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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [POST128][026][AIML] LCM Procedure for Positioning Case1 (Ericsson)

Intended outcome:

• Discuss the FFS from the existing RAN2 Agreements

* Attempt to resolve the FFS which does not need RAN1 input
* Identify questions to ask to RAN1 for resolving FFS waiting on RAN1 progress

• Collect general guidelines on the criteria for deciding whether to enhance legacy method(s) or introduce new method

Deadline: Phase 1: January 17th, 2025

Deadline: Phase 2: February 5th, 2025: 10:00 CET

The agreements for Positioning Case1 has been listed below, and the FFS are highlighted.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN2#128**  **Agreements**  1 For POS Case 1, RAN2 confirm that the existing unsolicited UE capability report mechanism in LPP can support UE to report the applicable functionality in both “proactive” and “reactive” as a baseline.  - Proactive case: When the applicability change, UE can send an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF .  - Reactive case: If the applicability changes based on the configuration in LPP ProvideAssistanceData message in step 3, UE can send an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF. Configuration details are FFS  2 As a baseline, If the AIML based positioning method becomes non-applicable when LMF requests UE location estimation, UE cannot perform the AIML based positioning, and reply with LPP Providelocationinformation message with error cause. FFS if other fallback options are considered  **RAN2#127bis**  **Agreements:**  1: The following procedures for LCM for UE sided model for AI positioning case 1 is the baseline:  Step 1: LMF may request the UE to report the supported functionalities at the UE side by *LPP request capabilities* message.  Step 2: UE sends *LPP provide capabilities* message to LMF with the supported functionalities at the UE side.  Step 3: LMF sends the *LPP provide assistance data* message (which may contain network side additional condition).  Step 4: UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message.  Step 5: The LMF requests the inferred location information using the *LPP request location information* message.  Step 6: UE reports the inferred location using *LPP provide location information* message.  2: Whether the inference configuration is provided in step 3 or/and step 5 is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress).  3: Whether network side additional condition is needed and what it contains is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress).  4: FFS whether LMF controls the UE sending unsolicited LPP provide capabilities (i.e. whether step4 is sent reactively or proactively). FFS the signalling details.  5: RAN2 will decide whether AI positioning will be a new method after further details from RAN1 are received.  **RAN2#126**  **Agreements:**  1 The LPP Capability Transfer procedures (RequestCapabilities/ProvideCapabilities messages) are used to indicate supported AI/ML positioning capabilities. FFS how to handle dynamic capabilities, depending on further RAN1 progress and understanding of the functionality.  2 wait for RAN1 for associate ID discussion  3 At least for Case 1, existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are used for providing the results of the UE sided model inference operation. FFS further details on signaling enhancements |

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Xiaomi | Xiaolong Li | lixiaolong1@xiaomi.com |
| Apple | Peng Cheng | Pcheng24@apple.com |
| Fraunhofer | Birendra Ghimire | [birendra.ghimire@iis.fraunhofer.de](mailto:birendra.ghimire@iis.fraunhofer.de) |
| vivo | Boubacar Kimba | kimba@vivo.com |
| Qualcomm | Sven Fischer | sfischer@qti.qualcomm.com |
| ZTE | Yu Pan | pan.yu24@zte.com.cn |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jun Chen | jun.chen@huawei.com |
| Lenovo | Congchi Zhang/ Tapisha Soni | zhangcc16@lenovo.com, tsoni@lenovo.com |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan | fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| CATT | Tangxun | tangxun@catt.cn |
| Ericsson | Ritesh Shreevastav | Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com |
| Fujitsu | Yujia Shan | shanyujia@fujitsu.com |
| Samsung | Taeseop Lee | taeseop.lee@samsung.com |
| CEWiT | Jishnu | jishnup@cewit.org.in |
| Nokia | Mani Thyagarajan | mani.thyagarajan@nokia.com |
| CMCC | Chen Ningyu | chenningyu@Chinamobile.com |
|  |  |  |

# 

# Discussion

# (Phase I)

## General guidelines/factors influencing the decision on AI/ML positioning as a new method or an existing method.

Below we try to collect company’s opinion on what should be the main basis for deciding whether to select a new method or update the existing legacy method. Example: If (most)/same assistance data from legacy positioning method is applicable to AI/ML based technique then reuse the existing one, else use a new method.

This would serve as a basis for RAN2 to swiftly decide when more information is received from RAN1.

Companies are invited to provide their opinion on the principles that govern the selection of new method or update of existing method.

**Question** 1**: What is the criteria for deciding if AI/ML positioning should be introduced as a new method or introduced as an enhancement to an existing method?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Guidelines/factors** |
| Xiaomi | We think the legacy positioning methods are defined according to different the PRS measurement, for example, DL-RSTD for the DL-TDOA, UE Rx-Tx time difference and gNB Rx-Tx time difference for the multi-RTT and DL-PRS-RSRP for the DL-AoD.  Therefore, if the new PRS measurements are needed for the AI based positioning, the AI positioning should be introduced as a new method. |
| Apple | We understand there are two criteria:   1. Whether any new measurement, as Xiaomi mentioned 2. Whether any new assistance data |
| Fraunhofer | We think the following should be the criteria for determining if this is a new method or not   1. Extensibility in future – whether future AI/ML enhancements can be accommodated in a clean manner. 2. Are the assumptions/constraints in existing method applicable to the new method as well? |
| Vivo | To introduce AI/ML in NR positioning architecture, the forward compatibility should be taken into account.  On the one hand, there can be possibility that R19 UE only supports AI-based positioning but not the legacy positioning method. Once AI is introduced under the legacy one, from R19 UE point of view, some mandatory features (e.g., *NR-DL-TDOA-MeasurementCapability*) in the legacy positioning method may become unnecessary to support.  On the other hand, AI/ML enhanced positioning can be extended to support UE obtaining location prediction based on the hands-down information at UE in spec. Although we study AI/ML based on current introduced positioning methods (e.g., DL-TDOA, DL-AOD etc.), UE may be allowed to execute AI/ML based on other underlying methods. In this understanding, it will save more signaling overhead to introduce an individual method which does not rely on any existing positioning method; and the specification only specifies what are required for the inputs of UE-sided model (what kind of information does UE need to obtain the input to further perform AI/ML based positioning), and what are the output (UE location prediction) that UE required to transmit toward LMF. |
| Qualcomm | Similar view as Xiaomi.  The standard UE positioning methods currently supported in 3GPP are defined in clause 4.3 of TS 36.305/38.305. The methods are defined based on the required measurement type (and associated position calculation function). For example, DL-TDOA is based on RSTD measurements (and hyperbolic trilateration), DL-AoD is based on RSRP/RSRPP measurements (and beam-power matching), etc. To perform the location measurements (and possibly calculate the location) assistance data are usually needed. However, the assistance data are not necessarily unique to a positioning method. For example, DL-PRS assistance data are needed for all DL-PRS based methods (DL-TDOA, DL-AoD, multi-RTT) or TRP location information is needed for all UE-based methods, etc.  Therefore, the criteria for defining a new positioning method should be based on the actual positioning measurement type (e.g., T(D)OA-based, range-based, angle-based, etc.). |
| ZTE | Whether there is no measurement type;  Whether there is independency of the new feature compared to the legacy feature. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Each positioning method uses distinct signals and/or additional information for UE position determination. In our understanding, the intention is to reuse the existing signals and information while potentially introducing some new information on top and relying on AIML predictions in addition to measurements. In that case, we should try to enhance existing methods unless critical issues with this approach are identified. |
| Lenovo | The new method introduction should be introduced depending on the use case, e.g., Direct AI/ML or AI/ML assisted positioning. For Case 1-Direct AI/ML it would be beneficial to introduce a new positioning method for the following key reasons:  - New measurements- For Case 1, Direct AI/ML positioning, the UE may perform different tzpes of measurements: new (e.g., power delay profile measurements) and existing positioning measurements (e.g., DL-RSTD and/or DL-AoD), and therefore it would be a cleaner design to introduce a new method. Re-using existing methods may risk overloading the current methods, e.g., DL-TDOA and DL-AoD.  - New positioning assistance data  - Future proofness. This is the first release 3GPP supports AIML based positioning at UE side. The considered inputs are limited to majority companies’ views and limited scenarios (e.g., RRC connected state). In the future releases, new measurements and new assistance data could be considered. The framework design should be future proof to consider possibilities in the future.  - **UE capability requirement**. We understand AIML based positioning is more demanding w.r.t UE computing power compared to legacy positioning methods. A UE supporting legacy positioning methods, e.g., DL-TDOA, does not naturally mean the UE supports AI based DL-TDOA. |
| OPPO | Whether there is new measurement type;  The dependency with non-AI based positioning method. |
| CATT | Whether there is new measurement (type);  Whether there have significant change(s) compared with legacy methods. |
| Ericsson | New measurement type alone may not be adequate. For example, for carrier phase positioning (CPP) a new measurement type RSCP has been introduced but CPP is not a new/separate method.  We agree with Huawei. We should judge it based upon how much it differs from legacy. |
| Fujitsu | The most crucial factor is whether a new PRS measurement type will be introduced or not, e.g., the UE locations can be derived by both legacy and AI/ML ways based on same DL-TDOA measurement results, there is no reason to consider them as two separate positioning methods. Therefore, it is natural to agree that new positioning methods need to be introduced if there are new measurement types.  For non-AI and AI positioning methods based on same PRS measurement, different assistance data (e.g., for AI/ML consistency) can be used to distinguish. |
| Samsung | - Dependency with the legacy positioning methods. I.e., whether the output of AI/ML model can be used for (or associated with) legacy positioning method.  In detail, in Case 1/2b (AI-direct), the functionality (AI-based UE location estimation) can be defined as a new method (i.e., AI-based POS) since it does not have any dependency on the legacy POS methods. We can’t say that the AI model inference the location using the legacy POS method (e.g., DL-TDOA, DL-AoD) because we don’t know how the AI model inferences the location based on the input data. On the other hand, for Case 2a (AI-assisted), the output of AI model (e.g., NLOS) can be used as an assistance data for legacy POS method. The functionality (AI-based NLOS, RSTD, AOD measurement) can be defined as part of existing POS method. |
| CEWiT | The legacy positioning methods are based on specific measurements corresponding to the positioning methods. We think that for the direct AI/ML approach as in case 1, such dependency cannot be defined and hence we prefer to introduce AI/ML positioning as a new method.  Furthermore, introducing AI/ML positioning as a new method facilitates any enhancements to be supported more robustly in future releases. |
| Nokia | Only looking at it from an assistance data perspective is an incomplete way to analyze the issue. We should look at it from the perspective of what new measurements are used and whether they apply only to AI/ML positioning or to legacy positioning methods also and must also look at what technique is used by utilizing the new measurements to derive the UE position i.e., is it a timing technique or angle technique or finger printing or something totally new e.g., prediction/guess based on utilizing knowledge derived from training data etc. |
| CMCC | We also think the new measurement is criteria for deciding whether AI/ML positioning is new method. |
|  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

From the companies answer, below are the main criteria discussed:

* New Measurements: 10 companies consider that if AI/ML positioning requires new PRS measurements, it should be considered a new method.
* Dependency on Legacy Methods: 7 companies comment that (in)dependency on legacy methods or how much Case 1 differs from legacy methods should be taken as the criteria. Enhancement is added if the new AI/ML positioning can reuse legacy measurement techniques and assistance data without significant modifications, while a new method if independent on legacy.
* New Assistance data: 3 companies proposed this as criteria
* Future-Proofing and UE Capability: 3 companies consider future-proof designs to accommodate anticipated evolvement for AI/ML positioning. Lenovo also commented future UE may support only AI or non-AI positioning in terms of capability.

1. Criteria for introducing a new method include: new measurements, assistance data, incompatibility of assumptions/constraints in legacy methods, forward compatibility for future AI/ML enhancements.
2. There may not be one golden rule to decide whether to introduce new method or enhance legacy and thus a case-by-case decision has to be made.

Further, companies are invited to express whether their initial preference is to update a legacy method or to define a new method.

**Question** 2**: What is the (initial) preferred view; update of legacy or introduce new method?**

**Option A: Enhancement of legacy**

**Option B: Introduce new method.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **A/B** | **Remark (Optional)** |
| Xiaomi | B | Considering the new PRS measurement is needed for the AI positioning, we prefer to introduce a new method. |
| Apple | B | According to RAN1#119 agreement, new assistance data different from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA may be introduced. Furthermore, considering forward compatibility, we tend to think a new positioning method is cleaner way.  Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning Case 1, all assistance information from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA, other than info #7, can be provided from LMF to UE. For info #7, RAN1 study, if necessary, choose one alternative from the following:   * Alternative 1. Info #7 is provided implicitly via associated ID.   + Associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 2. Info #7 can be provided either implicitly or explicitly by LMF. Note: no UE capability is introduced on whether info #7 is provided implicitly or explicitly, and the UE can request info #7 to be provided explicitly or implicitly.   + If provided implicitly, associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 3. Info #7 is **not** be provided from LMF to UE.   + If info #7 is not provided, UE may assume info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 4. Info #7 is provided explicitly from LMF to UE. |
| Fraunhofer | B | A new method provides possibility to introduce AI/ML specific enhancements in later releases, which may not be necessary for existing methods.  In LPP, we already differentiate between DL-TDOA, DL-AoD and Multi-RTT even though the AD regarding the DL-PRS is provided in only one of the methods. |
| vivo | B | Based on the forward compatible design criterion, we prefer to introduce AI/ML based positioning as an individual method. |
| Qualcomm | B | For Case 1, the UE reports the determined ("inferred") UE location coordinates. The AI/ML model and model input is implementation dependent. The model input may be timing, power, and/or phase information of a channel impulse response, possibly together with other UE obtained and/or UE internal information, etc. It may not be possible/desired to define Case 1 as e.g., T(D)OA based method or angle-based method, etc.  For Case 2a (and likely also Case 2b) on the other hand (although, 2nd priority), RAN1 already agreed that (at least) DL-RSTD and UE Rx-Tx Time Difference measurements can be reported (together with other (existing) attributes such as LOS/NLOS indicator). This seems to imply that Case 2a (and Case 2b) can be considered as an AI/ML enhanced DL-TDOA and/or Multi-RTT method.  Therefore, the decision may have to be made on Case-by-Case basis. Considering Case 1 has priority, the above implies that Case 1 may have to be a separate/new method. |
| ZTE | B | Using AI to generate measurements/location is a totally new UE behavior which does not have any explicit relationship with existing RSTD/RSRP/RSRP/Rx Tx time difference measurement.  From signaling perspective, having a separate AI positioning method is better for forward compatibility since case 2a/2b will be specified eventually, which will introduce new measurement report quantity for AI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A | In RAN1 119 meeting, it was agreed to introduce assistant information:  *For AI/ML based positioning Case 1, all assistance information from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA, other than info #7, can be provided from LMF to UE. For info #7, RAN1 study, if necessary, choose one alternative from the following:*  It can be seen that RAN1 assumes that legacy UE-based DL-TDOA is re-used, and all assistance information from that can be provided. So it is more reasonable to enhance legacy positioning methods to support AI-based positioning, instead of defining a new one and copying all the information there. |
| Lenovo | B | Based on our replies in Question 1 |
| OPPO | B | A new method is more future proof. |
| CATT | A | **For assistance data**, we agree with Huawei’s comment that the most information of legacy UE-based DL-TDOA can be re-used, and the potential enhancement of info #7 provided by RAN1 Alternative#1~4 could be easily implemented.  **For reference signal**, at least for case1 PRS RAN1 agreed both options are feasible by using legacy mechanisms:  *Option A. (UE initiated) UE makes a request to LMF on the preferred DL PRS configuration for training data collection, e.g., on-demand PRS. LMF makes the decision on determining the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.*  *Option B. (LMF initiated) LMF determines the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.*  **For the measurement**, RAN1 has agreed to use DP/PDP (CIR FFS):  - Timing: Reuse of existing measurements (e.g. UL RTOA, DL RSTD, Rx-Tx, and some other parameters such as reference time, timing quality);  - Power: DL PRS-RSRPP and UL SRS-RSRPP, as starting points.  Since all parameters are exist in current spec, no new measurement has been defined/enhanced by RAN1.  RAN1 has considered sample based measurement type for AI/ML data collection. This is the timing information based on the samples related to the first detected path. We think all the sample based measurement could be enhanced in the legacy method, e.g. *NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16*. |
| Ericsson | A/B | Both can work. It appears majority of companies prefer to introduce new method for case1. We are as such fine with new method as well. |
| Fujitsu | B | At least for case 1, potential new measurement (e.g., PDP/DP) has to be introduced to support AI/ML, therefore, a new positioning method is preferred for case 1. |
| Samsung | B with comment | Similar view with Qualcomm. We can make the decision case by case.  Based on our replies in Q1, at least for Case 1 (AI-direct), we agree to have a new method for AI-based positioning. However, for Case 2a (AI-assisted), the AI feature can be a part of legacy positioning method and there is no need to introduce a new method for the case. |
| CEWiT | B | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Nokia | B with comments | This should be decided after conclusion and RAN2 decision on the outcome of Question 1. We tend to think AI/ML positioning should be a new positioning method but also agree that we should analyze each case separately. For now, we should focus on the priority Case 1. |
| CMCC | B | As answer of Q1, we prefer to introduce a new method. |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

13 companies choose to introduce a new method for Case 1 mainly considering that case 1 UE location reporting mechanism is different than any legacy method. That is case 1 cannot be integrated with legacy method and also for leaner design, better forward compatibility, and avoidance of overloading legacy methods majority of the companies prefer a new method

2 companies prefer enhancing legacy method by reusing existing infrastructure and ensures consistency with prior specifications.

As observed in Q1, there may not be a golden rule to make the decision and we will have to go with majority view and there is a clear majority to Introduce AI/ML positioning case 1 as a new method.

1. Introduce AI/ML positioning Case 1 as a new positioning method.

## FFS which does not need RAN1 input

### Signaling enhancement for UE reporting location using AI/ML

In RAN2#126, below was agreed

|  |
| --- |
| At least for Case 1, existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are used for providing the results of the UE sided model inference operation. FFS further details on signaling enhancements |

For Case 1, UE only reports location result to LMF without measurements. If taken as a new method, then there is default signaling for RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages as part of the procedure of new method, while when taken as legacy method then indication of AI/ML should be added in RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages.

**Question** 3**: Regarding LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer, do companies agree with the following?**

* **If a new method is introduced, no additional signaling enhancements are needed, i.e., there is a default procedure to request and provide location;**
* **If the legacy method is reused, an AI/ML indication should be added in the request/provide location information.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | Agree with comment | If the legacy method is reused, an AI/ML indication in the LPP request location information is enough, in other words, there is no need to add an AI/ML indication in the LPP provide location information. |
| Apple | Agree 1st bullet, 2nd bullet is postponed to stage 3 discussion | We agree 1st bullet.  2nd bullet is detailed stage 3 signaling design, which is not essential. We are not sure why rushing to make this agreement at this stage. |
| Fraunhofer | Agree | The existing LPP mechanisms are to be reused, with AI/ML specific IEs that are signalled. We further understand that the call-flow diagrams are added in Stage 2 descriptions for AI/ML based positioning. |
| vivo | Agree, with comment on second bullet | Agree with an indication is added for reusing the legacy ones. Such indication should be able to indicate whether the method is for AI/ML only or for both AI and non-AI. |
| Qualcomm | Partly disagree, with comments | No matter whether a new location method is introduced, or AI/ML positioning is defined as an enhancement of existing methods, the requested location method is always determined by an LMF (see TS 23.273). This means that the LPP Request Location Information message (*RequestLocationInformation-r9-IEs*) must include an entry for the "AI/ML Positioning Method", if AI/ML positioning is defined as a new method.  If AI/ML positioning is an enhancement of an existing method (e.g., DL-TDOA, multi-RTT, etc.), an indication of whether "AI/ML enhanced measurements" or "legacy measurements" are desired is needed. This could be implemented simply as an additional set of *locationInformationTypes* (e.g., "AI/ML enhanced required", "AI/ML enhanced desired, but non-AI/ML allowed", etc.). |
| ZTE | Agree with 1st bullet | Agree with apple on the stage-3 indication |
| Huawei, HiSiliccon | Agree, but | If the legacy method is reused, the motivation of introducing a new flag should be discussed, e.g. it may be related to monitoring, and RAN1 inputs are needed. |
| Lenovo | See comment | The meaning of 1st bullet needs clarification, since RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages will for sure be enhanced. We suppose what rapporteur means is to confirm the RAN2 agreement.  - Even if **a new method is introduced,** existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are re-used for this new method. The detailed signaling enhancement and contents of the RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages is FFS. |
| OPPO | Agree with 1st bullet | If the legacy method is reused, an AI/ML indication may be also not needed as LMF will indicate whether to activate AI or non-AI positioning method explicitly or implicitly when providing PRS configuration, so LMF can implicitly know which positioning method is used by UE when providing request/provide location information. |
| CATT | Agree | If the legacy method is reused, since NW (LMF) is expected to deactivate active functionality, the AI/ML indication could be added explicitly or implicitly in the request location information. This depends on whether the LMF will send the e.g. associated ID or info #7 to the UE which could be considered as an explicit AI/ML marker. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Also Agree that bullet 2 can be further discussed if legacy method is selected as commented by Huawei.  Agree with QC’s comment. |
| Fujitsu | Agree with comment | Agree on the 1st bullet, since existing LPP signaling and mechanism should be applied commonly beyond positioning methods.  In question 1, we agree to have a new method, so we agree on bullet 1, and bullet 2 does not apply to case 1.  For the 2nd bullet, there may be multiple ways to realize, e.g., LMF/UE may determine to use AI/ML or legacy methods during AI/ML applicability reporting phase, then no extra indication needed for the location information exchange procedure; otherwise, LMF may explicitly indicate UE to perform AI/ML positioning via *location information request*. Anyway, we agree with the above companies to postpone these detailed discussions. |
| Samsung | Agree with comment. | For the 1st bullet, we have the similar view with Qualcommn/Lenovo. The existing signalling procedure (i.e., LPP Request/Provide Location Information) can be reused for AI-based POS regardless of whether a new method is introduced or the legacy methods are enhanced. In case of having a new method, we can just introduce the corresponding new fields for the new method in Request/Provide Location Information messages.  For the 2nd bullet, we see the need of indication to request AI-based measurement/estimation in LPP RequestLocationInformation message. However, for the indication in LPP ProvideLocationInformation, it depends on RAN1’s decision on whether new types of measurement/estimation are introduced or not. If the new fields are introduced to report the new types of measurement/estimation with higher accuracy, the indication in ProvideLocationInformation may not be needed. |
| CEWiT | Partially agree | Agree from the stage 2 perspective but the stage 3 design would require modifications for both new and legacy enhancements. |
| Nokia | See comments | If a new method is introduced: instead of signalling enhancements to existing IEs, new signalling IEs are needed (note that LPP message is always going to be RequestLocationInformation and ProvideLocationInformation. So, the question is not whether new message is needed. It is about whether new IEs is needed or not).  If legacy method is re-used: Needs further discussion. Taking legacy UE-based DL-TDOA method as an example, the question is whether the LMF can control if the UE can use new measurements and use inference operation or not. Can the LMF just request a UE-based DL-TDOA method as usual and leave it up to UE to decide whether UE can use new measurements and inference operation or not? Currently, UE does indicate the method used in the ProvideLocationInformation message but should the UE still indicate it as DL-TDOA, in this example, or should it indicate it as an AI/ML positioning method? If you consider AI/ML positioning is a legacy method, then the UE obviously have to indicate “legacy method” only in the ProvideLocationInformation. Also, if the request from LMF can indicate it wants the UE to use new measurements and use inference operation then there is no need for a new indication in the ProvideLocationInformation. |
| CMCC | Agree | Same understanding as Apple. |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

All companies agree with no additional signaling enhancements are needed if a new method is introduced, as one can use the new messages that comes as part of new method. Rapporteur agree with QC and Lenovo’s comment that procedures can be reused for a new method while the content details are FFS.

The intention is to confirm as Lenovo mentioned:

Even if **a new method is introduced,** existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are used for this new method. The detailed signaling enhancement and contents of the RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages is FFS. Hence, proposal is

1. Existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are used for providing the results of the UE sided model inference operation. The detail stage 3 message extention can be disucssed while drafting the stage 3 CR.

### Fallback Configuration

In RAN2#128, it was agreed:

|  |
| --- |
| If the AIML based positioning method becomes non-applicable when LMF requests UE location estimation, UE cannot perform the AIML based positioning, and reply with LPP ProvideLocationInformation message with error cause. FFS if other fallback options are considered: |

When LMF requests UE location estimation, if for any reason UE cannot perform the AIML based positioning, the question that arises is that whether there should be a fallback option apart from the error reporting (e.g.: fallback to legacy method).

**Question** 4**: Regarding fallback option, companies are requested to provide their view on whether they agree/disagree to have any other fallback configurations?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | Agree | For the periodic reporting, the requested functionality may not be available due to the time gap between the LPP request location information message and the LPP provide location information message, so the fallback configuration is necessary and the fallback configuration could reduce the positioning latency.  Moreover, if the legacy positioning method is reused for the AI/ML positioning, the existing signaling could support the fallback configuration. |
| Apple | Disagree | We think it is sufficient to rely on agreed UE reporting error code:   1. With UE reporting error code, LMF can already take corresponding reaction (e.g. configure non-AI/ML positioning) as legacy. Thus, fallback configuration is an optimization. 2. If NW provides fallback configuration, it implies that NW needs to simultaneously provide at least two sets of radio resource and assistance data normal operation and fallback operation (e.g. non-AI positioning and AI based positioning). It is radio resource consuming for NW and a new requirement for UE, but its benefit is not clear (maybe just saving latency of one LPP message?). Rel-19 AI/ML positioning doesn’t requirement for latency reduction. So, we are not convinced its necessity. 3. On the issue of time gap raised by Xiaomi, we think that is the reason why we introduce applicable functionality reporting. |
| Fraunhofer | Agree | While the fallback option may be triggered by the UE by providing appropriate error code, based on model monitoring on the UE-side., in some scenarios, configuration of fallback mechanism from the LMF may be useful to avoid latency between the time the UE detected that AI/ML model is not performing to the time a new method is configured to the UE. |
| vivo | Disagree | The current LPP supports LMF to request several positioning methods concurrently, which realize backup options to obtain location information by LMF implementation to request AI/ML positioning method with other legacy NR positioning methods in the meantime. No signaling enhancement is needed to support potentila “fallback” scheme. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | We think there is nothing new to solve in this regard. Any LMF location request with a (LMF selected) positioning method can fail. E.g., GNSS location may not be possible in a given environment, etc. It is then up to an LMF to decide what to do, e.g., based on client request type. LMF may instigate another location attempt with different method(s), may fall-back to (E)CID, etc. |
| ZTE | Agree | All legacy positioning functionality (DL-TDOA, DL-AOD, M-RTT) have same level of processing capability. We see AI functionality is an upgraded version which takes more power consumption/more computation resource to achieve, and the AI applicable functionality may change faster than legacy UE processing capability.  However there is a fixed QoS (including latency) from LCS client. LCS client does not care whether the UE is using AI or not, it just cares that UE should response the required estimated location on time. So facing this upgraded AI positioning which may fail or unsatisfied more easily, if LMF decides to activate it, LMF should allocate the fallback option in advance, to ensure that UE has something meaningful to report, rather than ‘UE reporting Error+LMF’s another scheduling’.  To Apple’s second argument:  Currently the assistance data for non-AI and assistance data for AI are almost the same (the minor difference depends on RAN1’s further discussion). LMF does not need to provide it twice. |
| Huawei, HiSiliccon | Comments. | RAN2 agreed that when the applicability changes, UE sends an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF. Based on this the UE should be reconfigured and LMF will normally not ask the UE for a location until this reconfiguration is done. With that in mind, the issue seems a corner case, so replying with an error cause seems sufficient.  Furthermore, we should follow the principles agreed for BM use case as a baseline and for BM we agreed:   * When a functionality becomes non-applicable the UE doesn’t autonomously deactivate. NW is expected to deactivate active functionality when it receives report from UE that it is non-applicable.   Similarly, for positioning, the functionality management should be under NW control, so if the NW has received the error cause from the UE, it is up to NW decision, e.g. the NW can decide to disable AI/ML based positioning and instruct the UE to use legacy positioning method.  We understand that "any other fallback configurations" may refer to UE autonomous fallback mechanism, and the motivation and benefit should be discussed first, considering the above understanding. |
| Lenovo | Agree | AIML based positioning is restricted to the scenario/environment under which the AIML model is trained. It is a safer approach to have another regular legacy positioning as a fallback option to meet the demand of the LCS client.  From specifications point of view, it does not require much additional effort considering it is already supported for LMF to request multiple positioning methods at the same time. Just in the case of fallback, UE only uses the fallback method to estimate the UE location if the AIML based method becomes not applicable. |
| OPPO | Disagree | Rely on error reporting can be sufficient. |
| CATT | Disagree | Relying on error reporting is sufficient. We think the fallback behaviour can be based on NW implementation, i.e., when network receives the error indication, then network can reconfigure the non-AI/ML positioning method as legacy. |
| Ericsson | Agree but (see comments) | We agree with what ZTE mentioned that in scenario where UE may fluctuate from applicable to non-applicable, a pre-configured fallback option is good choice to avoid latency.  However, we can also be fine with Beam Management approach commented by Huawei which is in essence same as QC/CATT points to. That after receiving failure message, LMF can deactivate the AI/ML functionality and select a new positioning method. |
| Fujitsu | Agree with comments | We think it is beneficial to have one fallback scheme to guarantee the positioning accuracy in case of AI/ML failure, the most two crucial KPIs for positioning are accuracy and latency, UE may switch to another better positioning method with pre-configuration from LMF to avoid the service discontinuity and extra signaling exchange overhead.  We think the “fallback” strategy is also aligned with the discussion of current capability/applicability reporting procedure. LMF is the entity to decide which positioning method(s) can be used, and it may request multiple capabilities/applicability via LPP signaling, after the applicability reporting, LMF may send indications and/or configurations of more than one positioning method including AI/ML and legacy for UE.  The configuration for AI/ML and legacy can be largely shared, the similarity on configuration between AI/ML and legacy method can be one of the considerations for LMF to select the fallback. For assistance data, at least in current RAN1 discussion, there may not be too many differences, even if there is some, UE may request LMF for assistance data via LPP directly, it will be more efficient than triggering the entire LCS service request from very top layers. |
| Samsung | Comments. | If the legacy methods are reused/enhanced for AI-based POS, it seems reasonable to allow UE to fallback to the legacy estimation when the AI/ML-based inference is unavailable.  If a new method is introduced, the LMF can indicate the use of multiple POS methods in the same LPP RequestLocationInformation message as in legacy and it’s up to UE implementation how to use them for location estimation. No further enhancement is not needed for the fallback operation in this case. |
| CEWiT | Disagree | We think it should be up to the LMF to decide based on the error reported and/or the LCS request. |
| Nokia | See comments | For now, as a baseline, UE can just report error with error cause. Fallback options can be discussed later after we agree whether AI/ML positioning is new method or not. If AI/ML positioning is considered a legacy method then what does it mean if we say fallback to legacy method? Also, we need to discuss whether UE can autonomously select a fallback positioning method or if it is under LMF control. For minimizing the scope of discussion and specification impacts, we can just go with the above suggested baseline functionality and come back to further enhanced functionalities later if time permits. |
| CMCC | Disagree | Under network control via LPP reconfiguration to fallback, instead of UE autonomously fallback. |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

6 companies support fallback options and consider it is helpful to ensures continuity when AI/ML positioning fails, especially for high QoS required application to save latency.

9 companies disagree of using fallback options considering this can rely on error reporting and should be in NW control to select a new positioning method.

From companies’ comments, all agree that when AI positioning becomes unavailable or QoS not met, other positioning method should be selected, either by fallback, or by requesting multiple methods in the LPP request msg, or by NW to start new LCS after receiving error code. Many companies also acknowledge that fallback is the most efficient way in latency perspective.

However, fallback can be viewed as an optimization and the error cause reporting from UE as a baseline functionality. As per current agreement; it allows UE to report error if failed during AI/ML procedure and for the LMF to take subsequent action (provide new AD, select new method etc).

With fallback, along with error reporting, UE may also provide location/measurement using preconfigured fallback method. This can be viewed as an optimization which comes as a signaling overhead.

1. The way forward is that companies preferring fallback configuration should provide how much latency saving can be done; i.e motivate companies who have disagreed to introduce this option. However, additional signaling overhead with fallback configuration should be considered since assistance data for two methods may have to be provided.

If yes, companies are invited to provide view on when the fallback should be (pre)configured (e.g., in which step fallback config is configured (step 1 to 6 of agreements) or if it is configured only after getting a failure message from the UE).

**Question** 5**: Regarding fallback option, when should the fallback be configured?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Remark (when is fallback configured)** |
| Xiaomi | We think the fallback can be configured in step 5. |
| Apple | If fallback is supported (although we are negative), we think it should be configured in step 3, which provides UE sufficient time to prepare the fallback operation. If it is provided in step 5, why not just rely on LMF reconfiguration? |
| Fraunhofer | Configuration after a failure message induces unnecessary latency. The fallback can be configured in step 3, since the LMF has been informed on the UE capability already at step 2. |
| Vivo | In **step 5**. Since we support AI/ML as an individual positioning method and fallback by NW implementation, LMF can request the “fallback” positioning method(s) together with the AI-enhanced one for both location predication and estimation in the meantime. |
| Qualcomm | As comment in our response to Question 4, we cannot see why "AI/ML positioning" requires any special/new treatment regarding "fallback". |
| ZTE | Step 5. Step 3 is to provide assistance data configuration, not to provide NW’s request/command/indication. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As a baseline, the NW can reconfigure the UE after an updated LPP ProvideCapabilities message or a failure message is received. This is aligned with the principle of BM case where the functionality management is under NW control. |
| Lenovo | Step 5 is more preferable as this step triggers the UE to provide the Location. |
| OPPO | See answer in Q4 |
| CATT | See answer in Q4 |
| Ericsson | If fallback is configured, it can be part of step 5. |
| Fujitsu | Step 5 can be the baseline, since step 3/4 is the procedure for determining the AI/ML applicable functionality, LMF may select proper fallback strategy with the knowledge of applicability. |
| Samsung | We can’t see any need of having explicit configuration/indication to allow the fallback operation.  First, as in our comments in Q4, we think the design of a new fallback operation is needed only if the legacy methods are reused/enhanced for AI-based POS.  With that assumption, in step 5, the LMF can provide the configuration for the legacy positioning method (e.g., nr-DL-TDOA-RequestLocationInformation-r16) with the indication to request AI-based location measurement/estimation. Then, when the AI-based operation is not available at the UE-side, the UE can automatically fallback to the legacy measurement/estimation and report the results in step 6 with the error cause (e.g., modelNotApplicable). No need to have any explicit configuration/indication to allow the fallback operation. |
| CEWiT | Like our view in Q4, it is up to the LMF to decide when to configure. |
| Nokia | We should first wrap-up on whether fallback option is needed or not and also decide whether AI/ML positioning is a new method or not, before discussing signalling details for fallback option. However, some options are: 1) fallback is entirely up to UE implementation, 2) fallback action is standardized & specified in the spec 3) fallback to same method but using legacy algorithms instead of inference operation (assumes AI/ML positioning is not a new method). |
| CMCC | Step 5. |
|  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

8 companies consider fallback to be configured in Step 5, which aligns with triggering the UE to provide location, minimizing pre-configuration overhead.

3 companies chose Step 3, commenting this allows earlier preparation but may increase complexity unnecessarily.

Summarizing the overall comments, configuring fallback in Step 5 aligns with the natural flow of signaling and avoids premature configurations. This approach also maintains flexibility and efficiency.

1. if fallback is requested, it is requested in Step 5 LPP request location information message.

Further companies are invited to provide their view on what should be the fallback configuration? Should it be a particular positioning method or any legacy positioning method or simply an abort of procedure?

Further companies are invited to provide their view on what should be the fallback configuration? Should it be a particular positioning method or any legacy positioning method or simply an abort of procedure?

**Question** 6**: Regarding fallback option, what should the fallback configuration be?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Remark (what should be the fallback configuration)** |
| Xiaomi | We think the DL-TDOA and DL-AoD can be considered for the fallback configuration.  For example, LMF configures the UE to use DL-TDoA or DL-AoD related PRS measurement to acquire its location. |
| Apple | If fallback is supported (although we are negative), we prefer to make it simple, i.e. an abort of procedure. |
| Fraunhofer | Falllback need to be configured to switch to a legacy method if AI/ML method fails.  In addition, as RAN1 has not yet defined the meaning of functionalities in AI/ML positioning, we cannot exclude at this point that more than one applicable functionality are defined for Case 1 (UE-based positioning). Thus, the fallback strategy in this case, could be switching to a different AI/ML functionality within Case 1. |
| Vivo | Since fallback can be supported by NW implementation, the fallback configuration can be any legacy positioning method requested together with the AI based positioning method. |
| Qualcomm | See our response to Question 5. If a specific location request cannot be fulfilled, the UE reports an applicable error cause.  If a LMF allows/requests multiple positioning methods, the request is normally a request for “hybrid positioning”. |
| ZTE | If AI positioning method falls back to legacy positioning method, agree with Xiaomi that UE based DL-TDOA/DL-AoD can be the fallback option. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There is no need for any UE autonomous fallback configuration. It can be left to the NW to decide which positioning configurations (legacy or AI) to use after the UE indicated applicability change or an error cause, similar to what we agreed for BM case. |
| Lenovo | It can be any legacy DL based positioning method that is supported by UE and configured by the LMF, i.e. either UE-based DL-TDOA or UE-based DL-AoD. |
| OPPO | See answer in Q4 |
| CATT | See answer in Q4 |
| Ericsson | Agree with Xiaomi and ZTE that if fallback is configured then fallback is legacy UE based DL-TDOA |
| Fujitsu | The fallback method should be chosen according to LPP capability and other factors as we mentioned in the answer to question 4, so the configuration will be the measurement configuration such as DL-TDOA which may be same or different from the AI/ML. |
| Samsung | There is no need to have any explicit configuration/indication to allow the fallback operation. See our answer in Q5. |
| CEWiT | Like our response in Q4, it is up to the LMF to decide based on the error reported and/or the QoS in the LCS request. |
| Nokia | See our response to Question 5. |
| CMCC | UE can fallback to legacy positioning method under network control. |
|  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

8 companies agree to take legacy methods as fallback options under NW control to ensure continuity of service. Fraunhofer pointed that if there are more than one functionalities within Case 1, may also switch/fallback to a different functionality inside Case 1.

7 companies do not support fallback options, but considers error reporting to NW, and NW to schedule another method based on the error received, LSC request, and UE capability.

1. Fallback configurations should be legacy methods (e.g., DL-TDOA, DL-AoD) to ensure continuity of service.

Similar to fallback, the UE may also switch from using non-AI/ML to AI/ML, e.g., UE is inapplicable for AI/ML Positioning when LMF sends RequestLocationInformation msg and later UE becomes applicable for AI/ML Positioning to be used. This would be applicable mainly for periodic positioning if there are several localizations needed over a period of time, and AI/ML Positioning is more favorable in the scenario, e.g., in NLoS condition. That is when the UE can perform both AI/ML and non-AI/ML, but initially UE reported that the applicability condition is not met but later it identifies the applicability conditions are met. Hence, should there be a switching option from non-AI/ML to AI/ML?

**Question** 7**: Do companies view a need of switching options that is to change from non-AI/ML to AI/ML, similar to fallback?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Remark (Preference on Switching Configuration from non-AI/ML to AI/ML)** |
| Xiaomi | We don’t support that UE switches the positioning method autonomously with the functionality applicability change since the positioning method should be controlled by the LMF, and he LMF could switch the positioning method to AI/ML positioning method according to the functionality reporting from UE. |
| Apple | Not support. We can rely on LMF reconfiguration, instead of introducing more UE complexity for unclear benefit. |
| Fraunhofer | Support. The LMF shall configure the switching between functionalities or between AI/ML or non-AI/ML methods. It may enable the UE to switch from non-AI/ML to AI/ML based on the conditions configured to the UE. |
| vivo | So far, no discussion/decision is made on switching from non-AI to AI. We think, the AI/ML positioning should be employed by UE under LMF control. See that obtaining positioning information can be a short-time process, it may not be necessary for LMF to configure an AI backup for non-AI under some certain conditions. Besides, as mentioned above, LMF can request both AI and non-AI positioning method concurrently to achieve potential “switch” scheme. |
| Qualcomm | See our response to Question 4. The above description seems to imply that the UE can select a positioning method, which is currently not the case. For the periodic reporting example, the UE is required to send a report when reporting interval expires, even when no measurements or location estimate is available, but UE cannot autonomously select a different method (see e.g., 37.355). |
| ZTE | No. If a UE supports both AI and legacy positioning, AI will be an upgraded version compared to legacy positioning. So there is no reason to fall back from non-AI to AI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our opinion, the switch between non-AI/ML and AI/ML can be done in the same signaling procedure under the command of the NW (i.e. no UE autonomous switching), and the difference is just about configurations. For example:  - from AI/ML to non-AI/ML, the NW disables AI/ML and enables a non-AI/ML  - from non-AI/ML to AI/ML, the NW disable non-AI/ML and enables an AI/ML  Once we can define configurations for AI/ML in signalling, the above procedure should be supported naturally. |
| Lenovo | The concept of “switching” has some similarity as “fallback”. Suggest to discuss and conclude fallback first and see if additional discussion is needed. |
| OPPO | Not support. Rely on LMF reconfiguration can be sufficient. |
| CATT | Not support. |
| Ericsson | This is not for UE-Autonomous switching but allowing preconfiguration from LMF for fallback and switching options for the UE.  We are fine to take Lenovo’s approach |
| Fujitsu | Since AI/ML is used for “accuracy enhancement” as indicated in our topic title, so it is natural to use AI/ML first if it is applicable to achieve more accuracy, the “fallback” discussed in Q5/6 is used in case of AI/ML failure, but we do not think there could be “legacy failure” and fallback to AI/ML, it is against the basic logic.  However, we do think it is necessary to consider the procedure of bidirectional switching between AI/ML and non-AI/ML methods as HW mentioned, even if we do not think there is “fallback” from legacy to AI/ML. |
| Samsung | Not support. Share the view with other companies that the use of AI should be controlled by the configuration from LMF. |
| CEWiT | Again, up to the LMF. |
| Nokia | These additional enhancements add specification complexity and increases the scope of work. Keep it simple and finalize a baseline solution first. Error reporting is sufficient for Rel-19. |
| CMCC | Not support. Just rely on LMF reconfiguration. |
|  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

14/Most companies do not support autonomous switching from non-AI/ML to AI/ML as they consider this introduces complexity and contradicts network control principles. Many companies propose that UE should not switch autonomously, and instead the control should always come from NW to configure/activate or deactivate AI or non-AI positioning methods.

The intention of the question was to ask if LMF should preconfigure any switching between non-AI/ML to AI/ML similar to (pre)configured fallback configuration; however companies viewed the question as UE autonomous switching. Anyhow, we can conclude or reach consensus at least on below:

1. UE autonomous switching between AI/ML and non-AI/ML methods is not allowed.

### Error Causes

*NR-AI-ML-TargetDeviceErrorCauses*

The IE *NR-AI-ML-TargetDeviceErrorCauses* is used by the target device to provide NR AI/ML positioning error reasons to the location server.

-- ASN1START

NR-AI-ML-TargetDeviceErrorCauses-r19 ::= SEQUENCE {

cause-r19 ENUMERATED { assistanceDataInconsistentBetweenTrainingAndInference,

thereWereNotEnoughSignalsReceivedForUeBasedAI-ML,

resourceOrProcessingCapacityIssueForAIML,

battery-low,

...

},

...

}

-- ASN1STOP

**Question** 8**: For Case 1 error causes, do companies agree with the above error causes? Please add if anything is missing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi |  | For the periodic reporting, the requested functionality may not be available due to the time gap between the LPP request location information message and the LPP provide location information message, so we suggest to add to cause *functionalityNotAvailable*. |
| Apple | Postpone to stage 3 discussion | We are not why rushing to have detailed stage 3 signaling design, even before RAN1 design is not clear (e.g. what does “assistanceDataInconsistentBetweenTrainingAndInference” mean before RAN1 don’t conclude on assistance data design). |
| Fraunhofer |  | For the periodic reporting, the AI/ML model could be underperforming, as detected by monitoring session. So, we suggest to add to cause *performanceMonitoringEvent* |
| vivo | See comment | With regard to IE:  Whether there is additional or new IE *NR-AI-ML-TargetDeviceErrorCauses* depends on whether AI/ML is introduced as a new positioning method. If AI/ML is enhanced on the legacy positioning method, the AI specific error causes are added based on the legacy error causes per positioning method.  With regard to field contents:   1. *assistanceDataInconsistentBetweenTrainingAndInference*   The error cause is provided via *LPP Provide Location Information* after the applicable functionality reporting, where the applicability is decided based on the consistency between training and inference. Thus there is no need to consider this is a kind of cause for Target Device location error.   1. *battery-low*   There is no discussion on UE battery to cause location error. Moreover, the legacy location error does not include the case that UE indicates the network that it is in low battery state and cannot perform the location estimation. If UE is short of power, it may try best effort to finish the current procedure.   1. To capture the agreement, “*As a baseline, If the AIML based positioning method becomes non-applicable when LMF requests UE location estimation, UE cannot perform the AIML based positioning, and reply with LPP Providelocationinformation message with error cause*”, the first and foremost error should be *FunctionalityNotApplicable*. 2. Inspired by the legacy target device location error causes, the listed ones below can be also considered as candidate applied for AI positioning.   NR-AI-ML-TargetDeviceErrorCauses-r19 ::= SEQUENCE {  cause-r19 ENUMERATED { *undefined,*  assistance-data-missing,  attemptedButUnableToMeasureEnoughSignals,  locationCalculationAssistanceDataMissing,  FunctionalityNotApplicable,  …  },  …    } |
| Qualcomm | Partly agree | Dependent on the resolution of Question 2, additional error causes could be added to the existing error causes. However, they should provide some useful meaning/assistance to an LMF. E.g., it is unclear what a LMF should do with resourceOrProcessingCapacityIssue or battery-low, which both seem not specific to AI/ML positioning. |
| ZTE |  | Agree with VIVO on *FunctionalityNotApplicable*.  When the procedure/positioning method is triggered for UE training, UE can report ‘there is not enough training data to train an AI model’. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | It is about stage-3 details, and motivations should be discussed first.  We understand that for now for AIML-based positioning, the only use case for the error cause is for "functionality non-applicable", and whether the cause of non-applicability is needed in the capability report can be discussed later, i.e. after we make the decision on this point for BM use case. |
| Lenovo | See comment | “thereWereNotEnoughSignalsReceivedForUeBasedAI-ML”, “resourceOrProcessingCapacityIssueForAIML”, “battery-low” sound reasonable to us.  We could also additionally consider at least these UE error causes as well: “AI-ML-assistance-data-missing” , “attemptedButUnableToMeasureTRPs” and “locationCalculationAssistanceDataMissing” as they are related to the legacy error causes are equally applicable to AI/ML positioning error reporting.  “assistanceDataInconsistentBetweenTrainingAndInference” is one case of non-applicability, not sure if we are going to include other possible reasons or have a general cause “functionalityNotApplicable” |
| OPPO | Postpone to stage 3 discussion | No need to address this issue at this stage as this may have some dependency with non-applicable functionality reporting. |
| CATT | Postpone to stage 3 discussion | Agree with vivo that if AI/ML is enhanced on the legacy positioning method, the AI specific error causes are added based on the legacy error causes per positioning method. |
| Ericsson | Postpone to stage 3 discussion | We are fine to postpone this to stage3 discussion |
| Fujitsu | Postpone | We prefer to postpone the discussion until clearer clarifications on other LCM issues (e.g., functionality, applicability, consistency) are given. |
| Samsung | See comment | Share the similar view with Vivo.  First, the existing error causes (e.g., undefined, assistance-data-missing, …) can be the baseline also for the AI-based POS.  For new causes specific to AI-based POS, we also prefer to have some general error cause related to the applicability (i.e., functionalityNotApplicable) rather than the other detailed error causes (e.g., battery-low, ProcessingCapabilityIssues, …). That’s because the UE can determine the applicability considering all those aspects as part of UE-side conditions.  Meanwhile, for the performance monitoring, RAN1 agreed to support the performance monitoring metric calculation at the UE-side. If the UE can calculate the metric and the outcome of monitoring is ‘fail’, the UE can send LPP ProvideLocationInformation message with some error cause (e.g., performanceMonitoringFail). |
| CEWiT | See comment | Postpone to stage 3 discussion. |
| Nokia | See comments | Too early to decide since many issues regarding handling of inconsistencies between training and inference are open. Should come back to specific IE details when we have a stable stage-2 specification. |
| CMCC | Postpone to stage 3 discussion |  |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

Companies generally agree with most listed causes but suggest adding:

* FunctionalityNotAvailable
* PerformanceMonitoringEvent,
* legacy positioning error causes

Some companies also hold different view on whether to report *functionalityNotAvailable* or more detailed cause of why functionality is unavailable.

9 companies expressed to postpone this discuss error cause due to dependency on Stage 3 design, RAN1 progress, and non-applicable functionality reporting discussion.

1. The content of error cause is discussed while drafting stage3 CRs.

### Inference configuration

In RAN2#127bis, there is an FFS along the agreements

|  |
| --- |
| 2: Whether the inference configuration is provided in step 3 or/and step 5 is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress). |

In Step 3, the assistance data is sent from LMF to UE, and at this stage LMF has no information about whether UE meets applicability condition for using AI/ML model or not. In this regard, the PRS configuration in Step 3 is assistance which may be used for inference, but it is up to the UE to decide suitable PRS config that is applicable for inference. LMF on the other hand only requests whether UE should perform AI/ML inference or not in Step 5 after receiving the applicability condition from the UE in Step 4 and thus the request location information (Step 5) is used for inference configurations.

**Question** 9**: Do companies agree that Step 5 is the step where an inference configuration is provided?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| vivo | See comment | We consider the primary issue for RAN2 is to figure out **what is inference configuration in POS case 1**, which should be a question to ask RAN1 in Section 3.3. Q9 can only be answered with the clear content of inference configuration. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Step 5 is the LPP request location information, which includes an indication of location information type, QoS, etc. together with selected positioning method and method specific information types requested (e.g., requested measurement types, requested TEGs, Rx hopping, etc.). "Inference configuration" seems more related to Assistance Data and should be part of Step 3. |
| ZTE | Agree | It is not clear what is inside the inference configuration. if the inference configuration is the request/command that LMF requests UE to perform inference, step 5 is ok |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | It makes sense. |
| Lenovo | Agree, but | We should also check with RAN1 in relation to the content of the inference configuration. This will help us to better understand the suitable applicable step. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree | This is basically same as what QC replied for Question 3: that the inference config is: an entry for the "AI/ML Positioning Method", if AI/ML positioning is defined as a new method.  “  No matter whether a new location method is introduced, or AI/ML positioning is defined as an enhancement of existing methods, the requested location method is always determined by an LMF (see TS 23.273). This means that the LPP Request Location Information message (*RequestLocationInformation-r9-IEs*) must include an entry for the "AI/ML Positioning Method", if AI/ML positioning is defined as a new method.  If AI/ML positioning is an enhancement of an existing method (e.g., DL-TDOA, multi-RTT, etc.), an indication of whether "AI/ML enhanced measurements" or "legacy measurements" are desired is needed. This could be implemented simply as an additional set of *locationInformationTypes* (e.g., "AI/ML enhanced required", "AI/ML enhanced desired, but non-AI/ML allowed", etc.).  “ |
| Fujitsu | See comment | Agree to figure out the content of inference configuration first. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| CEWiT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | See comments | RAN2 agreement was only to attempt resolving the FFS which do not need RAN1 input and wait for RAN1 progress. |
| CMCC | Agree | The details are based on RAN1 progress. |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

12/Most companies support Step 5 as the appropriate stage for inference configuration, which align with existing signaling flow. Vivo, ZTE, Lenovo, and Fujitsu commented to check with RAN1 in relation to the content of the inference configuration.

Qualcomm suggested Step 3 for earlier alignment with assistance data.

1. UE receives the needed assistance data for calculating UE location for AI/ML in step3 (ProvideAssistanceData) and UE receives the instruction to perform the interference in step 5 (RequestLocationInformation). The content of Assistance Data and the content of request location information is based upon RAN1 parameter list.

### On LMF control for Unsolicited Applicability Reporting

|  |
| --- |
| RAN1 128 Agreement  1 For POS Case 1, RAN2 confirm that the existing unsolicited UE capability report mechanism in LPP can support UE to report the applicable functionality in both “proactive” and “reactive” as a baseline.  - Proactive case: When the applicability change, UE can send an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF .  - Reactive case: If the applicability changes based on the configuration in LPP ProvideAssistanceData message in step 3, UE can send an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF. Configuration details are FFS |

It has been agreed that existing unsolicited UE capability report mechanism in LPP can support UE to report the applicable functionality in both “proactive” and “reactive” as a baseline. However, a question that remains (FFS) is whether there is a need for LMF to control on sending these unsolicited messages.

We need to note here that there are two attributes:

1. Capability: AI/ML Functionality for Positioning
2. Applicable functionality.

The applicability reporting is considered a dynamic attribute which is associated with AI/ML Positioning functionality. In legacy, this dynamic capability can be considered similar to remoteUE-Indication (e.g. as mentioned in discussion paper [R2-2410475]). This has been used for the case where UE reports its coverage state. That is if the UE is out of coverage and connected via a relay UE. This is needed for the LMF to select the right positioning method. This attribute is controlled by LMF.

***remoteUE-IndicationReq***

This field, if present, indicates that the target device is requested to indicate if it operates as a L2 U2N Remote UE.

For AI/ML case, it should be up to LMF to decide whether to configure AI/ML based inference or use legacy mechanism for obtaining the UE location. Hence, LMF would require assistance information from UE if the reported capability on AI/ML functionality for positioning meets UE side and NW side additional conditions to decide if LMF should pursue AI/ML or non-AI/ML (legacy technique) and in such case, it should be up to LMF to configure the needed relevant assistance information from UE. That is, whether step 4 is needed or not should be configured by LMF. There can be cases where LMF may have already decided not to pursue AI/ML based method, (example QoS of another UE in the same cell portion using AI/ML was not met).

|  |
| --- |
| Step 4: UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message.  4: FFS whether LMF controls the UE sending unsolicited LPP provide capabilities (i.e. whether step4 is sent reactively or proactively). FFS the signalling details. |

**Question** 10**: Do companies agree with above that LMF should provide configuration that would allow the UE to send unsolicited LPP to provide capabilities similar to remoteUE-Indication (e.g: aiml-ApplicabilityReq in RequestCapability)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | We think, anyway, this is a UE capability and there is no harm in reporting it to the LMF without LMF control.  Moreover, if the LMF wants to use the AI/ML positioning method, it can use it directly according to the functionality applicability reporting. Otherwise, the LMF should request the UE to report the applicable functionality and then indicates the UE to use the AI/ML positioning method, which will lead to additional positioning latency.” |
| Apple | Disagree | As legacy LPP, the NW control is implicitly enforced in a LPP positioning session. Legacy LPP unsolicited information transfer procedure doesn’t need LMF control whether the UE can report.  On the exceptional case of L2 U2N relay quoted by moderator, we think it is different from AI/ML based positioning. According to Rel-18 discussion the reason to introduce “***remoteUE-IndicationReq”*** is due to some special technique issue of L2 U2N relay rather than due to dynamic capability. For example:   1. Serving cell timing is not known by remote UE   Some positioning methods requires serving cell timing by target UE. The Relay UE knows the SFN timeline of its serving cell, but the Remote UE only sees the DFN timeline provided by the Relay UE.   1. L1/L2 Uu signaling can’t be used by remote UE   There are some MAC-CE/DCI specified for positioning (e.g. AP/SP SRS activation/deactivation, Measurement Gap activation/deactivation). They can’t be used for the Remote UE because there is no L2 forwarding on L1/L2 siganling specified.  Thus, the IE for remote UE status reporting is due to L2 relay special issue and system may not work if no such indication reported to LMF. However, for AI/ML based positioning, the applicable functionality reporting in step 4 falls into the legacy LPP unsolicited information transfer procedure. We fail to see any serious technique issue without explicit LMF configuration in AI based positioning. Thus, we think it is only an optimization, and prefer to keep the legacy LPP procedure. |
| Fraunhofer | Needs clarification | Our understanding is that the capability of UE to perform AI/ML based positioning can change based on the environment it is in. The UE can be aided with information from the network, enabling the UE to determine whether the AI/ML model it contains is applicable to the area or not. This information could lead the UE to determine whether or not the model it contains is applicable or not. Therefore, we see a value in providing information to the UE to enable the UE to determine whether it still has capability to perform AI/ML based positioning in the area.  In our view, the proactive reporting of change in capabilities of the UE shall be supported, and this shall be optional (since the capabilities reported during Step 2 may not have changed). This enables the LMF to configure a suitable fallback approach if one of the AI/ML functionalities (or models) are not applicable in the area. |
| vivo | Disagree | As agreed in RAN2#128 meeting, it is clear how reactive case is performed: “*Reactive case: If the applicability changes based on the configuration in LPP ProvideAssistanceData message in step 3, UE can send an unsolicited LPP ProvideCapabilities message to LMF.*” Based on NW provision of NW-side additional condition, UE can provide its applicability based on the current situation, which is supported by the current LPP Provided Capability message. **If any further indication is provided from LMF via LPP Request capability** (**Step1**, like *aiml-ApplicabilityReq*) **to enable applicable functionality reporting (Step 3)**, in the normal positioning logistic, **UE should respond** to *aiml-ApplicabilityReq* **in Step2 rather than Step3.** This is not aligned with the current positioning design. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Since not needed.  Since a UE does generally not know the LMF capabilities, such a "control" is needed when a UE cannot infer the LMF capabilities from other messages (e.g., LPP Provide Assistance Data message). E.g., a UE should not send updated capabilities related remote status if the LMF does not support the corresponding functionality. The same applies to AI/ML positioning functionality. It would be useless/overhead if a UE reports its "applicable AI/ML functionality" when a LMF is not AI/ML positioning capable.  However, for the actual "positioning capabilities" (in this case, the "supported/applicable AI/ML functionality"), the UE would always know the LMF support, either from Step 1 or Step 3 or Step 5 (at the latest). This is different from e.g., remote status indication, or LPP segmentation capabilities. I.e., the LPP Request Capabilities at Step 1 indicates which positioning capabilities are requested (e.g., DL-TDOA, etc.) and therefore, the UE knows which positioning functionality is supported by an LMF and would provide corresponding updated capabilities (if needed) e.g., at Step 4. For example, a UE would not report its changed Bluetooth positioning capabilities (e.g., at Step 4) if a UE has not received a request for Bluetooth Capabilities before (e.g., at Step 1). If Step 1 did not happen (e.g., since the LMF received the positioning capabilities from the AMF), a UE would know the LMF supported functionality from Step 3 or Step 5. |
| ZTE | Disagree | UE’s dynamically changed AI capability should be dynamically sent to LMF, since LMF does not know when/how such capability changes, LMF cannot control.  Also if AI is a new method, when LMF sends AI-RequestCapabilities, it means LMF wants to activate AI method. So at this case why LMF will need to prevent UE from sending dynamic AI capability in step 4? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For applicability report, agree to discuss the necessity of NW configuration | As rapporteur indicated above, the LPP message can be used for either capability or applicability reporting.  For capability reporting, "unsolicited messages" is purely up to UE, and there is no need to have network control. For example, in legacy, it may happen that the UE supports positioning method 1, but the NW does not support it, and such UE reporting behaviour has been allowed based on current specs.  For applicability reporting, we understand that if step 4 is out of network control, the UE may unnecessarily report its applicable functionalities (also in case they change). Similar to BM case where where the network configures whether the UE should report its applicable functionality, we suggest to discuss the necessity of NW configuration whether to allow step 4 or not. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | We also don’t see any issue to support unsolicited LPP *ProvideCapabilities* without explicit LMF control as in legacy. This has already been specified in TS 37.355 Clause 5.1.2 “Capability Indication Procedure”. |
| OPPO | Disagree | The motivation is not clear, it still works without LMF control. |
| CATT | Disagree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree if AI/ML introduced as enhancement to legacy. | The LMF control would be essential if AI/ML was introduced as enhancement to legacy. Since, there could be case that LMF may proceed with legacy measurements and would not care/need the UE applicable condition. That is, if UE happened to send the applicable condition at step 4 it would be waste as LMF would not anyway pursue AI/ML. But for new method, if there is no fallback configuration reconfigured then yes it is needed, |
| Fujitsu | Disagree | Firstly, LPP unsolicited information reporting does not require NW control as defined in legacy, we do not expect any violation for AI/ML only.  Secondly, as discussed in previous meetings, there are “static” and “dynamic” reporting regarding the capabilities, so basically, after the “static” round (step1/2), NW has already down selected the interested functionalities for UE to dynamically monitors the applicability, and it can add its control by providing the NW-side additional conditions in step 3, there is no reason for any extra NW control for the UE reporting in step 4. |
| Samsung | Disagree | The assistance information related to AI-based POS in step 3 can implicitly request UE to update the applicability of AI if needed. There is no need to introduce any explicit indication/configuration to request UE to report the applicability. |
| Nokia | See comments | Discussion is a bit confusing, but the following should be clarified:  - Use of LPPProvideCapabilities to report Applicable functionalities is AI/ML (positioning) specific and is done only when AI/ML positioning is decided/selected by LMF.  - LMF controls whether LPPProvideCapabilities can be sent whenever UE decides to report changes in applicable functionalities (LMF may disable UE from sending LPPProvideCapabilities for changes in applicable functionalities and instead always send a LPPRequestCapabilities to query the latest status of applicability of functionalities). At least there should be some configuration for reporting of changes in applicable functionalities to manage the UE reporting of changes in applicable functionalities.  In the last RAN2 meeting there was some confusion about the definition of proactive vs reactive and whether LMF must control only the proactive reporting or both proactive and reactive reporting which was leading RAN2 down a path to decide not to have LMF control at all for UE sending LPP provide capabilities. However, it is to be noted that the definition of proactive vs reactive is still undefined and it is not the way Samsung had defined it in their paper in R2-2409824. In Samsung’s paper both proactive and reactive were defined only from the perspective of reporting changes in applicable functionalities. If that is the case, then both proactive and reactive sending of LPPProvideCapabilities should be controllable by LMF since what we want LMF to control is the UE flooding the network with change reporting. So, we should discuss the definition of proactive vs reactive separately from the LMF control of UE reporting changes in applicable functionalities. |
| CMCC | Disagree |  |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

* **Support for LMF Control:** Supported conditionally by Ericsson for legacy methods.
* **Opposition:** Majority/ 11 companies oppose, citing redundancy with existing mechanisms.
* **Other comments:** HW suggests to discuss the necessity of NW configuration whether to allow step 4 or not. Nokia raised three good perspective to retrigger this discussion.

If LMF selects AI/ML based positioning method, then it appears majority of the company view that, if applicable condition is not met, UE may send an unsolicited message to the LMF since LMF has already selected AI/ML based method.

It appears the way reactive and proactive have been defined is:

Reactive case: Dependent upon NW side additional condition and if not met for inference, then UE can send the report.

Proactive case: Dependent upon UE side additional condition; if UE side additional condition is not met, then UE can send the unsolicited report.

If rapporteur understands, then Nokia’s view is that it should not be viewed as above but reactive should be viewed as LMF control and proactive should be viewed without LMF control. However, majority of the company do not see any need of LMF control and thus the proposal:

1. UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message without any additional LMF control.

## Questions to ask to RAN1 for resolving FFS waiting on RAN1 progress

### Applicable functionality reporting

Do companies agree that RAN2 can provide below Agreements sequence flow (steps) and ask RAN1what would be the message content of step 4 (UE side additional condition).

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreements:**  1: The following procedures for LCM for UE sided model for AI positioning case 1 is the baseline:  Step 1: LMF may request the UE to report the supported functionalities at the UE side by *LPP request capabilities* message.  Step 2: UE sends *LPP provide capabilities* message to LMF with the supported functionalities at the UE side.  Step 3: LMF sends the *LPP provide assistance data* message (which may contain network side additional condition).  Step 4: UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message.  Step 5: The LMF requests the inferred location information using the *LPP request location information* message.  Step 6: UE reports the inferred location using *LPP provide location information* message.  2: Whether the inference configuration is provided in step 3 or/and step 5 is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress).  3: Whether network side additional condition is needed and what it contains is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress).  4: FFS whether LMF controls the UE sending unsolicited LPP provide capabilities (i.e. whether step4 is sent reactively or proactively). FFS the signalling details.  5: RAN2 will decide whether AI positioning will be a new method after further details from RAN1 are received. |

RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 if RAN1 has any opinion on whether there are any specific UE signaling as part of the applicable functionality report.

Step 4: UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message.

**Question** 11**: Do companies agree to pose a question to RAN1 asking “RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 if there are any specific parameters as part of the applicable functionality report from the UE”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | No | We think this is not necessary since we understand that RAN1 will work on FG for AI/ML positioning in the later meeting. |
| Apple | No | RAN1 is already quite busy. We don’t think it is important question to bother RAN1. |
| Fraunhofer | Maybe | RAN1 will potentiality not understand what applicability functionality is, this needs to be clarified as part of LS before a question about specific parameter is posed. |
| vivo | Yes with some update | Since the applicable functionality is reported on the basis of supported functionality, and RAN2 has no common understanding over supported/applicable functionality. Therefore, before enquiring RAN1 about the applicable functionality, the supported one should also be asked (See our reply in Section 3.3.4). And the question can be simplified as: “**RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 What is the content and granularity of applicable functionality ~~if there are any specific parameters as part of the applicable functionality report from the UE~~?**”  As to the UE side additional condition mentioned by the Rapp, we think it is internally known by UE and no need to be transferred in step 4. |
| Qualcomm | No | Not needed at this stage, since this seems usual Stage 3 work to implement RAN1 capabilities/FGs. |
| ZTE | No | This should be RAN1’s UE feature discussion. We just implement them all in the ProvideCapabilities message. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We share similar views as Xiaomi. For now, it does not seem to be much need to ask RAN1 about it, and we can wait a bit for RAN1 progress. |
| Lenovo | Yes, but | It would be more easier to directly ask RAN1 about the content and granularity “Applicable Functionality” as vivo mentioned. RAN1 does not have any related agreements on Applicable functionality and therefore it would be good to add the RAN2 definitions on “supported functionality”, “applicable functionality” and “activated functionality” made in RAN2#127. |
| OPPO | No | RAN1 progress is still quite limited, we need to wait a little bit. |
| CATT | No | No need to ask RAN1 for the detailed parameters, and we could wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Fujitsu | No | Similar to the revise of UE capability parameters in each release, the detailed parameters should not be discussed at this stage of Rel-19. |
| Samsung | No | It can be implemented based on RAN1 capabilities/FGs later. |
| CEWiT | No |  |
| Nokia | See comments | The text proposal for the question to RAN1 is too broad and vague. We need to be specific in our question to RAN1. It seems the intent was to ask about UE side additional conditions but the use of the RAN2 agreements here does not make any clear association between the RAN2 agreements and UE side additional conditions. We could ask the following instead:  - RAN2 understanding is the LMF provides NW-side additional conditions as part of the assistance data provided to the UE for applicable functionalities determination by UE. RAN2 understands that this is done to ensure consistency between training and inference. RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 for specific details on NW-side additional conditions to proceed with signalling specification. Also, can RAN1 shed more light on how UE determines applicable functionalities and what is the relevance of consistency between training and inference and how it helps the UE. Can RAN1 provide additional details on what other inference configuration information, if any, needs to be signalled to UE. |
| CMCC | No | Wait for RAN1 progress. |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

* **Opposition:** Majority /11 companies prefer waiting for RAN1 progress or believe the question is urgent.
* **Others:** Vivo, Lenovo supported seeking clarity, with simplified questions about granularity and content. Nokia reformulated the questions to ask additional details on what other inference configuration information.

1. Since, there is clear majority to let RAN1 progress and send RAN2 parameter list, we can wait for RAN1 to comeback, however RAN2 can send as LS to RAN1 with RAN2 agreements.

### Consistency between training and inference

To ensure consistency between training and inference, UE should receive assistance with NW side additional condition. According to the RAN1 progress listed so far, all assistance information from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA, other than info #7 have been agreed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RAN1 Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning Case 1, all assistance information from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA, other than info #7, can be provided from LMF to UE. For info #7, RAN1 study, if necessary, choose one alternative from the following:   * Alternative 1. Info #7 is provided implicitly via associated ID.   + Associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 2. Info #7 can be provided either implicitly or explicitly by LMF. Note: no UE capability is introduced on whether info #7 is provided implicitly or explicitly, and the UE can request info #7 to be provided explicitly or implicitly.   + If provided implicitly, associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 3. Info #7 is **not** be provided from LMF to UE.   + If info #7 is not provided, UE may assume info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 4. Info #7 is provided explicitly from LMF to UE.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | 7 | Geographical coordinates of the TRPs served by the gNB (include a transmission reference location for each DL-PRS Resource ID, reference location for the transmitting antenna of the reference TRP, relative locations for transmitting antennas of other TRPs) | |

Several approaches to ensure consistency on the table:

* NW allocates associated ID
* UE’s on-demand request on NW side additional conditions

**Question** 12**: For Case 1, do companies agree to ask to RAN1 “what will be the approach to ensure the consistency”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes(ask question)/No (let RAN1 conclude)** | **Remark** |
| Xiaomi | No | Wait for the progress from RAN1. |
| Apple | No | As quoted by moderator, RAN1 is discussing this issue. We see no reason to send LS to push RAN1 at this stage. |
| Fraunhofer | No | Same view as above |
| vivo | No | RAN1 is discussing the format of NW sided additional condition. RAN2 can just wait for the further outcome and adopt in turn. Or as a compromise, RAN2 may ask RAN1 about “the detailed content of NW side additional condition” and let them feedback. |
| Qualcomm | No | Not needed at this stage, since this seems usual Stage 3 work to implement RAN1 parameter list. |
| ZTE | Yes | This has been a discussion that hangs in the air for several meetings. Suggest to ask RAN1 to accelerate their discussion |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Lenovo | Not yet |  |
| OPPO | No | RAN1 is discussing this issue |
| CATT | No | Wait for RAN1 progress. |
| Fujitsu | No | RAN1 is currently discussing this issue in more than one sub-topic given by the feature lead, we believe RAN2 can wait for their further conclusions. |
| Samsung | No | RAN1 is discussing this issue. |
| CEWiT | No |  |
| Nokia | See comments | See our response for Question 11. The level of detail we mentioned in our answer to Question 11 is fine for now, to ask RAN1. |
| CMCC | No |  |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

Majority of companies agree that network-side conditions should be clarified in collaboration with RAN1, and suggest waiting for RAN1's ongoing discussions.

**Question** 13**: Do companies see any other question that may be raised for NW side additional condition?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Remark (Pls provide the question to be asked)** |
| vivo | Yes | In addition to the content of NW-side additional condition, we think the optionality of that is important as well.  Besides, according to the current procedure of NW-side additional condition provision, as proactive way, we see some values that, in the inference phase, UE can require certain types of NW-side additional condition (in the form of LPP Request Location Information) in order to obtain the appropriate ones consistent to the ones in the training phase. For example, if UE-sided model is trained in some certain cells, it can indicate NW about the cell list. In this way, NW can know the specific NW configuration and allocate assistance data for inference accordingly.  The two questions we want to put forward are as follows:  **1.“Whether NW-side additional condition is mandatory or optional?”**  **2. “Whether NW-side additional condition can be provided by NW in a reactive way (i.e., UE to on-demand request for assistance data for specific cell(s))?”** |
| ZTE | Yes | Agree with vivo that UE should be able to request specific NW-side assistance data to ensure training-inference consistency.  Agree with vivo’s second question and modification:  **Whether NW-side additional condition can be provided by NW in a reactive way (i.e., UE to on-demand request for some specific assistance data or NW-side additional conditions of specific cell(s) or TRP(s) which has impact on the consistency between training and inference)?** |
| Lenovo | Yes | It would be good to check with RAN1 on the understanding and content of the NW additional conditions. |
| Nokia | See comments | See our response for Question 11. The level of detail we mentioned in our answer to Question 11 is fine for now, to ask RAN1. |

Rapporteur Summary:

3 companies proposed questions focused on optionality and reactive provisioning of network-side conditions.

Questions collected:

1.“Whether NW-side additional condition is mandatory or optional?”

2. Whether NW-side additional condition can be provided by NW in a reactive way (i.e., UE to on-demand request for some specific assistance data or NW-side additional conditions of specific cell(s) or TRP(s) which has impact on the consistency between training and inference)?

3. check with RAN1 on the understanding and content of the NW additional conditions

### UE side additional condition

* Should a question be raised to RAN1, if there is any specific need for UE to report UE side additional condition? If question needs to be asked to RAN1, pls provide what it should be?
* Or if RAN2 understands that this is already covered by UE reporting applicable functionality.

**Question** 14 **Companies are requested to select one or multiple of the Options:**

**Option A: Need to send as LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition**

**Option B\_ No need to send an LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition**

**Option C: UE side additional condition is covered by 3.3.1 Applicable Functionality Reporting; and an LS can be sent depending upon 3.3.1 discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option A/B/C** | **Remark (Pls provide the question to be asked)** |
| Xiaomi | Option C | In our understanding, there is no need to specify the UE side additional condition and UE only needs to the report the applicable functionality according to the network side additional condition, AI model and UE side additional condition. |
| Apple | Option C with change or Option B | We have same view as Xiaomi that UE-side additional condition is already covered by UE reporting applicable functionality, and there is no need to specify the UE side additional condition. But as we comment on Section 3.3.1, we see no reason to send LS to RAN1 for these non-essential issues. Thus, we suggest below change on Option C:  **Option C: UE side additional condition is covered by 3.3.1 Applicable Functionality Reporting~~; and an LS can be sent depending upon 3.3.1 discussion.~~** |
| vivo | Option B | From RAN2 perspective, the agreed LCM procedure is endorsed under the principle that, there is no need for UE exposing its additional condition to NW for UE-sided model. On top of that, there is no discussion or agreement from RAN1 referring such terminology in WI. |
| Qualcomm | B | Similar view as others above. In any case, this is not needed at this stage, since this seems usual Stage 3 work to implement RAN1 parameter list. |
| ZTE | B/C | Agree with Xiaomi, Apple and vivo. This UE side additional exposing should be mainly applied in usecase 2b where model is at LMF side |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B | For UE side additional condition, as we discussed in BM case, UE does not need to report it to NW, and instead it is expressed via applicability of functionality. We would like to apply the same principle here.  If companies are interested in it, we can discuss the motivation, the need and the possible solutions. |
| Lenovo | Option C | The term “UE additional condition” can be clarified in the question related to 3.3.1 and therefore a separate question may not be necessary. |
| OPPO | Option B/C |  |
| CATT | Option B | There is no any discussion about UE side additional condition in RAN1, so no need to ask. |
| Samsung | B | Share the view above that there is no need to specify the UE side additional condition for the Case 1 with UE-side model. The UE can decide the applicability considering its own UE-side additional condition and just report the applicability to LMF. |
| CEWiT | B |  |
| Nokia | Open to sending LS | We can ask a general question on what RAN1 considers as UE side additional conditions and whether they can list specific UE side additional conditions. |
| CMCC | B |  |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur Summary:

* **Option A Need to send an LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition:** No direct support, with Nokia remaining open to asking RAN1 general questions regarding UE-side additional conditions.
* **Option B No need to send an LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition:** Supported by 10 companies.
  + Majority view that UE-side additional conditions need not be explicitly reported to the network as they can be derived from applicability reporting.
  + Huawei emphasizes alignment with principles established in other use cases, such as BM.
* **Option C UE side additional condition is covered by 3.3.1, send LS based on 3.3.2 discussion:** Supported by 5 companies.
  + Xiaomi and Apple argue that UE-side additional conditions are inherently covered under applicable functionality reporting.
  + Lenovo suggests clarification of the term “UE additional condition” in the context of 3.3.1.

1. No need to send an LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition

### Other questions to ask RAN1

Companies are invited to input if there are other questions that should ask RAN1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Remark (Pls provide the question to be asked)** |
| vivo | As mentioned in **Q11**, other than the applicable functionality, the supported functionality in **Step 2** has no common understanding from RAN2 perspective. In this sense, we would like to pose RAN1 the following question:  “**What is the granularity of supported functionality? For example, is it on the use case level (e.g., use case 1)? or others?**” |
| Lenovo | It would be also good to add a question related to “Supported Functionality” and confirm the understanding with RAN1 that it refers to the UE positioning capabilities related to AI/ML positioning. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Phase 2

## Potential Questions to RAN1

### On NW side additional condition

* Whether NW-side additional condition can be provided by NW in a reactive way (i.e., based upon UE on-demand request)?

Do companies agree to ask above question?

Companies are invited to input if above question should be asked to RAN1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | See comments | We think it is straight forward to follow legacy mechanism of assistance data which already allows UE on-demand request. So, it can be decided by RAN2 and then inform RAN1 just for confirmation/checking issue. |
| ZTE | Yes | We support the proposal, and it is better to discuss this in RAN2. A LS to RAN1 is needed if RAN2 cannot make consensus during the meeting. |
| vivo | See comments | For Case1 (i.e., UE-sided model), UE is more aware of, which/what kind of NW-side additional condition(s) are required for such much model. Besides, UE on-demand request for assistance data is supported in legacy positioning architecture. In this understanding, we think it is viable for UE to employ this on-demand request scheme for NW-side additional condition in AI positioning.  However, we share similar view with Apple that there is no need to ask RAN1, this kind of issue is more related to procedure design, which can be discussed and determined in RAN2 and inform RAN1 if necessary. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with ZTE, on demand procedure is RAN2 procedure and hence RAN2 should decide. That is no need to ask RAN1. |
| Nokia | No | RAN2 had not discussed the need for on-demand request by UE for NW side additional condition. So, no need to ask the on-demand NW side additional conditions question to RAN1. Any **requirements** necessitating such on-demand NW side additional condition can be directly discussed in RAN1. What RAN2 agreed was “Whether network side additional condition is needed and what it contains is FFS (to be revised based on RAN1 progress).”. We were open to asking a general question to RAN1 about details of NW side additional conditions i.e. contents of it and proposed a TP in our answer to Question 11 but since there was no consensus to send LS to RAN1, we should just wait for RAN1 progress and parameters list from RAN1. If RAN1 agrees on-demand NW side additional conditions, we will get to know about it. |
| Qualcomm | No | Since nothing new is expected for RAN2 (e.g., there is a Request Assistance Data mechanism anyhow supported and solicited/unsolicited delivery).  Based on current RAN1 status, it also seems "NW-side additional condition" are not needed (i.e., the already defined NR assistance data (NW-side conditions) seems enough). Assistance Data can always be requested by a UE during an ongoing LPP session or via MO-LR otherwise and no new specification impacts are expected (apart from potentially new assistance data fields as usual).  So far, the "on-demand" assistance data request terminology has been used only for DL-PRS assistance data, where the NW may have to perform certain actions in the NW itself (apart from just delivering the requested assistance data); e.g., turn-on DL-PRS, configure a requested DL-PRS on the gNB's, etc. We don't think there will any other such (i.e., non-DL-PRS) "on-demand" assistance data needed, but depends on RAN1 progress. |
| Samsung | No | According to the latest FL summary on POS case in RAN1 (R1-2410718), RAN1 is still discussing whether/what NW-side additional condition (e.g., Geographical coordinates of the TRPs served by the gNB) is needed. RAN2 can start the discussion on whether any enhancement is needed on the legacy “on-demand” assistance data mechanism only after RAN1 make the final decision on the NW-side additional condition. |

### On UE Side Additional Condition, Applicable functionality reporting and Terminology.

RAN2 to send below agreements from RAN2#127 and ask RAN1 further below question:

**Agreements on definitions**

1. Supported functionalities refer to functionalities that UE can indicate by using UE capability information (via RRC/LPP signalling)
2. Applicable functionalities refers to functionalities that the UE is ready to apply for inference
3. Activated functionalities refers to functionalities already enabled for performing inference

* Does “Supported Functionality” refer to the UE positioning capabilities related to AI/ML positioning?
* What is the content and granularity of Supported functionality? For example, is it on the use case level (e.g., use case 1)?
* What is the content and granularity of Applicable functionality?
* Is the UE change of applicable functionality by Reporting a Boolean (true/false) or associated with list of conditions/requirements where the functionality is/can be applicable?
* What is UE side additional conditions and if RAN1 can list specific UE side additional conditions?

Companies are invited to provide their view if the above question should be asked to RAN1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No | Q1-Q2: RAN1 will discuss them later as part of UE capability. We don’t think it is necessary to ask RAN1 at this stage.  Q3: We think RAN1 will finally discuss this issue. As we don’t think it is an essential issue, RAN2 can just wait RAN1.  Q4: The reporting format should be discussed in RAN2 rather than RAN1.  Q5: We are confused why this question is even listed in phase 2: aren’t majority already shows clear negativity to ask RAN1 on UE-side condition in phase 1 of Q14? |
| ZTE | See comments | These set of questions can be sent together with the issue that RAN2 cannot decide and have RAN2 spec impact, e.g., together with the question of on-demand NW-side additional conditions.  Do not support to only send these questions in a LS since RAN1 will eventually discuss this. |
| vivo | Yes for Q2, Q3  No for the rest | *For supported functionality (Q1, Q2)*  Q1 is not needed, since we RAN2 has made the agreement that supported functionality for AI positioning refers to UE capability transferred in LPP. And it further contains to “positioning capability related to AI positioning”, it is actually to ask the granularity of the supported functionality, which is Q2.  Q2 may be needed. The applicable functionality is a filtering of supported functionality, It is necessary to know the details how it is mapped to the NR positioning procedure. Noticing that no related discussion has been made in RAN1 but they are running for RRC parameter list, we think it is better to ask and trigger their discussion this issue.  *For applicable functionality (Q3, Q4)*  Q3 is needed. Similar to Q2, we see little discussion in RAN1 about terminology of applicable functionality. We believe it is necessary for them to align on this terminology to ensure the procedure design progress.  Q4 is more like a Stage 3 design in RAN2. No need to expose this question to RAN1.  *For UE-side additional condition (Q5)*  Q5 seems has quite few supporters in Phase I contradictory with Observation 7. Because for UE-sided model, there is no need for UE to report its own information to the network. Besides, it may confuse RAN1 since no UE-side additional condition is referred in RAN1 WI. |
| Ericsson | No | Mainly because of timeline we would not prefer to send LS to RAN1. Since RAN1 is expected to respond anyway by April/May meeting with RAN1 parameter list; and this LS response may not be received by RAN2 by May meeting as RAN1 will prepare their answer only in April meeting and thus we do not see LS exchange can speed up RAN2 work.  The proponent companies of LS should in fact ask RAN1 to trigger these discussions in RAN1. |
| Nokia | No | We sent similar questions to RAN1 in the past for beam management use case to understand what a functionality is and what RAN1 thought of the RAN2 agreed definitions of different functionalities. We should first check the reply LS that RAN1 sent before sending these functionality definitions to RAN1 again. The content and granularity of supported functionalities will be known when RAN1 sends the UE features list but that will take time for RAN1 to come up with one. On the UE side additional conditions question, it does not look like there was consensus in Phase 1 discussions to ask that question. |
| Qualcomm | No | This can await the RAN1 feature list.  Also agree with other comments above regarding "functionality" for the positioning use case: RAN2 already agreed that this is related to LPP positioning capabilities. RAN1 will likely discuss capabilities/feature groups towards the end of a Work Item (as usual). |
| Samsung | No | Q1-Q3: Can wait for the RAN1 feature list.  Q4: Can be discussed later during stage-3 discussion.  Q5: No need to specify UE-side additional condition according to the majority view in phase 1 discussion. |

# Conclusion

In section 3 we made the following observations:

1. Criteria for introducing a new method include: new measurements, assistance data, incompatibility of assumptions/constraints in legacy methods, forward compatibility for future AI/ML enhancements.
2. There may not be one golden rule to decide whether to introduce new method or enhance legacy and thus a case-by-case decision has to be made.
3. The way forward is that companies preferring fallback configuration should provide how much latency saving can be done; i.e motivate companies who have disagreed to introduce this option. However, additional signaling overhead with fallback configuration should be considered since assistance data for two methods may have to be provided.
4. if fallback is requested, it is requested in Step 5 LPP request location information message.
5. Fallback configurations should be legacy methods (e.g., DL-TDOA, DL-AoD) to ensure continuity of service.
6. Since, there is clear majority to let RAN1 progress and send RAN2 the parameter list, we can wait for RAN1 to comeback. However, RAN2 can send as LS to RAN1 with RAN2 agreements.
7. No need to send an LS to RAN1 for UE side additional condition.

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

1. Introduce AI/ML positioning Case 1 as a new positioning method.
2. Existing LPP procedures related to Location Information Transfer (RequestLocationInformation/ ProvideLocationInformation messages) are used for providing the results of the UE sided model inference operation. The detail stage 3 message extention can be disucssed while drafting the stage 3 CR.
3. UE autonomous switching between AI/ML and non-AI/ML methods is not allowed.
4. The content of error cause is discussed while drafting stage3 CRs.
5. UE receives the needed assistance data for calculating UE location for AI/ML in step3 (ProvideAssistanceData) and UE receives the instruction to perform the interference in step 5 (RequestLocationInformation). The content of Assistance Data and the content of request location information is based upon RAN1 parameter list.
6. UE reports the applicable functionality to the LMF by the *LPP provide capabilities* message without any additional LMF control.

# Annex RAN1 agreements

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN1#116**  Agreement  For Rel-19 AI/ML based positioning, the measurements for determining model input are based on the DL PRS and UL SRS defined in TS38.211.   * Note: The use of SRS for MIMO resource is transparent to UE.   Agreement   * For AI/ML based positioning case 3b, at least the following types of time domain channel measurements are supported for reporting:  1. timing information; 2. paired timing information and power information.   Agreement   * For AI/ML based positioning case 2b, at least the following types of time domain channel measurements are supported for UE reporting to LMF:  1. timing information; 2. paired timing information and power information.   Agreement  In Rel-19 AI/ML based positioning, regarding the time domain channel measurements, RAN1 investigate the following alternatives:   * + - * Alternative (a). Sample-based measurements, where the timing information is an integer multiple of sampling periods.       * Alternative (b). Path-based measurements, where the timing information is according to the detected path timing and may not be an integer multiple of sampling periods.   The issues to be studied include, but not limited to, the following:   * + - * Tradeoff of positioning accuracy and signaling overhead       * Impact and necessary details of gNB/UE implementation to obtain the channel measurement values.       * Whether the same Alternative(s) applies to all cases or not       * Applicability and necessity of specifying the Alternative(s) to different cases       * Note: different sub-cases may have different issues.   Note: In addition to timing information, the components for the channel measurement for model input may also include power and potentially phase. To provide the type of the channel measurement in their investigation.  Agreement  For AI/ML assisted positioning Case 3a, at least LOS/NLOS indicator and/or timing information are supported for reporting.   * If LOS/NLOS indicator is reported, the indicator can be reported as soft indicator or hard indicator as defined in 38.214. * If timing information is reported, the timing information at least can be reported via UL RTOA or gNB Rx-Tx time difference as defined in 38.215. * Note: details of the report are pending further discussion.   Agreement  For AI/ML assisted positioning Case 2a, at least LOS/NLOS indicator and/or timing information are supported for reporting.   * If LOS/NLOS indicator is reported, the indicator can be reported as soft indicator or hard indicator as defined in 38.214. * If timing information is reported, the timing information at least can be reported via DL RSTD or UE Rx-Tx time difference as defined in 38.215. * Note: details of the report are pending further discussion.   Agreement  For LMF-side model, RAN1 studies whether/what assistance information and/or measurement report may be sent from UE/PRU, and/or gNB to LMF to assist at least for the performance monitoring.   * RAN1 understands that it is out of RAN1 scope to define monitoring metric calculation and related model management decisions for LMF-side model.   Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning Case 3b, for gNB channel measurements reported to LMF, the timing information is represented relative to a reference time.   * FFS: Whether any specification impact of the reference time used to represent the timing information. Details of the reference time   Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning for all use cases, RAN1 investigate the necessity and feasibility of using phase information (in addition to timing information and power information) for determining model input. The issues to study include:   * Tradeoff of positioning accuracy and signaling overhead * The impact of transmitter and receiver implementation * Specification impact * Other aspects are not precluded   Note: the phase information may be used in different ways, e.g., one phase value for the first path or first sample only; triplet of {timing information, power information, phase information} for CIR, etc.  **RAN1#116bis**  Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning Case 3b, for gNB channel measurements reported to LMF, the timing information is represented relative to the existing UL RTOA reference time T0+tSRS as defined in TS 38.215.  FFS: whether it is applicable when Case 3b is used to support multi-RTT  Conclusion   * It is out of RAN1 scope to decide whether/how synthetic data (i.e., not direct physical data) and related entities are used in AI/ML based positioning. In RAN1 discussion, data (e.g., measurement data, label data) refer to physical data, not synthetic data.   Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 1, the measurement and its related data (e.g., timestamp) are generated by PRU and/or Non-PRU UE.  Agreement  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 3a and 3b, the measurement and its related data (e.g., timestamp) are generated by TRP/gNB.  Agreement  For training data collection of AI/ML based positioning, the collected data sample can include the following components:  Part A:   * channel measurement * quality indicator of channel measurement * time stamp of channel measurement   Part B:   * ground truth label (or its approximation) * quality indicator of label * time stamp of label   Note: “Part A” and “Part B” terminologies are only for RAN1 discussion purpose, and may not be used in specification.  Note: contents in Part A and Part B may or may not be generated by different entities.  Note: Part A and/or Part B, and their contents may or may not apply for each case  FFS: detailed definition of channel measurement  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 2a and 2b, the channel measurement and its related data (e.g., time stamp) are generated by PRU and/or non-PRU UE.  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 1, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by:   * PRU * Non-PRU UE with estimated location * LMF   Note: transfer of the label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 2a, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by:   * PRU * Non-PRU UE with estimated location * LMF   Note: transfer of the label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 2b, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by:   * PRU * Non-PRU UE with estimated location * LMF   Note: transfer of label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 3b, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by:   * PRU * FFS: Non-PRU UE with estimated location * LMF   Note: transfer of label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Agreement  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 3a, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by at least:   * LMF   Note: transfer of label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Note: whether other network entities can generate label for Case 3a is out of RAN1 scope.  Agreement  For AI/ML positioning Case 3a, for model performance monitoring metric calculation in label-based model monitoring, study the feasibility of the following options. To provide information on how to generate information on ground truth label for each option.   * Option A. NG-RAN node performs monitoring metric calculation for its own model. * Option B. LMF performs monitoring metric calculation for the model located at the NG-RAN node.   Note: Final selection of Option A and Option B is out of RAN1 scope, but RAN1 can make recommendation about the option(s), and potential support of Option A and/or Option B is pending RAN3 confirmation.  Note: Exact method to perform the monitoring metric calculation is up to implementation  Agreement  For model performance monitoring of AI/ML positioning Case 1, for model performance monitoring metric calculation in label-based model monitoring, study the feasibility, benefits, and potential specification impact of the following options with regard to how to generate information on ground truth label:   * Option A. The target UE side performs monitoring metric calculation.   + Option A-1. At least information on ground truth label of the target UE is generated by LMF and provided to the target UE.     - In one example, target UE and/or gNB sends measurement (e.g., legacy measurement) to LMF so that LMF can derive the information on ground truth label.   + Option A-2. At least position calculation assistance data (e.g., existing information for UE-based positioning method) is provided from LMF to the target UE.   + Option A-3. Reuse Rel-18 assistance data transfer framework from LMF to the target UE, where the PRU measurement (e.g., legacy measurement) and the corresponding PRU location are sent via LMF to the target UE.   + Option A-4. PRU measurement (and the corresponding PRU location if not already known at the UE-side) are sent from PRU to the target UE side ~~(e.g., target UE, OTT server)~~.     - Note: Option A-4 can be realized by implementation in a manner transparent to specification if the PRU sends information to the target UE side in a proprietary method. * Option B. The LMF performs monitoring metric calculation.   + Option B-1. at least inference result (i.e., the model output corresponding to target UE’s channel measurement) of the target UE is sent by the target UE to LMF.   + Option B-2. PRU’s channel measurement is sent via LMF to the target UE, and the inference result (i.e., the model output corresponding to PRU’s channel measurement) is sent by the target UE to LMF.   Note: exact method to perform the monitoring metric calculation is up to implementation.  Note: Other options are not precluded.  **RAN1#117**  Working Assumption  For training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 3b, the label and its related data (e.g., time stamp) can be generated by:   * PRU * Non-PRU UE with estimated location * LMF   Note: transfer of label and its related data is out of RAN1 scope.  Note: It is assumed that user data privacy of non-PRU UE is preserved.  Note: Previous related working assumption made in RAN1#116bis for training data generation of AI/ML based positioning Case 3b will not need to be confirmed.  Agreement  Sample-based measurement is defined as:   * The measurement is composed of Nt' samples of the estimated channel response in time domain. The timing information for the Nt' samples are reported with a timing granularity T, where T=2kxTc. k represents the timing reporting granularity factor. Tc is the basic time unit for NR.   + The corresponding measurement (e.g., power if reported) corresponds to the measurement for the reported Nt' samples. * Nt' and k can be signalled   + FFS: the value range of Nt'; the value range of integer k for the timing granularity T. * The timing information is defined relative to a reference time   Further discussion is expected on the determination of Nt' and k (including signaling) , and a rule to be introduced for selecting Nt' samples.  Note: It doesn’t imply the definition of Sample-based measurement will be captured into the spec.  Agreement  Path-based measurement refers to the measurement in the existing specifications (up to Rel-18) including measurement reporting, with potential enhancements on the number of reported paths (if needed).  **Agreement**  For training data collection of AI/ML based positioning, if a training data sample contains both Part A and Part B, RAN1 assumes that Part A and Part B in one training data sample are:   * for a same UE (PRU or Non-PRU UE), and * for a same location associated with Part B.   Note: the association can be discussed  Agreement  Draft LS R1-2405577 is endorsed in principle by adding the latest agreements made in this meeting and adding “agreements” to “Note: the working assumptions above are based on RAN1 understanding for RAN work item (NR\_AIML\_air).”  Agreement  Final LS R1-2405578 is endorsed.  **RAN1#118**  Agreement  For AI/ML positioning Case 3a, for performance monitoring metric calculation in label-based monitoring, from RAN1 perspective, Option A and Option B are feasible,   * Option A. NG-RAN node performs monitoring metric calculation for its own model. * Option B. LMF performs monitoring metric calculation for the model located at the NG-RAN node.   Note: Final selection of Option A and Option B is out of RAN1 scope. Potential support of Option A and/or Option B is pending RAN3 confirmation.  Note: Exact method to perform monitoring metric calculation is up to implementation.  Note: For Option A, RAN1 assumes that user data privacy needs to be preserved.  Conclusion  For model performance monitoring of AI/ML positioning Case 1, for model performance monitoring metric calculation in label-based model monitoring,   * Option A-4 can be realized by implementation in a manner transparent to specification specification if the PRU sends information to the target UE side in a proprietary method. No further discussion on Option A-4.   Agreement  For training data collection of AI/ML based positioning case 3b, for time stamp of channel measurement,   * For channel measurement generated by TRP/gNB, existing IE “Time Stamp” in TS 38.455 can be reused from RAN1 perspective * Note: Purpose, such as above “training data collection", will not necessarily be specified in RAN 1 specifications   Agreement  For training data collection of Case 1 and 2a, in terms of DL PRS configuration for collecting training data, RAN1 study the following options on assistance data, using legacy mechanisms as a starting point:  Option A. (UE initiated) UE makes a request to LMF on the preferred DL PRS configuration for training data collection, e.g., on-demand PRS. LMF makes the decision on determining the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.  Option B. (LMF initiated) LMF determines the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.  Note: the UE can be a PRU and/or a Non-PRU UE.  Note: as in existing specification, the DL PRS configurations in the assistance data from LMF to UE are based on DL PRS configuration coordinated between LMF and gNB.  Agreement  For the definition of sample-based measurement, select Nt’ samples out of a list of Nt consecutive samples   * The Nt samples have timing granularity T. * FFS: the starting time of the list of Nt samples * FFS: the value range of Nt   For the sample-based measurement (if accepted in Rel-19),   * For measurement by TRP/gNB, the Nt’ selected samples are expected to be those with the highest power. * Note: Choice of the maximum value of Nt, Nt’ should take into account the need to preserve proprietary implementation.   Agreement  For AI/ML positioning Case 2b and 3b, regarding the power information for determining the model input,   * For downlink power measurement, use DL PRS-RSRPP defined in TS 38.215 as a starting point.   + For measurement report of DL PRS-RSRPP, use the existing measurement report mapping table for PRS-RSRPP in 38.133 as a starting point. * For uplink power measurement, use UL SRS-RSRPP defined in TS 38.215 as a starting point.   + For measurement report of UL SRS-RSRPP, use the existing measurement report mapping table for SRS-RSRPP in 38.133 as a starting point.   Conclusion  From RAN1 perspective, for Case 3a measurements,   * The existing procedures can be reused in terms of SRS configuration.   + Note: parameter values for SRS configuration can be further discussed * These measurements can be used for multiple aspects related to case 3a, e.g. training data collection, monitoring, or inference procedures. * Note: Purpose, such as the training data collection, monitoring, or inference procedures mentioned above, will not necessarily be specified in RAN 1 specifications   Agreement  For Rel-19 AI/ML based positioning Case 3b, regarding sample-based measurement (if supported), from RAN1 perspective,   * LMF can signal parameter values of Nt, Nt', k to gNB via NRPPa.   **RAN1#118bis**  Agreement  For training data collection of AI/ML based positioning, the quality indicator of timing information in Part A when reported is:   * When applicable, the existing IE for timing quality, i.e., NR-TimingQuality in 37.355 and IE “Timing Measurement Quality” in 38.455;   + FFS: details on how to associate quality indicator to timing information   Conclusion  For training data collection of Case 1, in terms of DL PRS configuration for collecting training data, both options are feasible by using legacy mechanisms:  Option A. (UE initiated) UE makes a request to LMF on the preferred DL PRS configuration for training data collection, e.g., on-demand PRS. LMF makes the decision on determining the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.  Option B. (LMF initiated) LMF determines the DL PRS configuration for training data collection and provides the assistance data to the UE.  Note: the UE can be a PRU and/or a Non-PRU UE.  Note: as in existing specification, the DL PRS configurations in the assistance data from LMF to UE are based on DL PRS configuration coordinated between LMF and gNB.  Agreement  From RAN1 perspective, for model inference of AI/ML positioning Case 3b, at least the following are mandatorily or optionally supported in a measurement report from gNB to LMF:   * (Mandatory) Channel measurement; * (Optional) Quality of the channel measurement;   + FFS: details of the quality * (Mandatory) Time stamp of the channel measurement.   Agreement  From RAN1 perspective, when timing information is reported for Rel-19 AI/ML positioning Case 3a, at least the following are mandatorily or optionally supported in a measurement report from gNB to LMF:   * (Mandatory) timing information; * (Optional) Quality of the timing information;   + Existing IE “Timing Measurement Quality” can be reused. * (Mandatory) Time stamp.   FFS: LOS/NLOS indicator.  Note: The final decision of “mandatory” or “optional” presence of each field is up to RAN3.  Agreement  For AI/ML positioning Case 1, regarding the assistance data provided from LMF to UE, for ensuring consistency between training and inference,   * for each of the existing assistance data IE of UE-based DL-TDOA and/or UE-based DL-AoD, study whether it should be: (a) explicitly indicated, (b) implicitly indicated and/or (c) other; * Companies can provide inputs on further enhancements of existing assistance data, including new information * Note: this does not mean that training and inference phases are mentioned in assistance data.   Table. Existing assistance data (supported up to Rel-18) that may be transferred from LMF to UE in UE-based DL-TDOA [1] or UE-based DL-AoD [2], as applicable.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Information** | **UE-based DL-TdoA** | **UE-based DL-AoD** | | 1 | Physical cell IDs (PCIs), global cell IDs (GCIs), ARFCN, and PRS IDs of candidate NR TRPs for measurement |  |  | | 2 | Timing relative to the serving (reference) TRP of candidate NR TRPs |  |  | | 3 | DL-PRS configuration of candidate NR TRPs |  |  | | 4 | Indication of which DL-PRS Resource Sets across DL-PRS positioning frequency layers are linked for DL-PRS bandwidth aggregation |  |  | | 5 | SSB information of the TRPs (the time/frequency occupancy of SSBs) |  |  | | 6 | Spatial direction information (e.g. azimuth, elevation etc.) of the DL-PRS Resources of the TRPs served by the gNB |  |  | | 7 | Geographical coordinates of the TRPs served by the gNB (include a transmission reference location for each DL-PRS Resource ID, reference location for the transmitting antenna of the reference TRP, relative locations for transmitting antennas of other TRPs) |  |  | | 8 | Fine Timing relative to the serving (reference) TRP of candidate NR TRPs |  |  | | 9 | PRS-only TP indication |  |  | | 10 | The association information of DL-PRS resources with TRP Tx TEG ID |  |  | | 11 | LOS/NLOS indicators |  |  | | 12 | On-Demand DL-PRS-Configurations, possibly together with information on which configurations are available for DL-PRS bandwidth aggregation |  |  | | 13 | Validity Area of the Assistance Data |  |  | | 14 | PRU measurements together with the location information of the PRU |  |  | | 15 | Data facilitating the integrity results determination of the calculated location |  |  | | 16 | TRP beam/antenna information (including azimuth angle, zenith angle and relative power between PRS resources per angle per TRP) |  |  | | 17 | Expected Angle Assistance information |  |  | | 18 | PRS priority list |  |  |   [1] Table 8.12.2.1.0-1 in 38.305, Use equipment (UE) positioning in NG-RAN (Release 18), v18.3.0  [2] Table 8.11.2.1.0-1 in 38.305, Use equipment (UE) positioning in NG-RAN (Release 18), v18.3.0  **RAN1#119**  Agreement  For the definition of sample-based measurement, for gNB/TRP measurement of an estimated channel response between a pair of UE and TRP, the starting time of the list of Nt consecutive samples is determined as follows.   * + starting time = first detected path rounded down with timing granularity T.   Note: UE-side measurement is a separate discussion  Agreement  For model performance monitoring of AI/ML positioning Case 1, support at least:   * Option A. The target UE side performs monitoring metric calculation.   + The target UE may signal the monitoring outcome to the LMF.   + FFS: content of monitoring outcome * FFS: Option B   Agreement  For Rel-19 AI/ML based positioning, for Case 3b, in addition to path-based measurement that is referring to the measurement in the existing specifications (up to Rel-18), additionally support the following enhancement to the measurement,   * The measurement is composed of Nt' values of the estimated channel response in time domain. The Nt’ values are selected from a list of Nt consecutive channel response values, which have timing granularity T. * The timing information for the Nt' values are reported with a timing granularity T, where T=2kxTc. k represents the timing reporting granularity factor. Tc is the basic time unit for NR.   + The associated measurement (e.g., power if reported) corresponds to the measurement for the reported Nt' values. * The timing information is defined relative to a reference time, same as the path-based measurement. * The Nt’ selected time domain channel measurement values are expected to be those with the highest power. * The starting time of the list of Nt consecutive values is determined as: starting time = first detected path rounded down with timing granularity T. * LMF can signal parameter values of Nt, Nt', k to gNB via NRPPa. Candidate set values:   + Nt'<=24. FFS: Nt' values.   + Nt = {32, 64, 128}   + FFS: k   + The gNB/TRP may use different Nt', Nt and/or k values other than the signalled parameter for measurement reporting. In this case, it’s up to LMF implementation to process the reported measurement * FFS: whether transmit offset from gNB to LMF   Note: measurement by UE is a separate discussion.  Note: the purpose of the time domain channel measurements, such as for Rel-19 AI/ML based positioning, is not specified  Agreement  For AI/ML based positioning Case 1, all assistance information from legacy UE-based DL-TDOA, other than info #7, can be provided from LMF to UE. For info #7, RAN1 study, if necessary, choose one alternative from the following:   * Alternative 1. Info #7 is provided implicitly via associated ID.   + Associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 2. Info #7 can be provided either implicitly or explicitly by LMF. Note: no UE capability is introduced on whether info #7 is provided implicitly or explicitly, and the UE can request info #7 to be provided explicitly or implicitly.   + If provided implicitly, associated ID is signaled by LMF to indicate whether info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 3. Info #7 is **not** be provided from LMF to UE.   + If info #7 is not provided, UE may assume info #7 is consistent between training and inference. * Alternative 4. Info #7 is provided explicitly from LMF to UE.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | 7 | Geographical coordinates of the TRPs served by the gNB (include a transmission reference location for each DL-PRS Resource ID, reference location for the transmitting antenna of the reference TRP, relative locations for transmitting antennas of other TRPs) | |
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