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# Introduction

**CB: # 5\_UAV**

**- Downselect Solution B or Solution C**

**- Can there be multiple configurations for Aerial UE Flight Information Reporting, and if so how to handle?**

**- Resolve any other open issues?**

(Ericsson)

This document captures the breakoff discussion summary for UAV.

# For Chairman

**Agreement 1:**

* Introduce in the LOCATION REPORTING FAILURE INDICATION message a new IE “Aerial UE flight information ongoing reporting failed” to indicate the ongoing reporting failed. Procedure text should specify the corresponding behaviour.
* Introduce a new Cause Value “Aerial UE flight information reporting initiation failure” for indicating the failure in the UAV Reporting initiation phase.

**Agreement 2: We send LS to SA2 to:**

* Report what have agreed on the UAV Reporting
* Ask if RAN should support multiple UAV reporting configurations? Right now RAN supports one pair of min /Max + optional Periodicity in the configuration. It is possible to support AMF sending multiple reporting configurations to the gNB, but does it mean that RAN needs to send multiple UAV Reports back for the same UE. If it is allowed for AMF to send multiple UAV reporting configurations to gNB, and eventually gNB needs to provide multiple configurations to the same UE.

It is proposed to agree the below CRs to capture the Agreement 1.

R3-255817 (NGAP)/ R3-255818 (TS 38.300)

It is proposed to agree the LS out in R3-255816 (CMCC) to capture Agreement 2.

# Discussion on Support on-demand SIB1 for UEs

From the online session,

**Solution B**: Ericsson, CATT, CMCC

Add a new indication to indicate the NG-RAN node cannot initiate aerial UE altitude reporting and the ongoing altitude reporting is stopped in the existing LOCATION REPORTING FAILURE INDICATION message

**Solution C**: ZTE, Samsung

Introduce a new cause value for Cause IE to indicate NG-RAN node cannot report the aerial UE information.

**Agree on either solution B or solution C.**

Breakoff Discussion:

**Related to solution to indicate failure:**

The supporting companies for Solution B: Ericsson, CATT, CMCC, Huawei, Nokia, LG.

But during the discussion, it is discussed to support the legacy behavior for the initial failure, and introduce the explicit indication to indicate the ongoing UAV reporting is failed or stopped.

1. Ongoing report failure: use the new indication
2. Initial Failure:

Huawei, Nokia: Prefer to use the “legacy way”, may add a new cause value

Ericsson, CATT: we can use the explicit indicator. AMF can differ from the legacy or new node.

**Majority companies agree that:**

* Introduce in the LOCATION REPORTING FAILURE INDICATION message a new IE “Aerial UE flight information ongoing reporting failed” to indicate the ongoing reporting failed. Procedure text should specify the corresponding behaviour.
* Introduce a new Cause Value “Aerial UE flight information reporting initiation failure” for indicating the failure in the UAV Reporting initiation phase.

Please revise the CR to reflect the above agreements.

**Related to Reference ID/ Event ID:**

LG: Need it. As SA2 clearly considered to configure the multiple thresholds, it implies that we should support multiple UAV reporting. Reporting already supports it. Copy Event Type in the failure message

Huawei: SA2 is not so clear to request multiple UAV reporting, it is just the min/max. Does seem to need it.

Ericsson: we can introduce reference ID, for future use, either multiple request, or multiple CN functions.

Nokia:

CMCC: if the RRC reporting is kept as legacy, then it is by implementation (gNB), maybe ok to have or not.

CATT: AMF will not send multiple thresholds to gNB. Not needed

Samsung: not clear if there will be multiple report.

It is unclear for the companies what is the SA2 requirement. We should send an LS to report our progress and ask the question related to multiple UAV Reporting.

**Report what have agreed on the UAV Reporting**

**Ask if RAN should support multiple UAV reporting configurations? Right now RAN supports one pair of min /Max + optional Periodicity in the configuration. It is possible to support AMF sending multiple request, but does it mean that RAN needs to send multiple UAV Report back for the same UE.**

**If it is allowed for AMF to send multiple UAV reporting configurations to gNB, and eventually gNB needs to provide multiple configurations to the same UE.**

Please CMCC provide LS.

# 4 Moderator Summary

Capture the discussion in chapter 2 for Chairman Notes.