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# Introduction

In RAN1#106b-e, the following papers provided input on latency improvements for DL and DL+UL methods.

1. R1-2108733 Enhancements to positioning latency improvements Huawei, HiSilicon
2. R1-2108881 Discussion on latency reduction for NR positioning ZTE
3. R1-2108978 Discussion on latency enhancement for NR positioning vivo
4. R1-2109054 Enhancements on Latency Reduction in NR Positioning OPPO
5. R1-2109227 Further discussion on latency reduction for NR positioning CATT
6. R1-2109255 Discussion on latency improvement for positioning methods China Telecom
7. R1-2109285 Discussion on latency improvement for positioning CMCC
8. R1-2109366 Views on PHY Latency Reductions Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
9. R1-2109414 Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning method Xiaomi
10. R1-2109493 Discussion on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods Samsung
11. R1-2109614 Solutions for NR Positioning Latency Reduction Intel Corporation
12. R1-2109682 Discussion on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods NTT DOCOMO, INC.
13. R1-2109793 Considerations on latency improvements for NR positioning Sony
14. R1-2110038 Views on Rel-17 positioning latency reduction Apple
15. R1-2110091 Discussion on latency improvements for NR positioning LG Electronics
16. R1-2110149 Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods InterDigital, Inc.
17. R1-2110190 Remaining issues on Latency Improvements for Positioning Qualcomm Incorporated
18. R1-2110257 Physical latency improvement aspects MediaTek Inc.
19. R1-2110300 Enhancements for Positioning Latency Reduction Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
20. R1-2110352 Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods Ericsson

This paper provides the moderator summary of solutions to improve positioning latency for DL and DL+UL methods, subject to the following email discussion.

[106bis-e-NR-ePos-04] Email discussion/approval on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods with checkpoints for agreements on October 14 and 19 – Su (Huawei)

# Measurement gap enhancements

## General information

The following agreements were made in RAN1#106-e on this issue.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, consider the following options with a decision to be made in RAN1#106b.   * Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message) * Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)   Agreement:  For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure, consider the following options with a decision to be made in RAN1#106b (and RAN4 to be informed about any decision made)   * Option. 1: DCI * Option. 2: DL MAC CE * Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG   FFS whether deactivation can be implicit via configurable number of the MG occasions |

## MG activation request (H)

The following sources provided their views on MG activation request.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 2:** For the MG request, only support LMF based request, and the request may indicate either one of the following:   * Full configuration of PRS for the UE to measure * Time span and frequency information of the PRS measurement |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 5:** For the sake of latency reduction related to the measurement gap, Rel-17 should allow LMF to request measurement gap. |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 4:**   * The MG request including the activated/deactivated indication (Option 1-B) by the LMF can be supported first if the information is transmitted in the NRPPa Request location information (via a UE-associated NRPPa message)   **Proposal 6:**   * If the MG request is by the UE, the Pre-configured MG should be supported considering the latency reduction and overhead of signaling.   **Proposal 7:**   * For the case of MG request from UE   + MG Request including the activation/deactivation indication is from UE to gNB by MAC CE.   + MG activation/deactivation of a pre-configured MG can be from gNB to UE by DCI or MAC CE |
| OPPO [4] | Proposal 3: Support the UE to use MAC CE to request a MG configuration. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 6:** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, support both of the following options:  • Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message).  • Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE). |
| China Telecom [6] | **Proposal 1:** Rel-17 should support a new mechanism of MG request by UE via UCI or UL MAC CE at least for UE-based positioning methods. |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 2:** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, support the following options:   * Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message) * Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE) |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 2**: Do not support option 1 or option 2 for MG request mechanisms. |
| Xiaomi [9] | **Proposal 1:** Support MG request by both LMF and UE. |
| Samsung [10] | **Proposal 5:** Both option 1(by LMF) and option2 (by UE) could be supported for the MG request; |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 1:**   * + To reduce latency of NR positioning with MGs for DL PRS processing define the following enhancements     - …     - Support new mechanism for MG request from LMF to gNB via NRPPa signaling       * Signaling details are left up to RAN3   + Inform RAN2/RAN3/RAN4 capturing outcome of the RAN1 discussion on MG enhancements for NR positioning latency reduction with a request to implement necessary NRPPa/LPP signaling |
| DCM [12] | **Proposal 1:**   * Rel-17 should support at least UE-initiated MG request via lower layer signaling |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 3:** Support new mechanism of measurement gap request using both options:   * From LMF to gNB via NRPPa * From UE to gNB via UCI |
| LGE [15] | **Proposal 2:**   * For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, RAN1 can support all options (initiated by LMF (option #1) and by UE (option #2)) for MG request. |
| IDC [16] | **Proposal 2:** For latency reduction, the UE can make a request for a measurement gap to the gNB via UL MAC-CE |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 4:** For low latency MG request, support request of MG(s) with an UL MAC-CE from the UE. |
| MTK [18] | **Proposal 2-1**: The new mechanism of MG request is initiated by LMF through NRPPa  **Proposal 2-2**: For new mechanism of MG request, the corresponding information to assist gNB for proper MG arrangement for a UE, for example the frequency layer/band for measurement, and DL-PRS configuration of neighbouring gNBs could be further discussed in RAN2 |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 2:** Option 1 request of the MG by the LMF via a NRPPa message can at least be supported. |

The positions of companies are shown below.

* Option 1 (By LMF)
  + Supported by (11): Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, vivo, CATT, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Intel, SONY, LGE, MTK
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB
* Option 2 (By UE)
  + Supported by (12): vivo, OPPO, CATT, CTC, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, DCM, SONY, LGE, IDC, QC
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB

**FL comments:**

According to the understanding of the FL

* Option 1 (by LMF) can go in parallel with the LPP RequestLocationInformation initiated by the LMF, but UE is not allowed to choose the PRS to measure.
* Option 2 (by UE) must go after UE receives the LPP RequestLocationInformation initiated by the LMF, but UE has the freedom to choose which PRS to measure to the gNB. The second level details of Option 2 (UCI or UL MAC CE) should also be decided.

It is also the FL’s understanding that the MG request initiated by LMF or UE may include information beyond measurement gap itself, e.g. information related to PRS, which should be resolved if either Option is adopted.

In addition, Rel-16 and earlier release already specified UE RRC based location measurement indication to facilitate MG configuration, which can serve as the fallback method, but this may not be latency friendly.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial question.

**Question 2.1.1-1 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options with regards to MG activation request.
  + Option 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message)
  + Option 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)
  + Option 3: both Option 1 and Option 2 are supported
  + Option 4: neither Option 1 or Option 2 is supported

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments:** *Please indicate why Option 1 or Option 2 should NOT be supported.* |
| vivo | Option 1 if measurement request can be transmitted to gNB | The latency can be reduced significantly based on the two enhancements, and if the relationship between PRS and BWP can be known to gNB, whether to activate MG or use active BWP can also be decided by gNB  In addition, we prefer to introduce the perconfiguration of MG. If it is introduced, the MG configuration may only need to be transmitted once when PRS is a cell-specific signal and the same for all the UE in a cell, but if not, the MG activation should be transmitted for each UE and each requesting (e.g. every time BWP switches). |
| CATT | Option 3 | We consider MG activation request by LMF and by UE can be used for supporting different scenarios. For example, Option 1 may be more usefulfor LMF-initialted on-demand PRS, while Option 2 can be used in more general cases. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 (UL MAC CE) | Why Option **~~2~~1** should not be supported:   * Overall, having another entity configure what the UE needs is not a robust solution that is bound to lead to many errors in real scenarios:   + When/How does the serving gNB know that the MG configuration has to stop or reconfigure? When the UE has the control of requesting a MG, it will ask for a new one whenever a new PFL needs to measured, or a different subset of PRS resources need to be measured   + It may happen that the UE gets a location request and sends back an error, and the serving gNB will just go ahead and configure a MG without really a need.   + The spec allows, after the location request is received, for the UE to send and AD request. In this case, the LMF would be asking the serving gNB to configure a MG without even having configured AD to the UE. Overall, it will be over over-configuring/over-provisioning MG and lead to waste of resources.   + What happens if after the location request, there is a serving cell change? In the legacy approach (when the UE is responsible for the MG request), the UE, after the serving cell change will ask a new measurement gap from the new serving cell. Now, the LMF is not aware of such a change. DL methods are supposed to work seamlessly during serving cell changes. |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 4 | We feel that the gains in option 1 are not clear and that there are still many open questions. For Option 2 we feel that the specification impact is very high and we only have 1 meeting left. |
| Qualcomm2 |  | To Nokia: Option 2 has very limited spec impacts: Transfer the RRC message of MG request from the RRC spec to the MAC-CE. RAN1 can make some agreements this and the next meeting, and then let RAN2 continue/finish the work. We did the same for SP-SRS activation/deactivation in NR Rel-16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | Option 2 introduces more latency under the objective of latency reduction.  Reply Qualcomm’s comments:   * Overall, having another entity configure what the UE needs is not a robust solution that is bound to lead to many errors in real scenarios:   HW/HiSi: Describing the duplicated functionality in different protocol layers for UE is not robust to our understanding.   * + When/How does the serving gNB know that the MG configuration has to stop or reconfigure? When the UE has the control of requesting a MG, it will ask for a new one whenever a new PFL needs to measured, or a different subset of PRS resources need to be measured   HW/HiSi: We do not think the case is for latency improvements, at least it is not a typical scenario when low latency positioning is required. This can be done via the existing POSITIONING ACTIVATION REQUEST/DEACTIVATION REQUEST message for efficiently activate and deactivate the MG.   * + It may happen that the UE gets a location request and sends back an error, and the serving gNB will just go ahead and configure a MG without really a need.   HW/HiSi: Is it for low latency positioning? And if an error is received, LMF could further send the information via POSITIONING DEACTIVATION REQUEST for the gNB to deactivate the MG.   * + The spec allows, after the location request is received, for the UE to send and AD request. In this case, the LMF would be asking the serving gNB to configure a MG without even having configured AD to the UE. Overall, it will be over over-configuring/over-provisioning MG and lead to waste of resources.   HW/HiSi: Is it for low latency positioning that LMF requests the measurement first and activates the MG knowingly without providing the AD in the first place?   * + What happens if after the location request, there is a serving cell change? In the legacy approach (when the UE is responsible for the MG request), the UE, after the serving cell change will ask a new measurement gap from the new serving cell. Now, the LMF is not aware of such a change. DL methods are supposed to work seamlessly during serving cell changes.   HW/HiSi: Mobility enhancement achieving low latency at the same time may not be feasible. At least for NRPPa based approach, the MG request information can be exchanged as part of the UE context during handover, and the target gNB could be aware and reconfigure the MG.  To our understanding, another alternative in case of cell change without specifying positioning context exchange over Xn is that UE may trigger the Rel-16 RRC LocationMeasurementIndication to the new cell. Even if for UL MAC CE based approach, the UE will any need to send another UL MAC CE to the new gNB. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | MG activation request doesn’t necessarily mandate serving gNB to configure the MG that the LMF suggests. It’s still up to serving gNB to decide which MG should be configured/activated. This message is to replace the RRC signaling LocationMeasurementInfo. The LMF request can be sent via NRPPa message, which saves latency. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | The major reason for MG latency is RRC request and RRC configuration. Using UCI or MAC CE can obviously reduce the latency. |
| China Telecom | Option 3 | We share the similar as CATT that which option is more suitable is in maily depend on the positioning methods. For LMF initial-methods, option 1 is more suitable, while for most other methods, the option 2 can biring more latency reduction. Therefore, we think option 3 should be supported, or at least option 2 should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 | First we think Option 2 should be supported. While for Option 1, it can also be supported, for example, LMF indicate the PRS resource configuration of the UE or recommend a MG pattern to gNB, and gNB decide the measurement gap pattern. |
| CMCC | Option 3 | We share similar views as CATT that both options can be supported, which are applicable to different use cases. |
| LG electronics | Option 3 | We think both options can be supported for a different cases and each is interpreted as LMF-initiated and UE-initiated. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | Ideally we tend to support Option 1 with the intention to save on the current RRC latency for the MG request. |
| MTK | Option 1 | 1, We support Huawei’s feedback to QC questions  2, the latency reduction is mainly targeted for first fix. So basically the MG may contains all PRS for UE to measure. It is up to UE to measure all or partially |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | Option 2 | We share similar view as OPPO/QC (with both UCI & MAC-CE) |
| InterDigital | Option 2 | Option 2 achieves latency reduction. |
| Ericsson | Comments | Our first preference is Option 4 and we share similar concerns with Nokia.  But to be constructive and make progress, we can live with one among option 1 or option 2. We cannot accept both options 1 and 2, as this is clearly an overkill. Also, the current Option 2 actually includes two solutions (UCI or UL MAC CE). It seems we first need some discussion to down-select among these two solutions in Option 2. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | Either LMF or UE can initiate a MG activation request. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 3 | Each option may have different use case. |

**FL comments:**

* Option 1
  + Supported by (7): vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, LenMM, MTK, Intel, Ericsson
  + Not supported by: Qualcomm
* Option 2
  + Supported by (5): Qualcomm, OPPO, Apple, IDC, Ericsson
  + Not supported by:
* Option 3
  + Supported by (6): CATT, CTC, Xiaomi, CMCC, LGE, Samsung, DCM
  + Not supported by: Ericsson
* Option 4
  + Supported by: Nokia/NSB

It seems like there is almost equal split among Option 1, Option 2, and Option 3 (both Option 1 and Option 2). There is one company expressed concern on supporting Option 1 and another companies expressed concern on supporting Option 3.

Option 2 will need further downselection between UCI and MAC CE.

Option 3 may need to resolve the applicable conditions of UE initiated and LMF initiated.

The FL thus has the following proposal for GTW.

**Proposal 2.1.1-2 (closed)**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, support the following Option 2 in the agreement made in RAN1#106-e.
  + Option 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)
    - Down-select between UCI and UL MAC CE in RAN1#106bis-e
  + FFS: support of Option 1: by LMF (via an NRPPa message)

Agreement made after GTW.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Support the following options (in the agreement made in RAN1#106-e) for a new mechanism of MG activation request for the purpose of positioning.   * Option 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)   + Select only one of UCI and UL MAC CE in RAN1#106bis-e * Option 1: by LMF (via an NRPPa message)   + Note: This is transparent to the UE |

### Round 2

For this round, we need to discuss the down-selection between UCI and UL MAC CE for Option 2.

**Question 2.1.2-1**

* For MG activation request by UE (Option 2), please indicate which alternative you support.
  + Alt. 1: UCI
  + Alt. 2: UL MAC CE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Alt. 2 |  |
| vivo | Alt. 2 |  |
| ZTE | Alt. 2 |  |
| China Telecom | Alt. 2 |  |
| CMCC | Alt. 2 |  |
| LGE | Al.t 2 |  |
| CATT | Al.t 2 |  |
| Ericsson | Alt 2 |  |
| InterDigital | Alt. 2 |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt.2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Alt. 2 |  |
| Intel | OK with Alt 2. |  |

**FL comments:**

Based on the comments received so far, the proposal is provided as below.

### Proposal 2.1.2-2

* Support using UL MAC CE for MG activation request by UE (Option 2),.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Intel | OK | As commented above we are OK with alt 2 |
| Ericsson | OK |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Ok to support. |
| Qualcomm | OK |  |

## MG activation (H)

The following sources provided their views on MG activation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 3:** Support activation and deactivation of MG(s) via a MAC CE.   * The MAC CE can include the MG pattern ID defined in TS 38.133.   **Proposal 4:** Support MG(s) activation by MAC CE with adaptive offset.   * The adaptive offset is determined to be the first subframe containing the next PRS measurement occasion after T+3ms, where T corresponds to the slot containing the PUCCH carrying the HARQ-ACK for the initial transmission of the DL MAC CE. |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 11**: Support measurement gap triggering along with BWP switching (at least for DCI based BWP switching) when the conditions for DL PRS measurement in the PRS processing window cannot be satisfied after BWP switching. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 5:**   * The MG activation via DL DCI or DL MAC CE can be supported if it only includes activation and deactivation indication.   + FFS pre-configured MG indication for indicating one of multiple pre-configured MG and/or indicating a positioning MG |
| OPPO [4] | Proposal 4: Support using MAC CE to activate a MG configuration and the MAC CE command can indicate:   * A MG configuration * A number of repetitions for the indicated MG configuration and the MG configuration stops when the indicated number of repetitions are finished. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 7:** Support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure by either DCI or DL MAC CE to reduce the latency (either Option 1 or Option 2 in RAN1#106-e’s agreement).  **Proposal 8:** To reduce latency, the aperiodic MG for NR positioning should be introduced in Rel-17. |
| China Telecom [6] | **Proposal 2-1:** Rel-17 should support the DCI to activate/deactivate the MG.  **Proposal 2-2:** The DL MAC CE can be used to activate/deactivate the MG if the pre-configured MG is supported in Rel-17. |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 3:** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure, support one of the following options:   * Option. 1: DCI * Option. 2: DL MAC CE |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 3**: Option 1 of DCI based MG activation/deactivation is not supported.  **Proposal 4:** Option 3 of UE autonomously applying the MG is not supported. |
| Xiaomi [9] | **Proposal 2:** Support triggering of on-demand measurement gap by MAC CE or DCI.  **Proposal 3:** Suggest to associate a state ID with a PRS configuration, a measurement gap configuration and a PRS measurement report configuration, and MAC CE or DCI can activate/deactivate or trigger the PRS measurement report by indicating a state ID. |
| Samsung [10] | **Proposal 6:** Support Option 2, i.e., DL MAC CE is used for a new MG activation and deactivation procedure. |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 1:**   * + To reduce latency of NR positioning with MGs for DL PRS processing define the following enhancements     - …     - …     - Support DCI signaling to activate pre-configured MG for DL PRS processing by UE       * RAN1 to discuss necessary DCI formats / fields   + Inform RAN2/RAN3/RAN4 capturing outcome of the RAN1 discussion on MG enhancements for NR positioning latency reduction with a request to implement necessary NRPPa/LPP signaling |
| DCM [12] | **Proposal 2:**   * We prefer the following option for a new MG activation and deactivation procedure   + Option. 2: DL MAC CE |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 2:** Support triggering/activation of MG(s) for positioning measurement with layer-1 signalling (e.g., via DCI).  These options can be used for different use-cases (e.g. UE-assisted, and UE-based positioning) and to provide flexibility in the deployment of positioning services. |
| LGE [15] | **Proposal 3:**   * For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, RAN1 can support both DCI and MAC-CE for MG activation/deactivation. Also, following can be applied.   + Major information through DCI, detail (or minor) information through DCI. |
| IDC [16] | **Proposal 3:** Activation or deactivation of a measurement gap can be done via DL MAC CE. |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 5:** For low latency MG configuration, support configuration and/or activation of MG(s) with a DL MAC-CE from the UE.  **Proposal 6:** From RAN1 perspective, it is beneficial to support autonomous MG for Positioning, wherein the UE, after it receives a low-latency location request, it is allowed to drop other DL signal processing/traffic during one or more window(s) of time subject to an explicit allowance from the serving gNB.   * Note: Coordination between UE-serving gNB-LMF may be specified to ensure seamless operation of the autonomous MG for Positioning. * Send an LS to RAN4 with the above agreement |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 3:** Activation/deactivation signalling Option 1: DCI and Option 2: DL MAC CE are feasible, although Option 2 is slightly more preferred. |

The positions of companies are shown below.

* Option 1 (By DCI)
  + Supported by (10): ZTE, vivo, CATT, CTC, CMCC, Xiaomi, Intel, SONY, LGE (jointly), Lenovo/MotM, Apple
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB
* Option 2 (By DL MAC CE)
  + Supported by (12): Huawei/HiSilicon, vivo, OPPO, CATT, CTC, CMCC, Xiaomi, DCM, LGE (jointly), IDC, QC, Lenovo/MotM
  + Not supported by:
* Option 3 (By autonomous gap)
  + Supported by: QC, Apple
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB

**FL comments:**

According to the understanding of the FL

* Option 1 should require further discussion on the DCI format, DCI field configuration in advance, search space set configuration. In addition, how the MG pattern (including MGL, MGRP, MG offset) maps to the DCI code points should be resolved to make the basic functionality work.
* Option 2 should require further discussion on the MAC CE payload, but the baseline should be move what is available in RRC to MAC CE.
* Option 3 should require further discussion on whether notification to the gNB to avoid potential resource waste is needed.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial question.

**Question 2.2.1-1 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options with regards to MG activation.
  + Option 1: by DCI
  + Option 2: by DL MAC CE
  + Option 3: by autonomous gap
  + Option 4: both Option 1 and Option 2 with potential jointly indication in DCI and DL MAC CE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments:** *Please indicate why the Options should NOT be supported.* |
| Vivo | Option 1 or 2 |  |
| CATT | Option 1 or 2 | Our preference is Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | Option2 or Option 3 | Option 1 is an overkill, with a lot of specification changes needed. Option 3 has limited spec impact from RAN1 pespective , and the remaining work would go to RAN4. OK with Option 2 since it will be “copying over” the RRC message in MACCE; likely smaller spec impact from Opton 1 (but higher compared to Option 3) |
| Nokia/NSB | No options | Similar to comments on section 2.1 there is large spec impact Option 1 and 2 with many open questions. Yet we only have 1 meeting left. Prefer to work on finishing the MG-less feature which has latency gains. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. | Agree with QC on Option 1. |
| ZTE | Prefer Option 1 | There should be some conditions to support DCI triggered MG. E.g. DCI based BWP switching when the conditions for PRS measurement in PRS processing window are not met. Otherwise, we don’t see the strong need to support DCI or MAC CE based MG activation. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | We share the similar understading as QC that Option1 would need too much specification effort, including chaning the DCI. |
| China Telecom | Option 1 or 2 | Prefer Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 or Option 1 | Option 2 is our first preference, and we can also accept Option 1. |
| CMCC | Option 1 or 2 | Considering that only two meetings left and Option 1 may bring more specification work, Option 2 is prioritized for us. |
| LG electronics | Option 2 | Even though we are supportive of option 4, considering the less specification impact and progress, we support option 2. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Option 2 | Option 2 is slightly more preferred and as most companies mentioned, Option 1 could lead to more spec work. |
| MTK | Option 2 | 1, spec impact is the concern  2, MAC CE has better protection level (decoding performance) than DCI |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| SONY | Option 1 |  |
| Apple | Option 1/3/2 | Our first priority is Opt1, next 3 and last 2 |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |
| Ericsson | Comments | We have strong concerns over Option 1, Option 3, and Option 4 due to the specification effort needed.  Even though we don’t believe this feature would bring much latency reduction in reality, we can live with Option 2 for the sake of progress. |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 | We think MAC-CE based scheme is enough to activate MG. |

**FL comments:**

* Option 1 (by DCI)
  + Supported by (9): vivo, CATT, ZTE, CTC, Xiaomi, CMCC, Intel, SONY, Apple
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson
* Option 2 (by DL MAC CE)
  + Supported by (16): vivo, CATT, Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSilicon, OPPO, CTC, Xiaomi, CMCC, LGE, LenMM, MTK, [Apple], IDC, Ericsson, SS, DCM
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB
* Option 3 (by autonomous gap)
  + Supported by: Qualcomm, Apple
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson
* Option 4 (by both DCI and MAC CE)
  + Supported by:
  + Not supported by: Nokia/NSB, Ericsson

I think Option 2 has majority support. Due to limited time, I would suggest not to consider other Options in RAN1. Company discuss Option 3 in other WGs if they have strong interest to support autonomous gap.

The FL thus has the following proposal for GTW.

**Proposal 2.2.1-2 (closed)**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure, support the following Option 2 for MG activation/deactivation in the agreement made in RAN1#106-e.
  + Option 2: DL MAC CE

### Round 2

Let’s continue discussion for the proposal written in the Chair’s Notes.

**Proposal 2.2.2-1**

* Support the following option (from the agreement made in RAN1#106-e) for a new MG activation procedure to be performed by the gNB.
  + Option 2: DL MAC CE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Whether needs to add a new proposal for MG deactivation? |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | Same views as vivo. Now the main bullet only says MG activation. How about the deactivation one? |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Deactivation might be not needed. The Activated MG configuration can stop after a certain time duration without deactivation. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | OK | For the sake of progress we are OK to accept the option with DL MAC CE activation |

**FL comments:**

Based on comments received so far, a company suggested to address the MG deactivation proposal, while another company argued that MG deactivation might not be needed. It is suggested to discuss the deactivation process in the next meeting.

The proposal is updated below.

### Proposal 2.2.2-2

* Support the following option (from the agreement made in RAN1#106-e) for a new MG activation procedure to be performed by the gNB.
  + Option 2: DL MAC CE
  + FFS: Deactivation process

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sony | OK |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Intel | OK | As commented above, for the sake of progress we are ok to support the option with DL MAC CE activation |
| Ericsson | OK |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support |
| Qualcomm | OK |  |

## Preconfiguration of MGs (M)

The following sources provided their views on preconfiguration of MGs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 1:** Preconfiguration of MGs for the purpose of latency reduction should be up to RAN4 to decide. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 2:**   * Before MG configuration, the time/frequency characteristics (i.e., periodicity/offset and/or frequency layer information) of PRS should be transmitted to gNB in advance.   **Proposal 3:**   * The pre-configured MG should be transmitted to LMF by NRPPa signaling and transmitted to UE by RRC signaling. * The pre-configured MG parameter should be transmitted to UE/LMF, and include the following information.   + The common configuration parameters (e.g. MGRP, MGL, etc.)   + Initial status of pre-configured MG: activated, deactivated   + The pre-configured ID for indicating one of multiple pre-configured MG, or indicating a positioning MG |
| China Telecom [6] | **Proposal 2-2:** The DL MAC CE can be used to activate/deactivate the MG if the pre-configured MG is supported in Rel-17. |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 1:** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support pre-configuration of multiple MGs by the gNB. |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 1:**   * + To reduce latency of NR positioning with MGs for DL PRS processing define the following enhancements     - Support pre-configuration of multiple MG patterns for DL PRS processing by UE       * Signaling details are left up to RAN2   + Inform RAN2/RAN3/RAN4 capturing outcome of the RAN1 discussion on MG enhancements for NR positioning latency reduction with a request to implement necessary NRPPa/LPP signaling |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 1:** gNB provides the configuration of supported MG(s) for positioning latency improvements to UE / LMF. |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 4:** Support multiple pre-configured measurement gaps for latency reduction together with applicable assistance information from the LMF. |

The preconfiguration of MG is supported by the following sources

* vivo, CTC, CMCC, Intel, SONY, Lenovo/MotM

**FL comments:**

There is also concern raised by companies, e.g. when the preconfiguration is provided, how gNB could be able to determine the preconfiguration of MG prior to any positioning related procedure, how latency can be achieved if the preconfiguration is provided in an on-going LCS procedure (since the preconfiguration itself is already part of the concern latency period).

It is also the FL understanding that we are approaching the physical layer function freeze target, and we need to also complete the higher layer parameter list. This work seems less essential.

### Round 1

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial question.

**Question 2.3.1-1 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the preconfiguration of MGs.
  + Q1: Should preconfiguration of MGs be provided before LMF receives any LCS request for the UE or provided after LMF instigates the LCS procedure for the UE.
  + Q2: How gNB determines the patterns of the preconfiguration of MGs for a UE, e.g. MGL, MGRP, MG offset.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Yes | First, preconfiguration of MGs has been supported for RAN4, and it is more flexible for activation and deactivation.  In addition, if the measured PRS is a cell-specific signal(ie, the assistance information is transmitted by broadcast), preconfiguration of MGs can be transmitted once to gNB for all the UE. It can reduce the signaling overhead. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | We feel this issue can be low priority given the time remaining in rel-17. |
| Qualcomm | No | If we go with DL-MAC-CE to activate a MG, there may not be a need to have a preconfiguration step, since MAC-Ces can carry enough bits. |
| Huawei, HiSiliSon | No | We prefer to leave it to RAN4 to handle the preconfiguration. |
| ZTE |  | Low priority. |
| OPPO | Yes | Even with MAC CE to activate a MG, in RRC we can still configure multiple precpnfiguraiton of MGs and then use MAC CE to activate one of them |
| China Telecom | Yes | We share the similar view as OPPO. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | MG can be activated together with PRS measurement report configuration. |
| CMCC | Yes | In our views, we believe that at least pre-configuration of MGs is applicable to the case of pre-configuration-based on-demand DL PRS. In such a case, some association information can be exchanged among the LMF and gNB (DL PRS pattern, or recommended MG pattern, etc.) to help the gNB determine the pre-configuration MG.  FL: I am assuming if on-demand PRS is involved, there may not be latency benefit, since the procedures take time. On the other hand, if there is a procedure between LMF and gNB on exchange on the recommended MG patterns, this has to happen when LMF starts UE positioning procedures, i.e. after LMF receives the location request for the UE. Otherwise, how could LMF know which UE needs the MG preconfiguration, so as to make the recommendation to the gNB of a target UE? |
| LG electronics | No | Considering the left number of meetings, we prefer to treat the issue as a low priority. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Since the key benefit is to configure more than one MG at a time while saving on request signalling of multiple MGs. The activation/deactivation proposal in 2.2 is an enabler to this aspect. |
| Vivo2 |  | Some supporters have listed some reasons in the previous reply. For example, flexibility, the small overhead for uu signaling, etc.  In addition, based on the discussion from RAN4, they are waiting for the RAN1 outcome. And there is only one meeting is left for RAN1, and if companies don’t want to discuss the issue in RAN1, can we send LS to ask RAN4 to decide whether introduce the pre-configuration of MG for positioning，or make a conclusion to leave RAN4 to decide?    FL: I think the difference between RRM and positioning is that RRM is totally gNB’s business, while positioning is more of LMF’s business. For RRM, gNB can decide which SSB to measure for a UE and provide the configuration to the UE, while for positioning, gNB does not even know if a UE will be requested to measure PRS, until it receives request from the UE or potentially LMF. |
| SONY | Yes | This would reduce latency and signalling overhead. We can leave the details to RAN4. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Same view as Sony. |
| CATT |  | We prefer to treat the issue as a low priority |
| Apple | Yes | We share similar view as OPPO |
| Ericsson |  | This is low priority. |
| Samsung | Yes | Preconfiguration of MGs before LMF receiving any LCS request may not satisfied the positioning requirements. Therefore, we prefer to preconfigure the MGs during the LCS procedure. |

**FL comments:**

I understand some companies think that activation may reply on the preconfiguration. However if we go with DL MAC CE in 2.2, the necessity of preconfiguration can be jointly discussed with the MAC CE payload.

The FL thus has the following proposal for GTW.

**Proposal 2.3.1-2 (may be merged to Proposal 2.2.1-2)**

* Further discuss the necessity of preconfiguration along with the DL MAC CE payload if DL MAC CE is used to activate/deactivate the MG.

### Round 2

Let’s continue the discussion for Round 2 on preconfiguration of MGs

**Proposal 2.3.2-1**

* Further discuss the necessity of preconfiguration along with the DL MAC CE/DCI payload, subject to proposal 2.2.2-1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | We think the system will work with having the MG configuration inside a DL MACCE, without having to specify ta preconfiguration step. Preconfiguraiton step seems to be more of an overhead optimization discussion, which we tend to not consider it the highest priority at this point given all the open items in this agenda and across the WI. |
| vivo | Yes | It can be found configuration MG is supported by 10 companies and 5 companies think it is a low priority considering the tight timeline, and 1 company proposes to up to RAN4 decided.  But RAN4 is discussing the issue and waiting for our decision and MG doesn’t have a lot of work for RAN1, so why don't make a conclusion and let RAN4 decide it? We have strong concern if no conclusion is made, it will cause RAN1 and RAN4 to shirk each other endlessly, leading to the wasted efforts of companies on this feature.  FL: I think the difference between RRM and positioning is that RRM is totally gNB’s business, while positioning is more of LMF’s business. For RRM, gNB can decide which SSB to measure for a UE and provide the configuration to the UE, while for positioning, gNB does not even know if a UE will be requested to measure PRS, until it receives request from the UE or LMF. |
| ZTE |  | The same view with Qualcomm |
| China Telecom | Yes | We support he preconfiguration along with the DL MAC CE. And we think the current configuration can be reused for the preconfiguratio, so we don’t think it will cost too much time. |
| CMCC |  | We agree with vivo that many companies provide positive feedback to support pre-configuraiton of MG along with the advantages to do so.  For us, we think that pre-configuration of MG is especially applicable for the pre-configuration-based on-demand DL PRS case. I’m a bit confused about the response from FL that “if on-demand PRS is involved, there may not be latency benefit”. What I have in mind is that the MG pre-configuration signaling can go in parallel with the on-demand DL PRS pre-configuration signaling (beforehead, the on-demand PRS pattern can be informed to the gNB via NRPPa to help gNB determine the MG patterns), and when the UE request a certain on-demand PRS configuration, it can request a proper MG pattern at the same time using lower layer signaling, which is faster than the RRC signaling in Rel-16 and also saves the payload.  FL:  1. Let’s assume LMF provides the MG-preconfiguration and on-demand PRS preconfiguration to the UE using unicast signaling. Do you agree that this can only happen when the location request has been triggered for the UE, thus being a part of whole E2E latency?  2. If so, it means an LPP ProvideAssistanceData is given to the UE that only provides preconfiguration, which means that LMF does not know which preconfiguration UE will request, correct?  3. When UE requests a certain on-demand PRS, UE will send LPP RequestAssistanceData to the LMF, and surely UE can request MG to the gNB using lower layer signaling, but when LMF receives the on-demand PRS request form UE, LMF should confirm the assistance data requested by the UE via LPP ProvideAssistanceData. Prior to LMF confirming the assistance data requested by the UE, LMF should also invoke related procedures to gNB via NRPPa to activate the requested PRS to be transmitted.  With that said, compared with traditional single LPP ProvideAssistanceData, on-demand PRS would require LPP ProvideAssistanceData + LPP RequestAssistanceData + NRPPa On-Demand PRS Activation Procedure + LPP ProvideAssistanceData in the core network.  4. If on-demand PRS MG preconfiguration is broadcast in SIB, it depends on the progress in RAN2 on MO-LR request to carry the on-demand PRS request by the UE, but anyway UE needs to receive the update PRS configuration via LPP ProvideAssistanceData with potential NRPPa exchange to activate the on-demand PRS. |
| LGE |  | Considering the remaining number of meetings, we prefer to leave the details of the configuration for RAN4. Regarding signaling for the activation, for smooth progress, we are okay with providing related information though the signaling, subject to proposal 2.2.2-1. |
| CATT | Yes | RAN1 needs to durther discuss the necessity of preconfiguration along with the DL MAC CE/DCI payload. |
| OPPO | Yes | Suggest to delete “DCI” since using MAC CE is supported by all the inputted comments in 2.2.2 |
| Ericsson |  | Isn’t it the case that before a MG can be activated by using the DL MAC CE of proposal 2.2.2-1, that we need some MGs preconfigured? May be it is simpler if a list of MGs are preconfigured using RRC, and then the DL MAC CE of proposal 2.2.2-1 can be used to activate one of the preconfigured MGs. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We support to preconfigre the MG and activated by using MAC CE. And we are also fine to leave it to RAN 4. |
| Intel | Comments | We support the pre-configuration of DL PRS MGs and still think that DCI is beneficial for MG activation and ltency redcution  But as a compromise we can accept DL MAC CE for activation in this release |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility |  | Support FL’s proposal to enable the preconfiguration of MG gaps. Activation via MAC CE is also feasible from our point of view. |

**FL comments:**

There is considerable support on preconfiguration of MG, while some companies argued that the DL MAC CE is sufficiently flexible in terms of providing all related fields currently provided in RRC.

Normally, we need RRC configuration of a subset of XX, and later use MAC CE to activation/select one out of the subset of XX. However for MG, it is possible that the DL MAC CE can direct select one from the existing 26 MGs defined by RAN4.

I suggest to further discuss and finalize this issue in RAN1#107-e, and have the following proposal. This proposal can be merged into the FFS items of Proposal 2.2.2-2.

### Proposal 2.3.2-2 (Can be merged into FFS items of Proposal 2.2.2-2)

* With regards to MG activation by DL MAC CE, further study
  + DL MAC CE payload
  + The necessity of preconfiguration of MGs in higher layers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes | There’s a typo in the proposal:   * With regards to MG activation by DL MAC CE, further study   + DL MAC CE payload   + The necessity of preconfiguration of MGs in higher layers.   FL: Fixed. Thank you. |
| SONY | Yes | This is the necessity subsequent works (after agreeing the activation by DL MAC CE) |
| vivo | Yes | Based on the Tdoc (R4-2115340)WF on R17 NR MG enhancements – Pre-configured MG, we think the pre-configured MG can be supported Whether can the pre-MG be used for PRS measurement?  * It is feasible to config Pre-MG for PRS measurements.   + The exact configuration of Pre-MG used for PRS measurement can be FFS     - FFS on whether UE assumes the Pre-MG is always activated     - FFS if UE should always indicate serving cell about the PRS measurement when it is configured with pre-MG. * It is up to NW to configure either Pre-MG which shall be always activated or legacy MG for PRS measurement |
| Ericsson | OK |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support merging the proposal with P2.2.2-2, for a more consolidated agreement. |

## MG sharing with RRM (L)

The following sources provided their views on MG sharing enhancement with RRM.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 6:** Enhance the measurement gap sharing scheme to prioritize the NR PRS measurement inside a measurement gap. RAN1 should send an LS to RAN4 on the benefits identified by RAN1. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 8:**   * Priority rules should be considered for MG sharing, for example,   + For high priority PRS positioning, the CSSF is 1 |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 1:** For Measurement gaps shared between Positioning and mobility measurements, support increased priority of processing of Positioning resources when low-latency Positioning Measurements are expected by the UE.   * Send an LS to RAN4 with this agreement |

There is limited input on this issue.

**FL comments:**

It is the FL understanding that this enhancements belongs to RAN4 expertise.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

### Proposal 2.4.1-1 (closed)

* Potential enhancements to latency reduction with respect to MG sharing with other RRM procedures is up to RAN4 to decide.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Agree with proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | Send an LS may be helpful to inform the benefits identified by RAN1. |
| LG electronics | Yes | We are okay with current FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | Yes | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with FL’s assessment. No need to discuss this online. |

Based on the discussion, the proposal is for email endorsement.

**Proposal 2.4.1-1**

* Potential enhancements to latency reduction with respect to MG sharing with other RRM procedures is up to RAN4 to decide.

This proposal is endorsed by email during the quiet period.

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:  Potential enhancements to latency reduction with respect to MG sharing with other RRM procedures is up to RAN4 to decide. |

## Other proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 1:**   * + To reduce latency of NR positioning with MGs for DL PRS processing define the following enhancements     - …     - …     - …     - Optimize Rel.16 measurement gap patterns (e.g., period, length, type) for NR DL PRS processing by UE and send LS to RAN4 with a recommendation to define new MG patterns for positioning   + Inform RAN2/RAN3/RAN4 capturing outcome of the RAN1 discussion on MG enhancements for NR positioning latency reduction with a request to implement necessary NRPPa/LPP signaling |

It is the FL understanding that MG pattern enhancements belongs to RAN4 expertise. It is suggested for the interested companies to bring this to RAN4 directly.

# MG-less PRS measurement

## General information

The following working assumption was made in RAN1#106-e on this issue.

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:  Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.   * Inside the PRS processing window, subject to the UE determining that DL PRS to be higher priority, support the following UE capabilities:   + Capability 1: PRS prioritization over all other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.     - Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.     - Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.       * FFS: band or CC   + Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window   + A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.     - FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.) * For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:   + Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only   + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell. * Note: When the UE determines higher priority for other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing, the UE is not expected to measure/process DL PRS which is applicable to all of the above capability options. * Further study   + Further details of which other DL signals/channels to be prioritized   + How the UE determines DL PRS’s priority based on one or more of the following:     - Opt. 1: Based on indication/configuration from serving gNB     - Opt. 2: Other options (e.g., implicit, signalling from LMF, etc)   + Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period   + How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens   + Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa. * Send an LS to RAN2, RAN3 and RAN4 informing them of this working assumption and requesting feedback in case they have concerns. |

## Confirm the working assumption (H)

The following sources provided their views on confirming the previous working assumption.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| OPPO [4] | **Proposal 5:** Support measuring DL PRS resource within active BWP and with same numerology outside measurement gap and confirm the WA. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 1:** Support the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e related to PRS measurement outside the MG. |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 5**: Confirm the prior working assumption on MG-less PRS reception. |
| DCM [12] | **Proposal 3:**  The working assumption made at RAN1#106-e meeting regarding PRS measurement outside MG should be confirmed |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 4:** Confirm the working assumption on support PRS measurement outside the MG that is subjected to UE capability, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP. |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 12:** Confirm the RAN1#106-e working assumption on PRS processing outside of MG |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 1** Confirm the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e to support DL measurements based on DL PRS without the UE having to request measurement gaps. |

Confirmation of the previous working assumption is supported by the following sources

* OPPO, CATT, Nokia/NSB, DCM, SONY, QC, Ericsson

**FL comments:**

Also other source may not explicitly mention in their proposal to confirm the working assumption, it is general considered they are OK to confirm it, since some of them are proposing to resolve the FFSs in the working assumption.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

**Proposal 3.1.1-1**

* Confirm the following working assumption made in RAN1#106-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:  Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.   * Inside the PRS processing window, subject to the UE determining that DL PRS to be higher priority, support the following UE capabilities:   + Capability 1: PRS prioritization over all other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.     - Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.     - Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.       * FFS: band or CC   + Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window   + A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.     - FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.) * For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:   + Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only   + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell. * Note: When the UE determines higher priority for other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing, the UE is not expected to measure/process DL PRS which is applicable to all of the above capability options. * Further study   + Further details of which other DL signals/channels to be prioritized   + How the UE determines DL PRS’s priority based on one or more of the following:     - Opt. 1: Based on indication/configuration from serving gNB     - Opt. 2: Other options (e.g., implicit, signalling from LMF, etc)   + Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period   + How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens   + Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa. * Send an LS to RAN2, RAN3 and RAN4 informing them of this working assumption and requesting feedback in case they have concerns. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

After GTW, it is agreed to continue work with the standing working assumption.

## Applicability to PRS from non-serving cells (H)

The following sources provided their views on PRS measurement outside MG from non-serving cell.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 6:**  Support PRS measurement outside MG for the PRS from the non-serving cell if the timing of the serving cell and the non-serving cell can be aligned.   * Note: This means that UE may use single FFT to process the PRS from the serving cell and non-serving cells. |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 9**: Support UE to receive DL PRS from both serving cell and non-serving cell, where search window determined by an expected RSTD value and an expected RSTD uncertainty value between the DL PRS from serving cell and non-serving cell should be smaller than a threshold(e.g the cyclic prefix length determined by the serving cell). |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 13:**   * At least, the PRS from the serving cell and/or the non-serving cell(s) synchronized to the serving cell can be measured in the PRS process window. |
| OPPO [4] | **Proposal 6:** PRS processing outside MG is applied to serving cell PRS only. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 2:** Support Alt. 2 for PRS-related condition in RAN1#106-e, with the following modification:  Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of both serving cell and non-serving cells. |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 5:** The PRS measurement within the PRS processing window is applicable to all PRS of a non-serving cell that is aligned to the serving cell. |
| Apple [15] | **Proposal 2**: For PRS measurement without/outside MGs, support subject to UE capability, the PRS from the serving cell and non-serving cell can be received and measured within UE’s active DL BWP. |
| IDC [16] | **Proposal 6:** Support assignment of the same prioritization level to PRS transmitted from the neighbouring cells |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 7:** For the MG-less PRS processing feature, the UE does not expect to process a DL PRS if the maximum expected receive difference between the PRS resource and the serving cell of the active BWP, is larger than a fraction X of the OFDM symbol.   * FFS: X |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 4** In Rel-17, support DL measurements based on DL PRS without the UE having to request measurement gaps is limited to serving cell PRS only. |

The positions of companies are shown below.

* Supported by (8):
  + Huawei/HiSilicon (Synchronized)
  + ZTE (RSTD less than a threshold)
  + vivo (Synchronized)
  + CATT
  + CMCC (Aligned to the serving cell)
  + Apple
  + IDC
  + Qualcomm (UE not expected to process the PRS with maximum expected receive difference larger than a fraction X of an OFDM symbol)
* Not supported by (2):
  + OPPO
  + Ericsson

**FL comments:**

On the supporting companies to extend the PRS to the non-serving cell, most think that the neighbouring PRS should be synchronized/time aligned with the PRS from the serving cell. However, there is also potential difference in their expression, either network should ensure they are synchronization, or UE is only expected to process those synchronized.

Considering that we are approaching the physical layer function freeze target, and that we have too many unresolved issues for MG-less PRS measurement, e.g. priority, PRS processing window indication, it is FL’s understanding that restricting PRS to only from the serving cell can reduce the potential signaling exchange between LMF, UE and the serving gNB.

### Round 1

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial question.

**Question 3.2.1-1 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options on applicability of PRS cells for the measurement outside MG.
  + Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
  + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
    - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alternative** | **Comments:** *Please indicate why Alt.1 or Alt. 2 should NOT be supported.* |
| Vivo | Alt 2 | We prefer to add an FFS before sub-bullet about the condition |
| CATT | Alt 2 | We share the similar view as vivo to add FFS to the sub-bullet |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt 2 | Same view as vivo |
| Qualcomm | Alt. 2 | We are in the last couple of meetings, so we prefer to write down what other conditions we can potentially envision.These should be spelled out directly, so that we can either try to make a decision this meeting, or try to understand what companies consider as potential conditions.  Can vivo/CATT/Nokia provide a specific alternative on what should be an alternative condition? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt. 2 |  |
| ZTE | Alt.2 | We should finalize this issue at this meeting. |
| OPPO | Alt.1 | Question on Alt2: How does the UE know whether the Rx timing difference between a non-serving cell and serving cell is within a threshold? |
| China Telecom | Alt 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2 |  |
| vivo 2 | Alt 2 | To be honest, we are happy about any progress. But there are some concerns for us about the above condition.  Firstly, we are wondering that do we need to restrict synchronization when UE does a sliding correlation in the time domain within PRS measurement window with capability 1A?  FL: I assume correlation needs more computation effort than FFT based approach.  Secondly, for the condition, how to understand “Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell”, since there are up to 4 RSTD measurements and up to 2 additional path measurements for a TRP pair and we don’t know which value should be used to determine Rx timing. In addition, we are curious about how to determine the threshold.  FL: My understanding is that there could be delay difference between TRPs for the first path. There are multiple ways to define the threshold, e.g. CP length.  Furthermore, how does the UE measure and calculate Rx timing difference? If the UE is able to measure and calculate Rx timing difference between serving and non-serving cell, why it cannot measure PRS from the same non-serving cell?  FL: I think first network could ensure that the delay difference does not exceed e.g. CP length by a proper deployment. UE just needs to assume the synchronization condition, and report the RSTD (within e.g. CP duration) |
| CMCC | Alt. 2 |  |
| LG electronics | Alt.2 | Same view as vivo. |
| MTK | Alt 2 | It seems to us that as long as the PRS from non-serving cell appear within the PPW, UE should be able to measure (similar concept for SMTC) |
| SONY | Alt 2 |  |
| InterDigital | Alt .2 | Alt. 1 limits applicability of MG-less measurement. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1. | We agree with the FL’s original assessment that  ‘restricting PRS to only from the serving cell can reduce the potential signaling exchange between LMF, UE and the serving gNB’  Seems Alt 2 needs discussion of conditions etc which is not feasible to complete given that only one meeting is left for Rel-17 completion.  Alt 2 formulation is also a bit confusing. It sounds like the applicability is only for PRS of non-serving cells. But shouldn’t Alt 2 be support both serving cell PRS and PRS of non-serving cell? |
| Samsung | Alt 2 | We prefer the conditions as FFS.   * Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.   FFS: The conditions. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt 2 |  |

**FL comments**

There is majority support of Alt.2. Some companies fear that there may be time restrictions to complete the feature. However, to my understanding, there is not much to specify in RAN1 if the condition is settled.

To Ericsson’s comment, the proposal is intended to address whether PRS from non-serving cell should be included, and the baseline is UE will receive PRS from the serving cell in either alternative. This is directly copied from the previous working assumption.

The FL thus has the following proposal for GTW.

**Proposal 3.2.1-2**

* For PRS cell conditions for PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with update of the condition.
  + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
    - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold

### Round 2

Let’s continue to discuss the proposal.

**Proposal 3.2.2-1**

* For PRS cell conditions for PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with the update of the condition.
  + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS (serving and/or non-serving cell) under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
    - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo |  | We can support Alt2, but we still have strong concerns about the condition.  Just reply FL’s previous comments  FL: I assume correlation needs more computation effort than FFT based approach.  It is up to UE implementation to do sliding correlation in the time domain or FFT based approach. Therefore, for UE does sliding correlation, it is no need to support such conditions.  In addition, if our memory is correct, at least in LTE OTDOA intra-frequency measurement without MG, there is no such condition limitation. If UE can only measure PRS from non-serving cell within a threshold such as CP length, why LMF configures expected RSTD+-uncertain as PRS searching window, whose range is about [-0.5ms, +0.5ms] which is much larger than the CP range.  FL: I think first network could ensure that the delay difference does not exceed e.g. CP length by a proper deployment. UE just needs to assume the synchronization condition, and report the RSTD (within e.g. CP duration)  Based on the reply of FL, we wonder whether the threshold needs to be sent to UE. If it is transparent to UE, we can compromise on the proposal with a note ” Note:The condition is transparent to UE ”.  Or, considering similar description for inter-frequency measurement of SSB without MG is captured in T318.133, we think it is better for RAN4 to determine whether to introduce such conditions. For example, change to ‘FFS by RAN4: The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold’. |
| ZTE | Yes | Add FFS: Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is determined by the expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Given the explanations we are okay with this proposal. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To vivo: The subbulet does not mean that the threshold is sent to the UE. It is clearly a UE implementation aspect, and cannot be configured to the UE! I agree it will either be a fixed threshold in RAN4 requirements, or from our side, we are even OK to have it as a UE capability.   * + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.     - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold       * The Threshold shall not ne a configurable parameter to the UE.   Could ZTE describe what the suggested FFS means? |
| OPPO | Have concern on current Alt2 | We have concern on Alt2. The problem is how does the UE know whether Rx time difference between non-serving cell and the serving cell is within a threshold before the UE measures that non-serving cell. That means the gNB has to configure MG first so that the UE can measure a non-serving cell and then the UE can determine if a non-serving cell can be measured outside MG.  So the logical of Alt2 would be: the UE needs to first measure one non-serving cell to determine its Rx timing information and then the UE can determine whether the UE can measure in outside MG? Such a lofical seems not correct.  Looks like the only feasible method is the LMF indicate the UE that the PRS of one-serving cell can be measured outside MG and how to determine that, the LMF can use some condition.   * For PRS cell conditions for PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with the update of the condition.   + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.     - The LMF indicates the non-serving cells of which the PRS can be measured outside MG to a UE.     - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold   FL: I think from assistance data perspective, there should not be serving/non-serving cell, but rather assistance data reference TRP and non-reference TRP. So I believe the bullet OPPO added may be controversial to others.  One way is that, UE may assume for PRS measurement without MG are synchronized, and RAN4 only defines the requirement under that side condition, and then it becomes no requirement at UE side if the synchronization condition is not statisifed. So technically, UE will not perform measurement to know if Rx timing difference is within a threshod, but UE assumes so when receives the PRS. Please check whether this logic is correct.  Another way is to signal a proper expected RSTD/expected RSTD uncertainty as ZTE quote. UE will only process the TRPs with a proper expected RSTD/expected RSTD uncertainty. |
| Ericsson | Comments | We are ok, but we have some suggested changes:  -> To address our question from the previous round, may be the wording can be impromved a bit to improve clarity. Suggest ‘Applicable to all PRS ( serving and/or non-serving cell) under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell’  FL: I think this is a useful clarification.  -> we agree that the precondition to accepting a non-serving cell PRS is that the delay difference between the serving cell TRP and the neighbour cell TRP are within the CP limit.  In addition, the following precoditions may also be needed:  -> when the PRS is higher priority than other channels/signals, for capability 1, the PRS from the non-serving cell PRSs have to be inside the PRS prioritization window since the serving cell does not know the symbol position of neighbour cell PRS.  FL: My understanding is that if PRS processing window is provided, UE will only process the PRS within the PRS processing window. PRS outside that will not be received by the UE, and thus no need to discuss the priority.  -> when the PRS is higher priority than other channels/signals, for capability 2, the PRS from the non-serving cell PRSs have to be in the same symbols as the PRS of the serving cell since the serving cell does not know the symbol position of neighbour cell PRS.  FL: I think this is a reasonable logic. However, I have comments:   * It may be possible in the “LMF-gNB coordination” part that LMF indicates the PRS symbols to help gNB configure a proper PRS processing window, at least for capability 2. * If we consider muting, I guess even if the PRS from the serving cell is muted, PRS from the non-serving cell should be allowed, correct? (I guess that the motivation of introducing PRS muting in the first place) |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| ZTE2 |  | To Qualcomm,  If expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty define a search window between serving cell and non-serving cell, which can help UE to identify Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell. As replied by FL to OPPO’s comments, UE only has to measure PRS whose associated search window is within a threshold. By doing this, UE has clear information on which DL PRS from non-serving cell should be measured in the PRS processing window. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | UE can assume the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold and only process the PRS. |
| vivo 2 |  | We are okay if adding the sub-bullet “The Threshold shall not be a configurable parameter to the UE” suggested by QC |
| Qualcomm2 |  | To ZTE: Thanks for the explanation. Yes the FFS is fine for us, i agree. |

**FL comments:**

Based on the comments received so far, it appears to me that companies are somewhat fine with the modification added by ZTE and Qualcomm. It is not sure whether OPPO would be OK with the update. For the comments from Ericsson on the overlapping of PRS from serving cell and non-serving cell, this could be at least be a basic operation. However, I would wonder if any coordination between LMF and gNB could resolve the non-overlaping issue.

The proposal is updated as below.

### Proposal 3.2.2-2

* For PRS cell conditions for PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with the update of the condition.
  + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS (serving and/or non-serving cell) under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
    - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold
      * The threshold shall not be a configurable parameter to the UE.
      * FFS: Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is determined by the expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty.
    - Further discuss the necessity on the following additional conditions
      * When the PRS is higher priority than other channels/signals, for capability 1A and 1B, the PRS from the non-serving cell have to be inside the PRS prioritization window.
      * When the PRS is higher priority than other channels/signals, for capability 2, the PRS from the non-serving cell have to be in the same symbols as the PRS of the serving cell since the serving cell does not know the symbol position of neighbour cell PRS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| vivo |  | Sorry for missing the wording “The threshold shall not be a configurable parameter to the UE.”  Actually, we prefer to “The threshold shall ~~not be a~~ transparent ~~parameter~~ to the UE.” , and left to LMF implementation. But if anyway, the judgment should do by UE, we prefer to remove the bullet.  Regarding ‘the additional conditions’, it is unclear for us and suggested to be removed since it is not mentioned before. |
| CATT | Yes | Some suggestion for the wording changes:  ● For ~~PRS cell conditions for~~ PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with the following update of the PRS cell condition.  For vivo’s comments: It is unclear to us what it means by “transparent to the UE” and “left to LMF implementation”. We assume the UE needs to make the judgment on whether to process the DL PRS from the non-serving cells based on the AD from the LMF, e.g., as to be discussed in “FFS: Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is determined by the expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty. |
| Ericsson | comments | Regarding the threshold, maybe it would be clearer to reword the proposal as:  The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell include the following:   * The UE assumes that the Rx timing difference between all PRS in the window is within the CP duration   Regarding the following, we don’t think further study is needed. If a PRS is out of the prioritization window, it is not high priority. Thus, we propose the following condition to be part of the agreement.   * + - * When the PRS is higher priority than other channels/signals, for capability 1A and 1B, the PRS from the non-serving cell have to be inside the PRS prioritization window.   We don’t see the possibility to use capability 2 for PRS from non-serving cell that are not overlapping with the serving cell PRS symbols, but we’re ok to postone the decision to next meeting. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We prefer the FL version rather than the update from vivo or Ericsson. We are not sure what is meant by transparent to the UE. We are okay to agree with or without the final “further discuss” bullet. |

## PRS processing window and priority indication (H)

The following sources provided their views on PRS processing window and priority indication.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 5:** Support   * To reuse the MG request by the LMF for the purpose of PRS measurement window configuration determination by the gNB * To reuse the MG activation/deactivation MAC CE by the gNB for the purpose of PRS measurement window activation/deactivation. * To add priority indication for PRS over other DL channels/signals in the MAC CE, if the MAC CE activates the PRS processing window. |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 8**: Serving gNB should have the following information with respective to the DL PRS processing window,   * Serving gNB should know UE’s capabilities for the PRS processing window. * Serving gNB can suggest the configuration of PRS processing window to LMF, e.g. the start time, maximum duration, the type (Capability 1 or Capability 2). * Serving gNB should be informed of the configuration of PRS processing window determined by LMF. * Serving gNB should be informed of the DL PRS resources that are expected to be measured in the PRS processing window as requested by LMF. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 11:**   * PRS processing window can be described by the following parameters   + Starting slot and symbol of PRS processing window   + Periodicity of PRS processing window   + Duration of PRS processing window   + PRS processing window type, e.g. Pre UE or Per Band, or Per CC window.   + PRS priority inside the PRS processing window, e.g. PRS priority indication   + Frequency related to PRS processing window, e.g. Point A of PRS within PRS processing window   **Proposal 12:**   * PRS processing window can be configured by LMF in the LPP signaling when UE supports PRS processing capability outside MG.   **Proposal 14:**   * Subject to UE capability, if PRS prioritization over all other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window, all the PRS from the serving cell and/or the non-serving cell(s) can be measured in the PRS process window. |
| OPPO [4] | **Proposal 7:** When processing PRS outside MG:   * The DL PRS and SSB can be mapped to the same symbol and which one of SSB or PRS has higher priority is indicated by the system. * PRS resource has higher priority than PDCCH, PDSCH and CSI-RS   Proposal 8: Processing PRS outside MG has higher priority than all UL channels/signals.  **Proposal 9:** When LMF requests positioning measurement results, the LMF indicates a configuration of PPW and the configuration of PPW includes the following parameters:   * The periodicity and slot offset of PPW * The length of time window * The number of occurrences of PPW. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 3:** All DL signals/channels (PDCCH, PDSCH, CSI-RS, PT-RS, and non cell-defining SSB) except for cell-defining SSB can be de-prioritized relative to DL-PRS by default, and cell-defining SSB has the highest prioritization by default.  **Proposal 4:** Support both of the following options for informing UE that other DL signals/channels are prioritized over the DL PRS:  • Opt. 1: Based on indication/configuration from serving gNB.  • Opt. 2: Other options (ignaling from LMF, etc). |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 4:** The PRS processing window can be determined implicitly by the UE.   * FFS: Additional ignaling among the UE, LMF and gNB for the determination of the window.   **Proposal 6:** Support introducing physical layer priority for DL PRS and DL signals/channels at least carrying the LPP ignaling. |
| Xiaomi [9] | **Proposal 4:** Support LMF to indicate the high priority PRS during the PRS processing window to serving gNB and UE.  **Proposal 5:** Consider of simultaneous reception of PRS and data by different panel for MPUE by panel specific measurement gap.  **Proposal 6:** The priority of PRS should be differentiated for different latency requirement. |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 2:**   * + For support of DL PRS measurement without measurement gaps, strive for simplified solutions that minimize impact to specification and other WGs |
| Apple [14] | **Proposal 1**: Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.   * + - * + Inside the PRS processing window, PRS is prioritized over all other DL signals/channels, from all DL CCs (per UE), in all symbols inside the window. |
| IDC [16] | **Proposal 1:** Support both measurement gap-less measurement of PRS via a prioritization windowing and fast MG configuration  **Proposal 4:** Support explicit indication of prioritization level of PRS  **Proposal 6:** Support assignment of the same prioritization level to PRS transmitted from the neighbouring cells |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 8:** For the MG-less PRS processing feature, downselect between the following options how the UE determines that a DL PRS is higher priority than other DL signals:   * Alt. 1: UE receives an explicit signaling from the serving gNB * Alt. 2: UE receives an explicit signaling from the LMF (LMF has previous coordinated with the serving gNB) * Alt 3: PRS is implicitly determined that it is higher priority than any other DL channel/channel in the processing window duration.   **Proposal 9:** Support to support the following priority options in the processing window:   * PRS is higher priority than any other DL signal/channel * PRS is higher priority than any other DL signal/channel except URLLC channels.   1. FFS details of what is considered a URLLC channel, e.g., dynamically scheduled PDSCH whose Ack has high-priority * PRS is lower priority than all other DL signals/channels |
| MTK [18] | **Proposal 3-2**: If gNB has the knowledge of Ues being under location request for measurement, and gNB still schedules data to these Ues around certain DL-PRS instances, the Ues may treat that the data processing has higher priority over DL-PRS measurement on these instances |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 2** Support the LMF configuration of the PRS prioritization window to the UE via LPP signaling.  **Proposal 3** Support the LMF configuration of the PRS prioritization window to the serving gNB via NRPPa signaling.  **Proposal 5** For the UE to determine whether DL PRS shall be prioritized or not, the priority of at least the following channels/signals relative to DL PRS can be indicated by the gNB to the UE:  Dynamic scheduled traffic/reference signals (e.g., PDCCH, dynamically scheduled PDSCH, aperiodic CSI-RS including aperiodic TRS)  (ii) Periodic/semi persistent signals and channels (e.g., SPS PDSCH, semi-persistent CSI-RS, periodic CSI-RS including periodic TRS) |

The proposal are somewhat diverse to address the remaining FFS from the previous working assumption. The positions of companies on the important matters considered by the FL are shown below.

**Priority indication**

* Option 1: by gNB
  + Supported by: Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Ericsson
* Option 2: by LMF
  + Supported by: CATT, Xiaomi
* Option 3: implicit without indication
  + Supported by: MTK

**PRS processing window (PPW) indication**

* Option 1: by LMF
  + Supported by: vivo, OPPO, Ericsson
* Option 2: by gNB
  + Supported by: Huawei/HiSilicon
* Option 3: implicit without indication
  + Supported by: CMCC

**DL channels/signals subject to priority consideration**

* Option 1: By default CD-SSB has highest priority, and PRS can have higher priority than other DL signals/channels (e.g. PDCCH, PDSCH, CSI-RS, PT-RS, non-CD SSB)
  + Supported by: CATT
* Option 2: Three priority statuses to select based on priority indication
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels.
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels except URLLC channels
    - FFS details of what is considered a URLLC channel, e.g., dynamically scheduled PDSCH whose Ack has high-priority
  + PRS is lower priority than all other DL signals/channels
  + Supported by: QC
* Option 3: DL signals and channels are grouped into dynamic schedule traffic/RS and periodic/semi-persistent scheduled signals/channels
  + Supported by: Ericsson

**FL comments:**

For DL channels subject to priority consideration, the understanding from the FL is that we may group the DL signals/channels into multiple predefined priority levels, and PRS can be inserted between them.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal, and questions.

**Question 3.3.1-1 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options with regards to the source of priority indication.
  + Option 1: by gNB
  + Option 2: by LMF
  + Option 3: implicit without indication, e.g. PRS is implicitly determined that is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels in the PRS processing window duration
  + Note that either options, there could be coordination between LMF and the UE serving gNB.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments:** *Please indicate why the Options should NOT be supported.* |
| Vivo | Option 2 | In our view, based on the requirement and PRS configuration, LMF can indicate the PRS priority first，and then UE can combine the priority of other DL signals/channels to determine PRS priority. |
| CATT | Option 1 and 2 |  |
| Nokia/NSB | FFS option 1 and 2 | We prefer to further study between option 1 and 2 as there are open questions in our view on how the gNB would know which PRS to indicate as high priority (e.g., if UE is allowed to measure PRS from non-serving cells). |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 & comments | We understand one potential procedure as follows:   * The LMF is aware of the UE’s capabilities with regards to the Processing-window based PRS and the associated PRS processing capabilities. * LMF sends a request to the serving gNB that it wants the UE to measure PRS with high priority with a PRS processing window. This could be an NRPPa message that also includes potential PRS processing window configuration parameters. * The gNB sends such a request to the UE (e.g. through DL MAC-CE). It could be the same MAC-CE that is used to configured the PRS processing window. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | We think the same procedure as MG-based and MG-less should be considered.  If MG activation is by DL MAC CE, the window and priority should also be done by the MAC CE, and gNB has the control over whether UE is performing MG-less or MG-based. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | The priority is decided by serving gNB. But LMF can inform the UE via location request. One possible procedure may be,   * Both LMF and serving gNB are aware of UE’s capabilities inside PRS processing window. * LMF may send a request to serving gNB to allow UE to do PRS measurement in PRS processing window (including the PRS configurations expected to be measured in PRS processing window) * Serving gNB responses the priority indication and configuration of PRS processing window to LMF. * LMF informs the UE of priority indication, PRS configurations expected to be measured in PRS processing window and configuration of PRS processing window via location request. |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 or Option 2 | Even with Option 2, it is necessary for LMF to corrdinate the PRS processing window configuration with gNB before indicating the PRS priority. |
| CMCC | Option 1 and 2 | The priority indication includes two parts. For an LCS service with stringent QoS requirement (incl. accuracy and latency), it should be guaranteed that the UE successfully decode the PDSCH carrying the LPP assistance data and LPP location request. Meanwhile, the priority of the DL PRS should be indicated as well. In our views, the source of priority indication of the PRS can be LMF, while that of the PDSCH carrying the LPP signaling should be gNB. |
| LG electronics | Option 3 or option 1(conditionally) | Actually, we are open to discuss it. But, we think option 1 and 2 are considered dynamic configuration and option 3 represents the predefined like a prioritization rule for transmission PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS/PRACH (this is for uplink case, just for clear understanding). Here, we have a concern about why the priority needs to be changed? We think that dynamic indication seems not necessary. So, we prefer to support option 3. If dynamic indication is really needed, we are supportive of option 1. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Option 1 or Option 2 | Open to support both Option 1/Option 2. Note clarifies that there needs be coordination signalling between LMF and gNB. |
| MTK | Option 1 | The most critical is data priority. Actually, if the data is high priority, gnb surely transmit, and if data is low priority, there is no reason gnb to transmit and then UE doesn’t need to decode |
| InterDigital | Option 1 or Option 3 | Depending on types of signals, PRS may have lower prioirty implicitly. Fundamentally, we are supportive of Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | Note that the gNB knows the priority of data channels and it will indicate this to the UE. It makes sense for the gNB to also indicate the priority of PRS to the UE.  Then, as suggested by vivo, the UE can compare the priority of DL channels/RSs and the priority of PRS to decide which one it should process. There can be some rules defined for this in specification. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | There is no DL signals/channels priority in the current specification. As a result, we prefer not to set a priority indication for PRS. |

**Question 3.3.1-2 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options with regards to the source of PRS processing window indication.
  + Option 1: by gNB
  + Option 2: by LMF
  + Option 3: implicit without indication, e.g. UE calculates the PRS processing window based on some rules
  + Note that either options, there could be coordination between LMF and the UE serving gNB.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments:** *Please indicate why the Options should NOT be supported.* |
| Vivo | Option 2 | At least，we prefer LMF recommending a PRS processing window for other nodes(e.g. UE or gNB) at least. |
| CATT | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 2 | We prefer LMF to configure the window but there may be some involvement of the gNB. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 & comments | We understand one potential procedure as follows:   * The LMF is aware of the UE’s capabilities with regards to the Processing-window based PRS and the associated PRS processing capabilities. * LMF sends a request to the serving gNB that it wants the UE to measure PRS with high priority with a PRS processing window. This could be an NRPPa message that also includes potential PRS processing window configuration parameters. * The gNB sends such a request to the UE (e.g. through DL MAC-CE). It could be the same MAC-CE that is used to configured the PRS processing window. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 | We think the same procedure as MG-based and MG-less should be considered.  If MG activation is by DL MAC CE, the window and priority should also be done by the MAC CE, and gNB has the control over whether UE is performing MG-less or MG-based. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | One possible procedure may be,   * Both LMF and serving gNB are aware of UE’s capabilities inside PRS processing window. * LMF may send a request to serving gNB to allow UE to do PRS measurement in PRS processing window (including the PRS configurations expected to be measured in PRS processing window) * Serving gNB responses the priority indication and configuration of PRS processing window to LMF. * LMF informs the UE of priority indication, PRS configurations expected to be measured in PRS processing window and configuration of PRS processing window via location request. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 or Option 2 | Even with Option 2, it is necessary for LMF to corrdinate the PRS processing window configuration with gNB before indicating to UE. |
| LG electronics | Option 2 | We think LMF needs to know the information of the processing window since LMF configure PRS resources and it also requests positioning measurement. In this perspective, we prefer to support option 2. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Option 1 or Option 2 | Open to support both Option 1/Option 2. Note clarifies that there needs be coordination signalling between LMF and gNB. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 | It is up to LMF to configure the processing window which can be associated with PRS configurations. |
| Ericsson | Some comments | We share a similar understanding as Qualcomm.  Since LMF knows the UE’s capabilities for MG-less feature, the LMF can send a request to the gNB. The gNB can then send the configuration of the PRS processing window to the UE. |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  |

**Proposal 3.3.1-3 (closed)**

* Define P (P>=1) DL signals/channel groups G1, …, GP­, with priority order G1 > G2 > …> GP, and the PRS priority can be indicated to be higher than G1 or lower than GN or between Gi and Gi+1.
  + FFS: N
  + FFS: DL signals/channels in each Gi

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

According to the GTW, it is suggest to discuss solid proposals based on contribution, thus I added the following question. Also based on comments from Apple, I added Option 4.

**Question 3.3.1-3 (closed)**

* Companies are invited to provide inputs to the following options with regards to the concerned DL signals channels subject to priority indication.
  + Option 1: By default CD-SSB has highest priority, and PRS can have higher priority than other DL signals/channels (e.g. PDCCH, PDSCH, CSI-RS, PT-RS, non-CD SSB)
  + Option 2: Three priority statuses to select based on priority indication
    - PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels.
    - PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels except URLLC channels
      * FFS details of what is considered a URLLC channel, e.g., dynamically scheduled PDSCH whose Ack has high-priority
    - PRS is lower priority than all other DL signals/channels
  + Option 3: DL signals and channels are grouped into dynamic schedule traffic/RS and periodic/semi-persistent scheduled signals/channels
  + Option 4: Only two priority statuses to select based on priority indication
    - PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels
    - PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels
  + Option 5: The system can indicate which one: PRS vs SSB has higher priority in PRS window.
    - PRS has higher priority than any other DL signals/channels except SSB

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Options** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | 2 or 4 | With regards to Option 1: It is unclear why high Priority PRS should be lower priority than SSB: SSB measurements are periodic, even if the UE misses one then it would still be OK overall; high priority PRS will likely be some single shot measurements. Furthermore, RRM measurement requirements (e.g. mobility measurements & relation to PRS processing and their prioritization) is typically addressed by RAN4, so not sure if we need to treat option 1 now.  We could also be OK to put in Opton 2 or 4, “FFS: Whether SSB processing needs to be treated separately”, if this would allow to make progress amongst option ½/4.  With regards to Option 3, even though we acknowledge that “timing based” prioritization has been done for SRS transmissions, we think that for PRS a more “definite” aspect would be needed: PRS burst is typically long, and has multiple resources, TRPs, sets, etc. We are not sure that we really want to optimize the scenario that one PRS resource is dropped because it collides with a AP-CSIRS, while other PRS resource on the same burst is measured because it collides with a P-CSIRS. We prefer to have a “clean cut”: Either all PRS inside the window is measured, or are dropped if there are collisions with any channel. In Option 2, URLLC was excluded because we thought that these are very special cases, and based on the previous discussion in the previous meeting that such channels must have higher priority than PRS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4 | The issue of Option 2 is that may need to specify the condition to classify URLLC traffic. |
| ZTE | Option 4 for simplicity. | The second bullet in Option 4 is not needed. If UE doesn’t receive the indication for high priority DL PRS. UE just follows Rel-16 behavior.  Cap. 1B or Cap.2 may support per band/CC of PRS processing window. If there is urgent traffic (i.e. URLLC), which may potentially be transmitted in another CC or band. |
| OPPO |  | In our view, within a PRS processing window, the PRS shall always have higher priority than general DL signal/channels (except SSB). Otherwise, why do we configure PRS window?  Regarding the SSB: the system can indicate whether PRS has higher priority over SSB.  **Within the PRS window:**   * **PRS has higher priority than any other DL signals/channels except SSB**   **The system can indicate which one: PRS vs SSB has higher priority in PRS window.**  FL: added. |
| Vivo | Option 2 | The issue of option 2 is more appropriate in the Capability 2 PRS measurement window, in this case, UE can hear scheduling in other symbols without PRS. And UE can compare the priority of PRS and other DL signals/channels. That is, the high priority PRS can be dropped if the gNB knows the PRS priority and also scheduling UE with high priority other DL signals/channels.   * + Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window |
| CMCC | Option 2 or 4 | Regarding Option 2, the wording “URLLC channel” may be confusing, but we agree with the intention of Option 2. Option 2 gives more details of the priority indication of different DL signals/channels and therefore provides more flexibility and robustness of UE behavior within the PRS processing window. |
| LG electronics | option 4 | Considering the progress, since we think that option 4 is the simplest way, we prefer to support option 4. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Option 4 | Seems easily feasible given the remaining time. SSB handling can be especially noted. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 | Option 4 may not offer enough granularities in priority level. |
| CATT | Option 1 or Option 5 | If we define DL PRS has higher priority that SSB, then it may have certain impact on RAN4 RRM requirements. |
| Ericsson | Comments | We share a similar understanding as vivo. Note that there is going to be priority associated with PRS, but there is also priorities indicated for DL channels/Signals. For instance, a PDSCH may be indicated with high priority which could mean it is for scheduling URLLC data, and another PDSCH may be indicated with low priority which could mean it is for eMBB.  Hence, what the UE needs to do is decide what to process based on both these priorities. May be what we could discuss is something like the following:  1. The UE processes PRS when the PRS is indicated with high priority and PDSCH is indicated with low priority.  2. The UE processes PDSCH when the PRS is indicated with high priority and PDSCH is indicated with high priority.  3. The UE processes PDSCH when the PRS is indicated with low priority and PDSCH is indicated with low priority.  4. The UE processes PDSCH when the PRS is indicated with low priority and PDSCH is indicated with high priority. |
| Qualcomm |  | **To OPPO**: There is a question why gNB would configure a PRS processing window of PRS is lower priority:   * Cosndier the case that the indication of the Processing window is with DL MAC-CE. The gNB schedules a processing window, and then, it observes that it has a short-fused DCI to send to the UE. Then, if the gNB cannot say that PRS is lower priority than the other traffic, the gNB would be stuck since the MAC-CE has already been sent. * So, it is useful to have the gNB to send PRS processing window and at the same time to say: If eventually some other traffic is scheduled, please prioritize that, OR please prioritize PRS. * If we implicitly associate the “PRS processing activation” to the meaning that PRS is high priority, the gNB looses the above flexibility. * Similar situation would exist if eventually we agree that LMF configures the PRS processing window. |
| Samsung | Option 4 -like | For simplicity, but whether we need an explicit indication is to be discussed.  Also, do we need to limit it’s within the whole window or just the overlapped symbols. |

**FL comments:**

For the source of priority indication, Option 1 is supported by majority sources. Some companies requests further study, however, my preference is that this is key to the timely completion of higher layer parameters, and hopefully we can resolve it at this meeting.

For the source of PRS processing window indication

* Option 1
  + Supported by: CATT, Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Xiaomi, LenMM, Ericsson
* Option 2
  + Supported by: vivo, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, LGE, LenMM, IDC, Sumsang.

For the priority levels, Option 4 is supported by majority sources.

The FL thus has the following proposal for GTW.

**Proposal 3.3.1-4**

* With regards to UE determining the PRS priority with other DL signal/channels within the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, support the priority indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. priority indicated by LMF

**Proposal 3.3.1-5**

* With regards to the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, at least support the window indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. window indicated by LMF, or UE calculates the window without explicit indication

**Proposal 3.3.1-6**

* With regards to the priority states to be indicated, at least support the case with two priority states
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels
  + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels

### Round 2

Let’s continue to discuss the proposals.

**Proposal 3.3.2-1**

* With regards to UE determining the PRS priority with other DL signal/channels within the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, support the priority indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. priority indicated by LMF

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LGE(2) |  | As we mentioned before, even though we are open to this issue. For clarification, we have a one thing we want to know. Why does the information regarding priority need to be transmitted dynamically? This is because we think that defining the specific rule (e.g. UE expect PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels within PRS processing window) seems sufficient for us.  FL: My understanding is that for low latency PRS reception, the PRS can always take higher priority. However, when the feature is introduced, normal PRS may also use that functionality, and network could set the priority based on different PRS requirements.  @FL Thanks for response. we can fully understand the intention of the proposal based on your response. But, for us, considering the specification impact and signaling overhead, we cannot sure whether the advantage of supporting the feature is effective or not. But, if there is no concern about the feature except for us, we are okay with smooth progress. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Intel | No/ Comments | We would like to understand the mechanism how gNB can determine and indicate priorities for the DL PRS transmission/reception vs other DL signals/channels and the impact to other WGs.  Also, we believe that decision on the aspects under FFS cannot be resolved by RAN1 only. |
| Ericsson2 | yes | For the same of progress, we’re fine removing FFSs is that leads to an agreement. The gNB implementation will decide of the priority to choose, this can be standard transparent. Regarding indication, we can leave to another agreement how the gNB communicate the priority to the LMF and/or the UE. |

**Proposal 3.3.2-2**

* With regards to the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, at least support the window indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. window indicated by LMF, or UE calculates the window without explicit indication

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LGE | No | Currently, we have been discussed latency reduction for MG. one example is reducing the MG activation, as we all know, the fundamental problem for the issue is that gNB does not know the exact time of PRS reception at UE. Similarly, If LMF controls/configures the processing window for UE, we believe that similar problems can be prevented. So, we think the processing window needs to be provided by LMF. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Intel | No/ Comments | We have concerns on the FFSs with broad open scope in the proposal and would like to at least see potential options to resolve them. |
| Ericsson2 | yes | For the same of progress, we’re fine removing FFSs is that leads to an agreement. |

**Proposal 3.3.2-3**

* With regards to the priority states to be indicated, at least support the case with two priority states
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB
  + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB
  + FFS: Special handling for SSBs
  + FFS: Special hanlding for priority related to PDSCH/PDCCH carrying URLLC data/control

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Can we add the following:   * FFS: Special handling for SSBs or URLLC channels   FL: OK. Let’s see if other companies feel comfortable with the terminology URLLC channels. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Okay with FFS for now. If we cannot get consensus, we prefer to only follow the majority view of Option 4. |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LGE |  | We think the issue needs to be discussed after a discussion on proposal 3.3.2-1. Since we think that a predefined rule as second or third seems sufficient, we prefer to change the word ‘to be indicated’ to another word in accordance with the result of the discussion.  FL: If there is no indication of priority, then we may use “to be selected from”? |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | How about “specific channels (e.g., URLLC)” rather than URLLC channels? |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to add “excluding SSB” in first two bullet. We do believe SSB shall be handled separately considering the importance of SSB to the serving cell. For example in some case, PRS could have higher priority than PDCCH/PDSCH/CSI-RS but has lower priority than serving cell SSB.   * With regards to the priority states to be indicated, at least support the case with two priority states   + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB.   + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB   + FFS: Special handling for SSBs or URLLC channels   FL: At least according to Rel-16 specification, PRS will not be mapped to SSB symbols. So I think there is no “symbol wise” collision. I think the SSB is something needs to be resolved anyhow, so I updated the proposal accordingly. |
| Ericsson | Yes with some comments | In the FFS, Regarding the terminology URLLC channels, it may not be well defined in NR. May be what we can discuss is ‘priority related to PDSCH/PDCCH carrying URLLC data/control’?  FL: OK |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The “excluding serving cell SSB” in the second bullet can be removed since the PRS is lower priority.  In addition, for URLLC, we are wondering how can gNB indicate which PDSCH/PDCCH is for URLLC data/control. |
| Intel | Comments | As assumed in the proposal 3.3.2-1 if gNB decides on the priorities on the DL PRS vs other signals/channels, we would like to understand based on what criterion the decision is made and whether LMF is aware or not?  In addition we would like to clarify, is it discussed from UE reception or gNB transmission perspective? |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Suport FL’s proposal and the associated FFS |
| Ericsson2 | yes | To Intel: the criterion for priority is up to the gNB implementation. At the end of the day, the PRS and other signals/channel are under control of the gNB.  We can discuss the signalling of priority In a separate proposal. In our view the UE should be made aware of the priority, especially if there are consequences on expected signals such as periodic RSs or SPS and so on. For the LMF, knowing a PRS is of highest priority can be useful when building the assistance data. |

**FL comments:**

For indication of the PRS processing priority against other DL signals/channels and the PRS processing window, majority companies support it based on gNB. One company has question on the necessity of “dynamic signaling” and prefers to have hard-coded behaviour. One company has concern on how gNB could determine the priority and the related work should have impact on other WGs. The two FFS bullets are removed as suggested by one company

For the priority states to be indicated from, the overall framework seems to be agreeable apart from the foundamental issue on how gNB determines the priority of PRS.

The proposals are updated as below.

* For the first two proposals, two FFS items are removed.
* For the third proposal, “if the priority of PRS is indicated by gNB” is added.

### Proposal 3.3.2-4

* With regards to UE determining the PRS priority with other DL signal/channels within the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, support the priority indicated by gNB

### Proposal 3.3.2-5

* With regards to the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, at least support the window indicated by gNB

### Proposal 3.3.2-6

* If the priority of PRS is indicated by gNB, with regards to the priority states to be indicated, at least support the case with two priority states
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB
  + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding serving cell SSB
  + FFS: Special handling for SSBs
  + FFS: Special hanlding for priority related to PDSCH/PDCCH carrying URLLC data/control

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| CMCC | See comments | We are fine with Proposal 3.3.2-4, and Proposal 3.3.2-5.  Regarding Proposal 3.3.2-6, we are basically fine but would like some clarifications on the last FFS bullet for the PDSCH/PDCCH carrying URLLC data/control. Considering a case that an urgent LCS is requested, it should be ensured that the UE successfully decodes the PDCCH/PDSCH carrying the LPP assistance data and location request, and measures the DL PRS. We would like to know that, in such a case, whether the important PDCCH/PDSCH carrying LPP belongs to the meaning of PDSCH/PDCCH carrying URLLC data/control? |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Ok with all three proposals |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Fine in principle for all above 3 proposals |
| Qualcomm | Comment | OK with the first 2 proposals.  Clarification question on the 3rd: If the reason of the expression: “excluding serving cell SSB” is to discuss it next meeting, since i see an “FFS special handlings for SSBs”, shouldn’t we say:   * + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding SSB     - FFS: Whether the above bullet shall be applicable for serving/non-serving SSBs also, or there will be a special handling   + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels excluding SSB     - FFS: Whether the above bullet shall be applicable for serving/non-serving SSBs also, or there will be a special handling |
| Nokia/NSB | Comments | What happened to the FFS coordination with the LMF for the first 2 proposals? We are unclear how the gNB could set the priority and processing window without further coordination with the LMF as LPP is transparent to the gNB. We suggest to add them back in. |

## PRS measurements both inside MG and outside MG (H)

The following sources provided their views on PRS measurements both inside MG and outside MG

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 9:**   * UE is not expected to perform the measurement outside MG if MG is requested or configured.   **Proposal 10:**   * When MG is not configured, subject to UE capability, whether to request MG or perform PRS outside MG is decided by UE itself   + if the overlapping bandwidth of active BWP and PRS can satisfy the performance requirement, UE measurement can be inside the active BWP. Otherwise, the UE can request MG(s) or BWP switching. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 5:** Subject to UE capabilities, support UE to do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period. When the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g., when BWP switching happens, support UE to do the DL PRS measurement inside the MG only. |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 6**: Specify a fallback method for the UE to switch from MG-less to MG-based if the UE drops enough PRS.  **Proposal 7**: A UE should be able to measure the PRS both outside and inside of a MG where applicable. Note: Any changes to RAN4 requirements can be discussed directly by RAN4. |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 10:** Leave it up to UE implementation whether to do simultaneous processing of PRS within an MG and outside an MG. Any measurement period requirements can be defined assuming one type of PRS processing or the other. |
| MTK [18] | **Proposal 3-1**: LMF provides gNB the information regarding the UEs being under location request. This procedure is applicable for both measurement with gaps and measurement without gaps since the gap configuration is determined by gNB |

**FL comments:**

The proposal are quite diverse. It is also the FL understanding that if UE is performing both MG-less and MG-based measurement, the RAN4 requirement will be complicated.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

**Proposal 3.4.1-1 (closed)**

* Rel-17 will not specify the case when UE does the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period.
* UE is expected to perform PRS measurement inside the MG if MG to measure PRS is in use and perform PRS measurement outside the MG if the PRS processing window is in use.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | No | We feel the MG-less feature is more useful and practical if the UE can also use a MG in the same measurement report. We would prefer continue discussing and/or involve RAN4. |
| Qualcomm | Not needed | RAN4 could discuss this eventually |
| ZTE |  | We think if when UE does the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG, UE has to follow the measurement period that is designed for MG based measurement. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | MG-less can be a complementary of MG based measurement. |
| LG | Not needed | We prefer to leave it for RAN4. |
| CATT |  | We can leave it to RAN4. |
| Ericsson |  | Leave it to RAN4 |

**FL comment:**

This could be left to RAN4 to decide. Not pursued for this meeting.

## Conditions not satisfied (M)

The following sources provided their views on UE behaviour when conditions for PRS measurement outside MG are not satisfied, e.g. BWP change.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 10:**   * When MG is not configured, subject to UE capability, whether to request MG or perform PRS outside MG is decided by UE itself   + if the overlapping bandwidth of active BWP and PRS can satisfy the performance requirement, UE measurement can be inside the active BWP. Otherwise, the UE can request MG(s) or BWP switching. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 5:** Subject to UE capabilities, support UE to do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period. When the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g., when BWP switching happens, support UE to do the DL PRS measurement inside the MG only. |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 5:** Define UE behaviour when positioning measurement (outside measurement gap) cannot be satisfied due to interruption event.  **Proposal 6:** Support a UE to provide positioning measurement report based on the partial reception of PRS resource(s) in case there is an interruption (e.g. BWP switching) during positioning measurement time window.  **Proposal 7:** UE can provide assistance information (UAI) indicating serving gNB that the UE is feasible to perform positioning outside the measurement gap. Subsequently, serving gNB can provide the response whether the UE is allowed to perform positioning measurement (e.g., when it is needed). Hence, there is no additional latency. |
| Apple [14] | **Proposal 3**: support under UE capability an indication to switch to a BWP associated with positioning measurements, by   * Alt1: UE-specific DCI * Alt2: GC-DCI   **Proposal 4**: NW provides assistance data to UE, based on which UE is configured with one or more MG configurations and A-PRS resources associated with each MG.   * A MG and PRS resources associated with that MG may be triggered/activated by DCI or MAC-CE signaling * Alternatively, once A-PRS is activated, the MG associated with A-PRS is consequently activated as well |

**FL comments:**

For this issue, the input is also diverse. According to the understanding of the FL, some sources are addressing conditions not met prior to UE performing any measurement at all, while some sources are addressing conditions not met during the MG-less PRS measurement, e.g. BWP switching happens when UE is doing measurement, which makes the measurement no longer valid.

In either case, it relies on how RAN4 specifies the requirement. I would suggest postpone the discussion until the solution of MG-less/MG-based PRS measurement is clear and see if the solutions can cover this.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial question.

**Question 3.5.1-1**

* Do you agree to postpone the discussion to see if the progress on MG-based and MG-less PRS is sufficient to cover the case when conditions for MG-less PRS measurement are not satisfied?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | At least we should clarify whether UE can only process the DL PRS that is fully inside the active BWP or partially inside the active BWP. |
| LG electronics | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| SONY | No | We can continue the discussion in parallel. This issue will occur if we support MG-less PRS measurement |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

**FL comment:**

According to the feedback, we would halt the discussion when the picture of MG-less PRS measurement is clear.

### Round 2

Let’s see if we can agree to the framework of handling PRS measurement outside MG if the condition is not satisfied.

**Question 3.5.2-1**

* Do you agree with the following questionnaire to collect options for handling PRS measurement outside MG if the condition is not satisfied?

|  |
| --- |
| * Consider the following options to handle when the condition for PRS measurement outside MG is not satisfied.   + Option 1: UE requests BWP switching or measurement gap configuration   + Option 2: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.   + Option 3: UE may report partial measurement if an ongoing PRS measurement without MG is interrupted   + Option 4: UE can provide assistance information (UAI) indicating serving gNB that the UE is feasible to perform positioning outside the measurement gap. Subsequently, serving gNB can provide the response whether the UE is allowed to perform positioning measurement (e.g., when it is needed).   + Option 5: gNB provide an indication to switch to a BWP associated with positioning measurements   + Option 6: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.   + Other options are not precluded. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE |  | We’re fine with the Options for further discussion.  We think the simplest way is to have a fallback mode. For example, UE has to follow the measurement period defined in Rel-16 (assuming UE always conducts measurement inside MG). We prefer to revise Option 2,   * + Option 2: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.   FL: Option 2 was proposed by CATT, not sure if that is the intention. May I can add Option 6 for the fallback mode. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We are okay with listing options and then downselecting. |
| OPPO |  | The problem is not well defined. What is “the condition” for “PRS measurement outside MG”?  FL: I think either bandwidth or SCS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP, which is the major problem here. |
| CATT |  | Similar question with OPPO. If the condition” for “PRS measurement outside MG” means “either bandwidth or SCS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP”, then it may be clearer to say:   * Consider the following options when the bandwidth and/or the SCS of the PRS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP. |
| SONY | Yes | We are also fine with listing the options for now and then downselecting later. At least, we make some progress here. |

**FL comments:**

Based on inputs received so far, the proposal is provided below.

### Proposal 3.5.2-2

* Consider the following options when the bandwidth and/or the SCS of the PRS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP.
  + Option 1: UE requests BWP switching or measurement gap configuration
  + Option 2: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.
  + Option 3: UE may report partial measurement if an ongoing PRS measurement without MG is interrupted
  + Option 4: UE can provide assistance information (UAI) indicating serving gNB that the UE is feasible to perform positioning outside the measurement gap. Subsequently, serving gNB can provide the response whether the UE is allowed to perform positioning measurement (e.g., when it is needed).
  + Option 5: gNB provide an indication to switch to a BWP associated with positioning measurements
  + Option 6: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.
  + Other options are not precluded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| SONY | [Y] | Is that a typo, in the headline?   * ~~Consider the following options when the bandwidth and/or the SCS of the PRS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP.~~   Shouldn’t it be?   * Consider the following options to handle when the condition for PRS measurement outside MG is not satisfied: |
| CATT | Yes | To SONY’s comments: In our view, we would like to have a more specific discreption on the conditions under which these options are considered. The conditions for PRS measurement outside MG discussed in Proposal 3.2.2-2 do not mention SCS and bandwidth. |
| Intel |  | Option 2 and Option 6 seems to be the same  We prefer option 2 |
| Ericsson | Comments | OK to discuss further. Since this issue is being brought up for the first time, may be we can say study in the main bullet. Also, Options 2 and 6 are duplicated. Proposal 3.5.2-2  * Study the following options when the bandwidth and/or the SCS of the PRS is not aligned with that of the active DL BWP.   + Option 1: UE requests BWP switching or measurement gap configuration   + Option 2: UE performs PRS measurement following the measurement period defined in Rel-16.   + Option 3: UE may report partial measurement if an ongoing PRS measurement without MG is interrupted   + Option 4: UE can provide assistance information (UAI) indicating serving gNB that the UE is feasible to perform positioning outside the measurement gap. Subsequently, serving gNB can provide the response whether the UE is allowed to perform positioning measurement (e.g., when it is needed).   + Option 5: gNB provide an indication to switch to a BWP associated with positioning measurements   + Other options are not precluded. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay |  |

# M-sample PRS processing

## General information

The following agreement was made in RAN1#106-e on this issue.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Subject to UE capability, support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with either M-sample or 4-sample, if RAN4 has supported M-sample measurement.   * FFS signalling details. |

The following sources provided their views on M-sample PRS processing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| OPPO [4] | Proposal 1: Introduce a new UE capability for supporting M-sample measurement   * the UE can report the supported M value. M = 1 is one candidate value   **Proposal 2:** The LMF shall request the same M-sample or 4-sample measurement for all the positioning methods to one UE. The UE shall expect the same M-sample or 4-sample measurement to be performed on all positioning methods configured to the UE. |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 12:** It is beneficial from RAN1 perspective to support M=1 sample measurements. RAN1 asks RAN4 to confirm the feasibility of the single DL PRS processing sample under assumption of relaxation of the Rel-16 NR positioning accuracy requirements. |
| Samsung [10] | **Proposal 3:**   * The LMF indicates whether the UE can use less than 4 samples. * The UE determines the number of samples to be used and indicates it to the LMF |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 3:**   * + Parameter *M* for UE DL PRS processing is configurable from the set of values {1, 4}     - LMF indicates which value is expected to be used by UE for DL PRS processing       * Signaling details are left up to RAN2 |
| LGE [15] | **Proposal 1:**   * For request location information, introduce a parameter for distinguishing between a specific case (e.g. 1<=M<4 sample(s)) and the normal case (e.g. 4 samples) which is accompanied in request location information. The parameter can be included in the following IEs:   + Common IEs for request location information (e.g. CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation)   + Positioning method specific IEs (e.g. NR-DL-TDOA-ProvideLocationInformation, NR-DL-AoD-ProvideLocationInformation, NR-Multi-RTT-ProvideLocationInformation, etc.) |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 2:** Support only M=1 for low-latency enhancements and de-prioritize specification support for M=2 and M=3.   * Introduce a UE capability whether a UE supports single-sample PRS processing |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 1:** RAN1 to wait until RAN4 has considered the Rel-17 requirements for M-sample measurements, in addition to Rel-16 positioning accuracy requirements. |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 6** Support measurement reports for RSRP and RSTD based on a single PRS measurement, i.e. Nsample= 1. |

There is a majority support to include M=1. However other sources would also consider other values.

**FL comments:**

Whether M can take 1, 2, and 3 depends on whether RAN4 specifies the requirements for M=1, 2, and 3, respectively, with e.g. relaxed performance requirement or changes of side conditions. It is not likely that all values will be specified by RAN4.

### Round 1

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

### Proposal 4.1.1-1

* For the PRS processing sample number M, at least M = 1 is supported.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LG electronics | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support FL’s proposal. |
| vivo |  | Even though we are supportive of one sample measurement, we also doubt the decision can be made by RAN1. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |

**FL comment:**

Only company suggest to wait for RAN4, while others think the proposal is agreeable.

The proposal could be discussed in the GTW session or endorsed by email.

**Proposal 4.1.1-1**

* For the PRS processing sample number M, at least M = 1 is supported.

**FL comments:**

The proposal is subject to further check according the chair’s announcement.

# Other open issues

## Positioning report resource (M)

The following sources provided their views on positioning report resource (i.e. PUSCH resource).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 1**: UE could request the expected measurement report resource from the serving gNB via RRC signaling to minimize the positioning measurement report delay. |
| Xiaomi [9] | **Proposal 7:** Support PRS measurement report by PUSCH including configured grant PUSCH and dynamic grant PUSCH. |
| Samsung [10] | **Proposal 1:** Configured grant PUSCH type 1 and type 2 are used for positioning measurement report in order to reduce the latency.  **Proposal 2:** The DG PUSCH with high priority is considered for positioning measurement report to reduce the latency. |
| SONY [13] | **Proposal 8:** Support CG-PUSCH for positioning measurement reporting. |
| Apple [14] | **Proposal 5**: At least for the case of M-BWP switching, NW configures (as part of M-BWP configuration and/or indication) PUSCH resource for UE to report positioning measurements and/or location information   * The grant is specifically configured for positioning measurement report, e.g. Nx symbols after the end of last symbol of last DL-PRS resource, or after the end of M-BWP * Nx is determined based on UE capability |
| LGE [15] | **Proposal 4:**   * For latency reduction of positioning measurement reporting, preconfigured resource based measurement reporting (e.g., CG-based PUSCH) should be introduced.   **Proposal 5:**   * If CG-based PUSCH is applied for positioning measurement report, ‘the lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of measurement gap(s) (MG(s)) (which is discussed as a method for MG enhancement in the previous meeting [2]) can be reused for activation of CG-based PUSCH resources for positioning measurement reporting.   **Proposal 6:**   * The information for indicating which CG-based PUSCH is used for is necessary to be included in lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of MG(s) when CG-based PUSCH is supported for the MG without case. |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 6:** Support Type 1 and Type 2 UL CG-based transmissions for position measurement reporting.  **Proposal 7:** Support assistance information between gNB and LMF for enabling lower latency UL CG-based measurement reports. RAN3 to be consulted for impacts.  **Proposal 8:** Support partial reporting and/or measurement dropping for UL CG-based measurement reporting. |

**FL comments**

For expected PUSCH resource indication to the gNB, the issue has been discussed in the past meetings, and some companies think that this should not be discussed in RAN1. There was also citation according to RAN3 summary that RAN3 was already address this issue in RAN1#106-e.

For DG-PUSCH and CG-PUSCH, it is not clear what specification impact is, since both are already supported to convey the LPP signaling.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial questions.

**Question 5.1.1-1 (closed)**

* Do you agree to leave the discussion to RAN2/RAN3 on expected PUSCH resource indication to the gNB that is used to carry the LPP measurement report?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | No | We still feel it would be better for RAN1 to indicate to RAN2/3 that we find this beneficial since this falls under “PHY latency” definition from the SI even if we agree the main spec impact is outside of RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | Up to RAN2/3 to decide |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| LG electronics | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes, but | Similar to previous proposals, RAN1 can also liase with RAN2/RAN3 on the benefits of expected PUSCH resource indication. |

**Question 5.1.1-2 (closed)**

* Do you agree that there is no RAN1 specification impact on the use of DG-PUSCH or CG-PUSCH to carry the LPP measurement report?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| LG electronics |  | We also agree that overall of the issue is up to the higher layer, but we think providing our consideration/preference to the higher layer looks very helpful for their decision. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes, but | RAN1 can still notify RAN2/RAN3 on the potential impacts on reducing the the PHY latency. |

**FL comment**

There is limited input for both questions.

For indication to the gNB on the expected PUSCH resource that is used to carry the LPP measurement report, there may be indeed specification impact for other WGs. On other hand, since we agreed MG activation request by UE and by LMF, would the proponents/opponents be willing to consider including the information of the PUSCH in the MG activation request message?

For CG-PUSCH/DG-PUSCH to carry to LPP measurement reporting, it is still unclear to the FL what the spec impact to other WG is envisioned, given both are already supported, and it is up to gNB implementation to decide which to use. In addition, if any necessary information is required for the gNB to make the decision, I believe this is somehow related to first question.

### Round 2

Let’s see if we can agree to the following proposal for conclusion.

### Proposal 5.1.2-1

* Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3 informing that
  + RAN1 finds it beneficial to support indication to the gNB on the expected PUSCH resource that is used to carry the LPP measurement report, according to the physical layer latency evaluation.
  + RAN1 understands that support of the feature is up to RAN2/RAN3 to decide.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| ZTE |  | We should treat equally for Proposal 2.4.1-1. If it should be decided by other working group, no LS is needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support FL’s receommendation |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Ericsson |  | Seems to be an issue internal to ran2 and ran3, we don’t see the need for an LS. |

## UE PRS processing capabilities (H)

The following sources provided their views on potential modification to the UE PRS processing capabilities.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 12**: For the UE capability design for DL PRS measurements in a PRS processing window, at least consider one of the following options,   * Type 1 PRS processing capability: UE has to report its capability with at least of the combination {R, P}, * A PRS processing window is divided into PRS buffering window and PRS computation window. The PRS computation window starts right after the end of the PRS buffering window. UE is only expected to receive the DL PRS in the PRS buffering window. * UE shall take P msec of time (the length of PRS computation window) to process up to R msec of symbols containing PRS resources expected to be received by the UE in the PRS buffering window * Type 2 PRS processing capability: UE has to report its capability of PRS computation time (T) * A time span (N) is calculated from an end of the latest DL PRS resource in the PRS processing window that is used for a location information report to the end of the PRS processing window * The value of N is not expected to be smaller than the PRS computation time (T) . |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 13:** In order to avoid measurement latency, UE processing capability should fit in the PRS resource allocation. We propose at least to add a condition of measurement, that is   - *T* ms < *P* ms where *T* ms is a UE processing time and *P* ms is PRS resource time window that network expects UE measurements. |
| Samsung [10] | **Proposal 4:** If the PRS processing window is supported for PRS measurement outside the measurement gap, a new set of UE PRS processing capabilities is required. |
| Intel [11] | **Proposal 4:**   * + Introduce additional values {1, 2, 4}ms for parameter T of UE DL PRS processing capability with measurement gaps   + i.e., T: {1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 20, 30, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1280} ms |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 11:** For MG-less PRS processing capability, and for each separate MG-less PRS processing UE capability (Cap. 1A, Cap 1B, Cap 2), the UE may report an (N,T) value with the following relation to the processing window:   * During the first part of the window with duration of at least N msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be received by the UE. * After the second part of the window, with a T-N msec length, which starts after the end of the first window, a UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window. |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 9:** Introduce additional T values for UE (N,T) processing capabilities. |

**FL comments**

The feature should be essential to low latency.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposals.

**Proposal 5.2.1-1 (Closed)**

* Introduce smaller number for T in the existing UE PRS processing capability (N, T) as per FG 13-1 in TR 38.822.
  + FFS: the numbers include {1ms, 2ms, 4ms}
  + FFS any restriction on the relation between T and PRS processing window duration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Support the intention, but the second FFS is unclear for us |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

After GTW session, this is to be handled in the UE feature discussion.

**Proposal 5.2.1-2 (closed)**

* For PRS measurement inside the PRS processing window, consider one of the following processing optimization for latency reduction:
  + Alt. 1 UE is only expected to buffer the PRS for the first N msec of the PRS processing window, and UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurement after T-N.
  + Alt. 2
    - During the first part of the window with duration of at least N msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered.
    - The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.
  + Alt. 3 UE has to report its capability of PRS computation time (T)
    - A time span (N) is calculated from an end of the latest DL PRS resource in the PRS processing window that is used for a location information report to the end of the PRS processing window
    - The value of N is not expected to be smaller than the PRS computation time (T) .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We would like to confirm the relationship of T，N and PRS processing window. And the connection between N msc and PRS configuration so that the UE is can only buffer the PRS for the first N msec… |
| Qualcomm | Generally supportive – suggest rewording | There can be gaps in the first part of the PRS processing window (e.g. non consecutive PRS symbols, or UL gaps). So, even though we generally agree with the intention, i think it is more correct to phrase it something like the following:   * ***During the first part of the window with duration of at least N msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered.*** * ***The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.***   FL: Added |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | This could mean that UE will discard the remaining PRS that exceeds the N ms. In addition, this assumes single positioning frequency layer.  For comments from Qualcomm, if the first part of the window is at least N msec, it means that it can be larger than N msec, at long as the PRS symbols number inside it is no longer than N msec? |
| ZTE | Fine with comments. | We think the PRS processing window should be divided into two parts as shown below,    UE can buffer the DL PRS in the first part of the PRS processing window, the process the DL PRS in the second part of PRS processing window. We propose to revise the texts provided by Qualcomm,   * ***During the first part of the PRS processing window with duration of ~~at least N~~ L-T msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered, where L is the duration of the PRS processing window.*** * ***The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after ~~T-N~~ T msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.***   However, There could be another UE implementation . UE may not need to buffer all the DL PRS before starting processing the DL PRS. That is, UE can do DL PRS receiving and processing simultaneously as shown in the figure below. Therefore, UE only needs to reserve enough time to process the latest DL PRS resource used for the location information report,    Therefore, we prefer to add another Option,  **UE has to report its capability of PRS computation time (T)**   * **A time span (N) is calculated from an end of the latest DL PRS resource in the PRS processing window that is used for a location information report to the end of the PRS processing window** * **The value of N is not expected to be smaller than the PRS computation time (T) .**   FL: Added |
| Xiaomi |  | We share same view as vivo that it is better to clarify the relationship between N, T and PRS processing window. From Alt 1 and Alt 2, is it N+T >= Processing window? But N has different meaning in Alt 3.  In addition, in Alt 3, we are confused that N is introduced for reception and processing simultaneously, but N is calculated from the end of the latest DL PRS resource. If it is calculated from the latest DL PRS resource, it means the reception is ended. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Supportive of FL’s proposal on the operation of PRS processing window. Alternatives can be further discussed and downselected. |
| CATT |  | Alt.3 is preferred, which seems having smaller latency than Alt. 1 and Alt.2 for the UE to report the measurements. |
| Qualcomm |  | Reply to HW: Yes, the first part of the window can be longer, but there cannot be more than N msec of PRS. This scenario is more relaxed, than having the first window to be N msec with N msec of PRS inside.  The difference between Alt. 1 and Alt.2 is just that the first part can be longer than N, no? Since we had said that there can be UL symbols in between, or the PRS may not be fully packed one after the other.  With regards to Alt. 3, we are OK to keep it for now, but we don’t prefer it; it changes the basic assumption of processing that we agreed in NR Rle-16; i doubt that a UE will start doing a new type of implementation, that is very different from what is considered the rel-16 baseline. |

**FL comment:**

I realized there is no support of Alt.1, which is the merged version based on contribution, and proponents listed there individual alternatives. Therefore, I would suggest remove Alt.1.

ZTE also suggested modification to Qualcomm’s version, which I prefer to list as another Option.

### Round 2

I modified Alt.1 to the proposal by ZTE, and modified N/T to a new parameter in the Alt. 3 to differentiate N/T in Rel-16.

**Proposal 5.2.2-2**

* For PRS measurement inside the PRS processing window, consider one of the following processing optimization for latency reduction:
  + Alt. 1
    - During the first part of the window with duration of at least L-T msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered, where L is the duration of the PRS processing window.
    - The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.
  + Alt. 2
    - During the first part of the window with duration of at least N msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered.
    - The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.
    - FFS: whether it is allowed N+T >= Processing window
  + Alt. 3 UE has to report its capability of PRS computation time (Tcompute)
    - A time span (Tspan) is calculated from an end of the latest DL PRS resource in the PRS processing window that is used for a location information report to the end of the PRS processing window
    - The value of Tspan is not expected to be smaller than the PRS computation time (Tcompute) .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Seems OK but some clarification | Question to the FL:   * The difference between Alt. 1, and Alt.1 is that, in Alt.2, the UE would be capable of reporting after T-N, whereas in Alt. 1 it will be after T, relative to the end of the first part of the window?   Both Alternatives seem to have a first window that contains up to N msec of PRS, so they look the same with this regards.  In both alternatives, the UE reports {N,T} right?  If my understanding is correct, the alternatives are very similar, just a different UE reporting option. Either way, maybe this can be clarified later.  FL: I would prefer ZTE to reply, but according to my understanding, there may be some difference. |
| vivo |  | We are confused about the proposal. The main bullet seems to be saying the processing optimization, but how it can be optimized by the three alternatives?  For Alt 1 and Alt 2, why do we need to define a first window for PRS processing window and there is any relationship between processing capability? It is more like PRS processing window definition. But we regret that even discuss the parameters of the PRS window is not be discussed, could we just start the discussion of the sub-window directly?  For Alt 3 whether means the UE processing capability needs to report to gNB? Or new capability Tcompute is needed to be introduced？ |
| ZTE |  | We need to add another subbullet for Alt.1 since the duration of first part should be larger than zero.   * UE is not expected to be configured a PRS processing window with duration smaller than T(i.e. L<T).   FL: Just to be clear which one is larger, L or T. In the previous comments, ZTE used L-T as the first part duration, now it is L<T.  We should not preclude that more than one alternatives are supported, which is up to UE implementation. We propose to revise the main bullet,  For PRS measurement inside the PRS processing window, consider at least one of the following alternatives for PRS processing capability:    To Qualcomm,  From our understanding,   * We think the PRS processing window should be divided into two parts. UE is expected to buffer PRS in the first part and process PRS in second part. That is, UE has to finish all the buffering and processing inside the processing window. The duration of first part is not N, it should be the remaining part of the PRS processing window after UE reserves enough time (i.e. T) to process PRS. Of course the duration of first part can be smaller than N since UE capability only defines the upper limit. Therefore, we agree that UE should only report {N,T}.  * For Alt.2, it’s unclear the relationship between the duration of PRS processing window and {N,T}. At least the specific duration of first part is unclear (N or the remaining part of the PRS processing window after UE reserves enough time (i.e. T) to process PRS) .     To vivo:  Alt.3 is to introduce new type of UE processing capability, which has been commonly implemented in CSI feedback (e.g. CSI reference resource for an aperiodic CSI report) |
| Qualcomm | Comments | Thanks to ZTE for the explanation.I think we are talking about a same thing, with a small variation; However, i agree that Alt. 1 is not well phrased now; Thanks for noticying this.   * I think the main difference is that, you assume “T” is the time needed after the buffering of the PRS symbols, whereas I assume that “T-N” is the time.   So, I suggest to rephrase/correct Alt. 1 as follows:   * + *Alt. 1*     - *During the first part of the window with duration of at least L-(T-N) msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered, where L is the duration of the PRS processing window.*     - *The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.*   Sending below a graph of how understand both alternatives. It seems to me that the difference is just a different parametrizaiton of how the UE reports capability. Alt. 1 is closer to the Rel-16 understanding; both seem to work to me though. Do we have same undersnatding that both Alt. 1 and 2, could work and try to characterize the similar “buffering-first-processsing-second” type of UE architecture? |
| Apple |  | Comparing Alt1 and Alt2, we prefer Alt1 revesion formulated by Qualcomm (which is closest to current definition of (N,T). That is in R16, UE buffers within N and needs further T-N ms to process the PRS.  Questions for clarification: How buffering window is defined in Alt3? For all alternatives, L is the duration of PRS processing window which is configured to UE and L>T where T (as part of {N,T}) is reported by UE, right? |
| ZTE |  | To Qualcomm,  Thanks for the nice explanation. We’re on the same page in the following statement,   * I think the main difference is that, you assume “T” is the time needed after the buffering of the PRS symbols, whereas I assume that “T-N” is the time.   We’re find with the changes to Alt.1 from Qualcomm.  To Apple,  Alt.3 assumes UE can do buffering and processing simultaneously, so there is no specific buffering window. UE only needs to reserve enough time (i.e. Tcompute) to process the latest PRS resource. |

**FL comments:**

With the comments received so far, the proposal is updated according to clarification from Qualcomm and confirmation from ZTE.

### Proposal 5.2.2-3

* For PRS measurement inside the PRS processing window, consider one of the following processing optimization for latency reduction:
  + Alt. 1
    - During the first part of the window with duration of at least L-(T-N) msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered, where L is the duration of the PRS processing window.
    - The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.
    - UE is not expected to be configured a PRS processing window with duration smaller than T (i.e. L>T).
  + Alt. 2
    - During the first part of the window with duration of at least N msec, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be buffered.
    - The UE is expected to be capable of reporting measurements derived on the PRS measured in the first window after T-N msec from the end of first part of the PRS processing window.
    - FFS: whether it is allowed N+T >= Processing window
  + Alt. 3 UE has to report its capability of PRS computation time (Tcompute)
    - A time span (Tspan) is calculated from an end of the latest DL PRS resource in the PRS processing window that is used for a location information report to the end of the PRS processing window
    - The value of Tspan is not expected to be smaller than the PRS computation time (Tcompute) .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| vivo | No | We wonder QC version is closest to the Rel 16 definition (N,T) and there is any difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2. Based on the conclusion and definition, it is more like UE buffers within N and needs further T ms to process the PRS. And if modified as QC version, there seems no alternative is similar to Rel 16 definition (N,T)   |  | | --- | | ***durationOfPRS-Processing***  Indicates the duration *N* of DL-PRS symbols in units of ms a UE can process every T ms assuming maximum DL-PRS bandwidth provided in *supportedBandwidthPRS* and comprises the following subfields:  - ***durationOfPRS-ProcessingSymbols***: This field specifies the values for *N*. Enumerated values indicate 0.125, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50 ms.  - ***durationOfPRS-ProcessingSymbolsInEveryTms***: This field specifies the values for *T*. Enumerated values indicate 8, 16, 20, 30, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1280 ms.  Conclusion:  Estimated minimum DL PRS measurement time in Rel.16 can be 88.5ms depending on DL PRS configuration settings   * Note: The following assumptions are made   + One DL PRS frequency layer in FR1   + CSSF = 1   + NRxBeam, i = 1,   + Nsample = 4 (DL PRS RSTD measurements are done across 4 DL PRS periods)   + Both DL PRS periodicity and MGRP are equal to 20ms   + Configured DL PRS resources are within UE DL PRS processing capacity (N,T) = (0.5ms, 8ms) | |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To vivo: Alt. 1 is indeed closer to Rel-16, but there are some differences: In NR Rle-16, there is NO assumption that the PRS will be in the first part of the window. That is why RAN4 had to add a whole “T” in the measurement period in the end. So, this assumes that the PRS shall be at the beginning of the window. That way, single-sample processing would be pssoble to be finished within “T-N” from the last PRS symbol. |
|  |  |  |

## SRS priority (M)

The following sources provided their views on SRS priority for the purpose of latency reduction.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| CMCC [7] | **Proposal 7:** The SRS for positioning priority enhancements is within the WI scope, and should be further studied.  **Proposal 8:** Support introducing physical layer priority indication for SRS for positioning. |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 8**: RAN1 should study and work on new priority rules of transmitting SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels, in order to reduce positioning latency for UL and DL+UL positioning methods. |
| IDC [16] | **Proposal 5:** For multi-RTT, the same level of priority should be assigned to both PRS and SRSp |

**FL comments**

This issue has been discussed in the past meeting. It is not clear to the FL whether the situation has changed.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

**Proposal 5.3.1-1 (to continue)**

* Support priority indication of positioning SRS with the following alternatives to down-select at RAN1#107-e.
  + Alt.1 Physical layer indication
  + Alt.2 Same priority as DL-PRS if indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Suggestion down selection at the next RAN1 meeting.  FL: Added |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LG electronics | Yes | Support. |
| vivo |  | Why the priority indication can not be in the RRC configuration information?  FL: No one is proposing it. Are vivo willing to support indication of SRS priority in the RRC SRS configuration? |
| InterDigital | Yes | Support |
| CATT |  | The meaning of Alt. 2 is unclear to us. How to compare the DL PRS priority and UL SRS priority. They do not share the same RF resources.  FL: My understanding is that if PRS has higher priority than data, then SRS has higher priority than data, and vice versa. The alternative is updated. |

### Round 2

Let’s continue the discussion

**Proposal 5.3.2-1 (more input requested)**

* Support, up to UE capability, priority indication of positioning SRS with the following alternatives to be considered for down-selection at RAN1#107-e.
  + Alt.1 Explicit indication by gNB
    - The type of indication (Physical layer, MAC CE, RRC) needs to be downselected also in RAN1#107-e.
  + Alt.2 The priority status between positioning SRS and UL RS/channels is the same as the priority status between DL-PRS and DL RS/channels if indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Suggestion down selection at the next RAN1 meeting. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LG electronics | Yes | Support. |
| vivo |  | Why the priority indication can not be in the RRC configuration information? |
| InterDigital | Yes | Support |
| CATT |  | The meaning of Alt. 2 is unclear to us. How to compare the DL PRS priority and UL SRS priority. They do not share the same RF resources. |
| Qualcomm | comments | Suggest to generalize Alt. 1 to “Explicit indication by the gNB”.  Suggest to change to the following:   * Support, up to UE capability, priority indication of positioning SRS with the following alternatives to be considered for down-selection at RAN1#107-e.   + Alt.1 Explicit indication by the gNB     - The type of indication (Physical layer, MAC-CE, RRC) needs to be downselected also in RAN1#107-e.   + Alt.2 The priority status between positioning SRS and UL RS/channels is the same as the priority status between DL-PRS and DL RS/channels if indicated.   FL: Looks like reasonable suggestion. Modified. |
| ZTE |  | The same comment as CATT  FL: You mean the current Alt.2 is still not clear? The intention is if PRS is higher priority than data, then SRS is higher priority than data, and vice versa. |
| CATT | Yes | We are fine to consider the alternatives of the modified version |
| Apple | NO | We do NOT agree this proposal. The scope is broad and as discussed couple of times, there is not enough time left to open and properly discuss/close this topic. Further comments: we are talking about SRS, it is under UE capability not gNB. If UE has URLLC data, how will be the interaction between positioning SRS and URLLC data/HARQ-ACK? Why gNB cannot handle this conflict (note that we are not talking about a sporadic/nonpredictable/high priority traffic like URLLC)… We are not supportive of this proposal while in our view gNB in general should be able to prevent any conflict between PosSRS and other UL signals/channels... |
| ZTE2 |  | To FL,  Even for the the priority status between DL-PRS and DL RS/channels, we haven’t decided whether we need to consider the CD-SSB and URLLC channels. So we’re confused with the wording “the same” here. How DL priority can be the same as UL priority. We think proposed company is trying to say we can use similar mechanism to the SRS priority when the priority status between DL-PRS and DL RS/channels in the PRS processing window is approved.  In addition, in the main bullet, it should be “ up to UE capability”.  We don’t prefer this proposal, as mentioned by Apple, this can be somehow be avoided by implementation.  FL: Fixed. |
| Xiaomi |  | It seems Alt 1 should be supported at least, since Alt 2 can’t work if there is no DL-PRS. |
| vivo |  | We are fine with the current proposal |
| Intel | NO | The scope is too broad for the remaining time of Rel.17. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility |  | Support the proposal with Alt 1 and 2 for further downselection. |

**FL comments:**

There were concerns on supporting the SRS priority considering limited time. My understanding is that

* In Rel-16, all UL data (except SRS) has higher priority than any SRS.
* The proposal itself aims to add another case with higher additional higher priority of SRS than UL data.

The companies not agreeing to this argue that both positioning SRS and data are scheduled by gNB, and it should be gNB’s responsibility of handle the conflict.

It seems anyway some level of clarification is needed to address the concern and a solution, if agreed, should aim to minimize the specification impact.

The proposal is updated below, with change of “support” to “consider”, and leave the feature open for this meeting.

### Proposal 5.3.2-2

* Consider, up to UE capability, priority indication of positioning SRS with the following alternatives to be considered for down-selection at RAN1#107-e.
  + Alt.1 Explicit indication by gNB
    - The type of indication (Physical layer, MAC CE, RRC) needs to be downselected also in RAN1#107-e.
  + Alt.2 The priority status between positioning SRS and UL RS/channels is the same as the priority status between DL-PRS and DL RS/channels if indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments:** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |

## Number of Rx beams (M)

The following sources provided their views on reducing the number of Rx beams for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 7**: UE should report Rx beam sweeping factor according to the UE capability. Meanwhile, LMF should be able to request the value of Rx beam sweeping factor used for a location information report. |
| Qualcomm [17] | **Proposal 3:** For low latency positioning, support a UE to report as a UE capability the for the case that the UE receives a low-latency positioning request.   * Send an LS to RAN4 with this agreement |

### Round 1

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposals.

**Proposal 5.4.1-1**

* Introduce a new UE capability on the number of Rx beams (<8) to reduce the PRS measurement latency for FR2 positioning frequency layers.
  + Send an LS to RAN4 to confirm.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Should send LS to RAN4 to confirm. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | OK with the LS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | OK. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| LG electronics | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Same view with Nokia |

**FL comments:**

All companies consider it useful to include the new capability, with a LS to RAN4 for confirmation.

The proposal is proposed for email endorsement.

**Proposal 5.4.1-1**

* Introduce a new UE capability on the number of Rx beams (<8) to reduce the PRS measurement latency for FR2 positioning frequency layers.
  + Send an LS to RAN4 to confirm.

**FL comments:**

Comments received during the email discussion copied below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal 5.4.1-1 | CATT: Since we want to send LS to RAN4, should we use the term “Rx beam sweeping factor” that is used in TS 38.133 instead of “the number of Rx beams” to avoid different understandings?  FL: Changed. |
| Nokia/NSB: Same question as CATT. Maybe better to say that RAN1 finds it beneficial to introduce lower Rx beam sweeping factor?  FL: Changed as CATT suggested. For changing the entire wording, my thought is that we may have to update the UE capability from RAN1 perspective. If Nokia prefers to have “RAN1 finds it beneficial…”, my suggestion is to move proposal 5.4.1-1 to the second round of discussion, since other companies may need more time to check. |
| Ericsson:  one question is which WG should introduce this capability?  If RAN1 can introduce this capability, do we need to send an LS to RAN4?  If we want confirmation from RAN4, then it is better to wait for RAN4’s response before we make an agreement.  Also, what are we asking RAN4 to confirm?  Could we be more specific on what we are asking RAN4 to confirm?  FL: My understanding is that it would be RAN1 decision to add the capability. RAN4 will be asked to check whether the new capability can be implemented in their specification and send confirmation to RAN1, and perhaps feedback update if they deem necessary. Anyway, I think “the confirmation part” in the LS can be checked during the LS draft review. |

The updated proposal is subject to further check according the chair’s announcement.

### Proposal 5.4.1-2

* Introduce a new UE capability on lower Rx beam sweeping factor (<8) to reduce the PRS measurement latency for FR2 positioning frequency layers.
  + Send an LS to RAN4 to confirm.

## Lower layer triggered measurement and report (M)

The following sources provided their views on low layer triggered measurement and report (including AP/SP PRS).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 16:**   * The request of the measurement via MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure should be supported. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 10:** AP-PRS and SP-PRS receptions triggered by serving gNB should be supported for single gNB positioning, in which a UE is informed to measure the DL PRS of the TRPs of the same gNB.  **Proposal 11:** Reception of AP-PRS or SP-PRS triggered by LMF through LPP message should be supported.  **Proposal 12:** UE can be triggered to receive periodic PRS through DCI or MAC CE to reduce the latency for PRS measurement outside the MG. |

**FL comments**

This proposal has been discussed for a couple of meetings. It is not clear how this can work given the existing LCS architecture, and the benefit thereof.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial questions.

**Question 5.5.1-1**

* Do you agree to introduce a mechanism of lower layer triggered PRS measurement, e.g. MAC CE or physical layer?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | We would like to separate the LPP signaling into NRPPa signaling and lower-layer signaling, and the NRPPa signaling can carry the measurement request and MG configuration/or activation. |
| Nokia/NSB | No |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Would not lead to Latency reduction given existing LCS architecture. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | DL PRS may be transmitted periodically. Lower layer triggered PRS measurement may significantly reduce the positioning latency when the network needs the UE to provide the measurements. |

**Question 5.5.1-2**

* Do you agree to introduce LPP-based AP/SP PRS triggering mechanism?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | No |  |
| Qualcomm | Comments | What does LPP-based AP/SP PRS mean? Just a high layer configured PRS with a start/end time? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| ZTE | No | It’s more like pre-configured DL PRS that is discussed in RAN2. So it’s better to let RAn2 to decide. |
| OPPO | No | It is not feasible to use LPP signalling to trigger or activate AP or SP PRS. |
| CATT | Yes | To QC: The consideration was that for LMF-initiated on-demand PRS, when the LMF sends the message to gNBs for the transmission of the DL-PRS, the LMF also asks the UE to perform the DL measurements. |

**FL comments:**

There is limited input and majority sources do not agree to introduce the feature. The discussion is closed.

## Early fix and multiple location reports (M)

The following sources provided their views on enhancements to early fix and support of multiple location reports corresponding to multiple response times.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 1:** In order to reduce UE measurement time of a location information report, LMF should be allowed to select a subset of DL PRS from DL PRS in ProvideAssistanceData message for UE to measure and report the location information.  **Proposal 2:** In order to get quick response of an early location information report, LMF should be able to configure an early location information report associated with some DL PRS used to derive the early location information report.  **Proposal 3:** For the purpose of reporting new location measurements in time, Rel-17 should allow UE to report multiple early location information reports prior to a response time.  **Proposal 10**: In order to balance the positioning latency and accuracy, LMF can configure two response times in the location request,   * UE is required to provide a first location information report before the first response time based on the measurements conducted in the PRS processing window. * UE is required to provide a second location information report before the second response time, where the second location information doesn’t necessarily require UE to provide measurements conducted in the PRS processing window. |
| Lenovo, MotM [19] | **Proposal 5:** RAN1 to support explicit priority indications to increase flexibility of the UE processing and help decouple low and high latency measurement reports transmitted to the LMF, which can be applicable to the following:   * Assistance Data (e.g., subset of PRS resources, TRP, beam info) * Measurement and Reporting Configurations (enable multiple latency response times) |

**FL comments**

This proposal has been discussed for a couple of meetings. It is not clear whether companies are interest to discuss it.

### Round 1 (closed)

Based on the input, the FL has the following initial proposal.

**Proposal 5.6.1-1 (more input requested)**

* Support R>=2 response times indication in LPP location request message.
  + FFS: PRS to measure for each response time.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Yes | This can be useful feature to balance the latency and accuracy. For example, when two response times are configured,   * UE is required to provide a first location information report before the first response time based on the measurements conducted in the PRS processing window. UE should follow the measurement period defined for the PRS measurement inside PRS processing window. * UE is required to provide a second location information report before the second response time, where the second location information doesn’t necessarily require UE to provide measurements conducted in the PRS processing window.UE should follow the measurement period defined for the PRS inside MG.   Meanwhile, the current measurement period defined in TS 38.133 has to consider all DL PRS configured in ProvideAssistanceData message for a location information report. We should allow some flexibility to allow LMF to select a subset of DL PRS in location request. So UE can get a quick location report based the selected DL PRS. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Share similar view with ZTE that this increases the flexibility of enabling the LMF to receive measurement reports of varying latencies (from to low to high) depending on the accuracy requirements. The current response time is a best effort configuration by the LMF and does not proactively reduce the latency even if a subset of assistance data can be prioritized and measured. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We are okay with this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | No | Low priority. We don’t see the big urgency/usefulness of this enhancement. |
| Apple | No | Same view as Qualcomm. |

**FL comments:**

There is limited input and no concensus to introduce the feature. The discussion is closed.

# Other proposals

The proposals from following sources cannot be categorized in the previous aspects, and is only supported by a single source.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [1] | **Proposal 7:** If UE does not receive the activation MAC CE, UE may fallback to Rel-16 by sending the LocationMeasurementIndication to the gNB for MG configuration. |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 1:**   * Physical layer latency reduction should be independent of scheduled location time.   **Proposal 15:**   * To support on-demand PRS configured/requested in a PRS processing window.   FL: It is not clear to me what the specification impact for this proposal besides “PRS processing window” as part of the on-demand PRS. It is suggest to firstly discuss whether “PRS processing window” can be a on-demand parameter. |
| CATT [5] | **Proposal 9:** For on-demand DL PRS, support the following methods related to the MG configuration for reducing the positioning latency:   1. Either a UE or a serving gNB may inform LMF about the existing MG configuration for the UE. 2. LMF may determine and send the recommended transmission time of on-demand DL PRS for a UE to the gNBs based on the UE’s capability of whether to support positioning measurement without a MG. 3. LMF informs UE of the expected MG before on-demand PRS is configured to UE by LMF.   FL: It is not clear to me why this has to be specifically associated with on-demand PRS. What is the parameter for the on-demand PRS? |
| Nokia, NSB [8] | **Proposal 9:** RAN1 should study mechanisms for controlling and/or assessing the way the UE performs positioning measurements, e.g. how flexible the beamed IF measurement is, and how long each measurement gap needs to be.  **Proposal 10:** RAN 1 should study solutions which can accommodate a reduced positioning session, in the sense that they allow for a reduced measurement report from UE, based on the RX beam information of the UE.  FL: Is it about the number of Rx capability for a better measurement period estimation?  **Proposal 11***:* RAN 1 should study mechanisms and/or revise the current SRS transmission/reception procedure to optimize for latency, particularly for higher carrier frequencies and for densely populated cells. |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 7** Do not support lower PRS periodicities for DL PRS in rel17.  a. Note: periodicity of measurement reporting is a separate discussion |

## Round 1 (closed)

For some proposals, it is difficult for the FL to understand the motivation, so the FL is requesting proponents to offer suggestions on how to merge the proposal with the previous discussion points. Otherwise, it is generally encouraged for interested companies to bring the issue in future meeting.

### Suggestions from proponents

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

No inputs provided. The discussion is closed.

# Conclusion

## Monday GTW session

The following proposals are suggest for Monday’s GTW session.

**Proposal 3.1.1-1**

* Confirm the following working assumption made in RAN1#106-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:  Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.   * Inside the PRS processing window, subject to the UE determining that DL PRS to be higher priority, support the following UE capabilities:   + Capability 1: PRS prioritization over all other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.     - Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.     - Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.       * FFS: band or CC   + Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window   + A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.     - FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.) * For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:   + Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only   + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell. * Note: When the UE determines higher priority for other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing, the UE is not expected to measure/process DL PRS which is applicable to all of the above capability options. * Further study   + Further details of which other DL signals/channels to be prioritized   + How the UE determines DL PRS’s priority based on one or more of the following:     - Opt. 1: Based on indication/configuration from serving gNB     - Opt. 2: Other options (e.g., implicit, signalling from LMF, etc)   + Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period   + How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens   + Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa. * Send an LS to RAN2, RAN3 and RAN4 informing them of this working assumption and requesting feedback in case they have concerns. |

**Proposal 3.3.1-3**

* Define P (P>=1) DL signals/channel groups G1, …, GP­, with priority order G1 > G2 > …> GP, and the PRS priority can be indicated to be higher than G1 or lower than GN or between Gi and Gi+1.
  + FFS: N
  + FFS: DL signals/channels in each Gi

**Proposal 5.2.1-1**

* Introduce smaller number for T in the existing UE PRS processing capability (N, T) as per FG 13-1 in TR 38.822.
  + FFS: the numbers include {1ms, 2ms, 4ms}
  + FFS any restriction on the relation between T and PRS processing window duration

## Wednesday GTW session

**Proposal 2.1.1-2**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, support the following Option 2 in the agreement made in RAN1#106-e.
  + Option 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)
    - Down-select between UCI and UL MAC CE in RAN1#106bis-e
  + FFS: support of Option 1: by LMF (via an NRPPa message)

**Proposal 2.2.1-2**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure, support the following Option 2 for MG activation/deactivation in the agreement made in RAN1#106-e.
  + Option 2: DL MAC CE

**Proposal 3.2.1-2**

* For PRS cell conditions for PRS measurement outside MG, support the following Alt. 2 in the working assumption made in RAN1#106-e with update of the condition.
  + Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
    - The conditions at least include that the Rx timing difference between PRS from the non-serving cell and that from the serving cell is within a threshold

**Proposal 3.3.1-4**

* With regards to UE determining the PRS priority with other DL signal/channels within the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, support the priority indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. priority indicated by LMF

**Proposal 3.3.1-5**

* With regards to the PRS processing window for PRS measurement outside MG, at least support the window indicated by gNB
  + FFS coordination with LMF
  + FFS other options, e.g. window indicated by LMF, or UE calculates the window without explicit indication

**Proposal 3.3.1-6**

* With regards to the priority states to be indicated, at least support the case with two priority states
  + PRS is higher priority than any other DL signals/channels
  + PRS is lower priority than any other DL signals/channels

## Monday GTW session (2nd week)