. establishment/ release is transparent to other UEs than the UE who is responsible for session management except the release of PC5 connection? Please elaborate your reason if you have different view.** **Summary:**19 companies provided inputs.No explicit session management procedure :12 companies ( OPPO, vivo, Nokia, Ericsson, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, Huawei, Spreadtrum, Fraunhofer, APPLE, Intel)Explicit session management procedure: 5 companies (Qualcomm, LG, Lenovo, InterDigital, xiaomi, ) Qualcomm mentioned “If UEs are not aware of this, the following problems could arise:* a UE continues (trying to) transmit and/or measure SL PRS after a session has ended
* a UE continues trying to measure SL PRS that was transmitted by another UE which has now left the session
* a UE does not measure SL PRS or obtain SL PRS measurements from another UE which has recently joined the session
* a UE does not know which other UEs are transmitting SL PRS or providing location results which could not only prevent location determination for these other UEs but also impede a UE locating itself
* some V2X and PS use cases might not be supported – where UEs are expected to know which other UEs they are interacting with”

However companies who preferred to follow legacy LPP procedure believed the issue mentioned by Qualcomm can be resolved by assistance data management procedure as today. Considering it is the fundamental issue for session management, Moderator would suggest to check companies’ view again in Phase 2 discussion.  |

**Question 4-6: Do companies see the need to introduce explicit session management procedure, i.e. session setup, session modification and session release?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Apple | No | We think this will just add latency and wouldn’t bring any value.  |
| vivo | No | Prefer to follow the session management in LPP. For the issues mentioned by QC:Issue 1: the SL-PRS transmission can be triggered or deactivatedIssue 2: The SL-PRS measurement is based on sensing, it happens that UE may not be able to measure the SL-PRS signal. Besides, the concept of ‘left the session’ needs clarification.Issue 3: UE may perform the measurement based on the result of the discovery. Besides, the concept of ‘join the session’ needs clarification.Issue 4: Rx UE can trigger the Tx UE to perform SL-PRS transmission or receive the location info/assistance data from LMF/sever UE, thus the Rx UE is aware of the SL-PRS transmission.Issue 5: The UEs can be aware of each other via discovery. |
| Xiaomi | See comment | A potential way forward is to reuse LPP session management as a start. If issues are found, we can revisit this. For example, if explicit session release is found to be needed, we can simply add an IE in the SLPP header to indicate this. For explicit session setup, if found necessary later, we also can add IE in the SLPP header or a new SLPP message body, it is quite easy. We should not make this as a stopper for progress. |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Nokia | No  | Agree with Apple, also see complexity and reliability issues. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Spreadtrum Communications | No | We think it is not necessary. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We don’t understand the comment on complexity and reliability issues. We agree on the problems addressed by QC. Companies should have a look at session handling in SUPL and provide further details on the complexity and reliability issues they have in mind. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The transmitting UE can ensure that the session ID is new between the two UEs for all the positioning sessions. The receiving UE can create a new session when a new session ID is received and send the subsequent SLPP message with the new session ID corresponding to this session. |
| Philips  | No | Explicit session management is useful to avoid the issues mentioned by Qualcomm. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We have same view with Lenovo. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Omitting session management from SLPP because some sessions with fixed known groups do not absolutely require it will lead to anomalies and breakdown of support for SLPP sessions where UEs do not all have compatible SLPP capabilities, or where a group of UEs was not defined in advance or where UEs elect to or need to leave (or join) the session. There is no good remedy for this using existing LPP message types. |
| CATT | No |  |
| LG | Yes | We see the benefit of explicit session management signaling. For an example, UE may store session information from SLPP message to use it anytime during session is activated and progressing, and to check validation of next message. If anchor UE does not know session status e.g. deactivation, pause or release at the right time, UE keeps to store session information at least until session expired, which could impact on power consumption and UE complexity. Fast session control can be simply and clearly achieved by explicit session management signaling. We also support Xiaomi comment. Some explicit signaling can be joint with SLPP message, in this case, explicit signaling can simply add an IE in the SLPP header. It does not introduce significant overhead, meanwhile, taking an advantage of explicit signaling.  |
| Intel | No | Do not see the strong need. We may add it if the system cannot work without it.  |

**Summary: 15 companies provided inputs**

* **No 9 companies (Apple, vivo, OPPO, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Huawei, CATT, Intel)**
	+ **Apple** commented that this will just add latency and wouldn’t bring any value.
* **Xiaomi**, commented that the potential way forward is to reuse LPP session management as a start, and we may revisit it if issues are found.
* **yes 5 companies (Lenovo, InterDigital, Philips, Qualcomm, LG)**
	+ **Lenovo** agreed the issues raised by Qualcomm, and would like to use session handling in SUPL. They do not see the issue on complexity and reliability.
	+ **Qualcomm** commented that Omitting session management from SLPP because some sessions with fixed known groups do not absolutely require it will lead to anomalies and breakdown of support for SLPP sessions where UEs do not all have compatible SLPP capabilities, or where a group of UEs was not defined in advance or where UEs elect to or need to leave (or join) the session. There is no good remedy for this using existing LPP message types.
	+ **LG** also commented that For an example, UE may store session information from SLPP message to use it anytime during session is activated and progressing, and to check validation of next message. If anchor UE does not know session status e.g. deactivation, pause or release at the right time, UE keeps to store session information at least until session expired, which could impact on power consumption and UE complexity. Fast session control can be simply and clearly achieved by explicit session management signaling.

Considering there is no majority on the need of explicit session management procedure, e.g. establishment, modification and release, Rapporteur would suggest to go for the suggestion from xiaomi:

**Proposal 8: Reuse LPP session management as a start, and we may revisit it if any issue is found.**

# Conclusion

The discussion above can be summarized in the form of the following proposals:

**Proposal 1: For LMF involved SL based positioning, follow SA2 on how to handle LMF involved SL based positioning between UE (who has connection with network), LMF and AMF. FFS on how to handle session for UEs involved in the same LMF involved SL based positioning and the relationship between routing ID/correlation ID and session ID.**

**Proposal 2: RAN2 should focus on single target scenario and will continue the discussion on multiple target UEs, and broadcast/groupcast once the basic functionality has been defined.**

**Proposal 3: For UE-only operation, introduce explicit field “sessionID” in SLPP, and put it under message header of SLPP message. FFS how session ID is defined**

**Proposal 4: (10 vs 8) For UE-only operation, RAN2 will continue the discussion on whether “sessionID” is applied for groupcast/broadcast once the basic functionality has been defined.**

**Proposal 5: (13 vs 4 ) from SLPP perspective, the UE who receives the LCS request at least needs to:**

**- Initiate the SLPP procedure;**

**- Assign the sessionID, and include it in the SLPP messages (Rx side should use the received sessionID for messages in the same positioning session);**

**Proposal 6: (15 vs 1 ) if the UE who receives the LCS request can act as the SL Positioning Server UE, then the UE shall trigger following procedures with each of UEs (UE2-UEn in the figure) in the SLPP session:**

**- SL Positioning Capability Transfer procedure,**

**- SL Location Information Transfer (FFS on who decide positioning method) and**

**- SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange (depends on RAN1 discussion on how to select the PRS resources)**

**Proposal 7: (11 vs 2 ) In stage 3 specification, use "Tx Endpoint" and "Rx Endpoint(s) to describe the procedure instead of target UE, anchor UE and server UE concept, e.g.**



**Proposal 8: Reuse LPP session management as a start, and we may revisit it if any issue is found.**
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# SLPP related agreements (for information only)

RAN2#119

Agreement:

Proposal 3 (modified): In order to enable sidelink positioning, SLPP/RSPP shall support at least the following functionalities:

1. SL Positioning Capability Transfer

2. SL Positioning Assistance Data exchange

3. SL Location Information Transfer

4. Error handling

5. Abort

This agreement does not imply any specific signalling structure.

Agreement:

Proposal 4 (modified): Align with SA2/RAN1 on the terms for sidelink positioning, and introduce the following terms of UE role as the baseline for further discussion:

- Target UE: UE to be positioned

- Anchor UE: UE supporting positioning of target UE, e.g., by transmitting and/or receiving reference signals for positioning, providing positioning-related information, etc., over the SL interface. FFS: clarification of the knowledge of the anchor UE.

Additional roles can be considered.

RAN2#121

Agreement:

Sidelink positioning supports a session-based concept in SLPP, in which signalling messages within a session can be associated with one another by the involved UEs. The relationship to upper-layer designs from SA2 can be discussed during normative work.

FFS if there is also sessionless operation and what aspects of session-based operation would not be included.

Agreement:

At least in the case that positioning methods are supported that do not require a mutual exchange of SLPP messages associated with one another among UEs, SLPP sessionless operation can be supported. FFS if sessionless operation can be operated with security.

Agreement:

From RAN2 perspective, if it is determined to support group positioning, it is feasible to perform at least ranging with the estimate calculation at multiple UEs.

Agreement:

RAN2 confirm that for cases without LMF involvement, besides method determination, assistant data distribution and anchor UE selection (agreed in RAN2), the SL positioning server UE may perform SL-PRS configuration coordination and location calculation.

Agreement:

With respect to the overall signaling procedure for PC5-only positioning (including at least IC and OOC; FFS if there are differences for PC), it is proposed to agree that the sidelink positioning procedure comprises the following series of steps as a baseline, between the LMF/positioning server UE/NG-RAN/candidate Anchor UE(s) and Target UE(s):

1. Triggering event
2. Sidelink positioning capability exchange

3. Sidelink positioning assistance data transfer

4. SL Positioning Request Location Information

5. Measurement of SL-PRS

6. Location calculation

7. SL Positioning Provide Location Information

Some steps may have dependencies on SA2 and can be revisited in this light. The order is subject to further discussion. FFS if discovery and selection of anchor UEs and/or server UE are part of the positioning layer in RAN2 scope.

LS to SA2 to ask for confirmation and guidance on the SA2 aspects.

RAN2#121bis

WA: RAN2 understand that group positioning is to acquire location estimates of multiple target UEs (absolute positioning) or multiple UE pairs (Ranging/relative positioning) per LCS request, in line with the guidance already received from SA2.

WA: At least part of the group management for group positioning is performed at upper/application layer.

Agreements:

R2 agree that for session-based SLPP, a SLPP session is used among UEs in PC5-only case in order to obtain location related measurements/location estimates, to transfer assistance data, or to exchange of capabilities.

RAN2 agree that for session-based SLPP, a single SLPP session is created to support a single location request at least in case of a single target UE; FFS how sessions work if there are multiple target UEs in a single location request.

TP in R2-2304005 is postponed.

RAN2 agree that, for session-based SLPP, SLPP transactions are indicated at the SLPP protocol level with a transaction ID in order to associate messages with one another (e.g., request and response)”

RAN2 agree that for session-based SLPP, messages within a transaction are linked by a common transaction identifier.

RAN2#122

Agreements:

SLPP over PC5-U/Uu will support reliable transport for at least unicast. FFS groupcast.

Inform SA2 about our agreements on sidelink positioning, with “take into account” action.

SLPP carried over NAS is used between UE and LMF. FFS on how to manage the session/transaction.

Agreements:

SLPP can support multiple target UEs in the same session when LCS requests.

RAN2 will not specify group management for multiple target UEs. RAN2 assumption is that a group ID will be provided from upper layers.

FFS how session IDs are managed between multiple UEs.