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# 1 Introduction

This is to kick off the email discussion.

* [Post126][406][POS] Rel-18 positioning LPP CR (CATT)

 Scope: Update the CR in R2-2404434 in line with decisions of this meeting. Late-arriving parameter updates from RAN1 can be taken into account if possible.

 Intended outcome: Agreed CR in R2-2405883

 Deadline: Short (for RP)

# 2 Discussion

The CR is based on the AIP CR in R2-2404434. The updates are corrected within the name ‘RAN2#126’ in line with decisions of this meeting.

Please provide your comments on the updates named as ‘RAN2#126’ in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Clause No.** | **Comments** |
| Intel | 6.4.3 |  nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequest-r18 SEQUENCE { nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequestedPFL-List-r18 SEQUENCE (SIZE (2..3)) OF INTEGER (0..nrMaxFreqLayers-1-r16) OPTIONAL -- Need ON } OPTIONAL, -- Need ONI must miss something. There is only one field contained in nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequest, why should the high level field “nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequest” be added? Does that mean, the UE can be requested to perform joint measurement within the same PFL?[Rapp]: Thanks for the comments. According to the RRC parameter list, nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequest-r18 works for

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| nr-aggregate-DL-FreqLayers | New | This field indicates whether to perform joint measurement across aggregated PFLs for Multi-RTT. |

And nr-DL-PRS-JointMeasurementRequestedPFL-List-r18 works for

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| nr-linked-DL-FreqLayerIndexList-PrsAggregation | New | Request from the LMF to the UE indicating which two or three PFLs to be used for performing joint measurement  | Up to three [DL-PRS-FreqLayerIndex] (potential new parameter, up to RAN2) values, each from INTEGER (0..nrMaxFreqLayers-1-r16)] |

 |
| Qualcomm | 6.5.11.4 | In the conditional presence table in *NR-DL-AoD-SignalMeasurementInformation* the following Rel-17 change is made:

| Conditional presence | Explanation |
| --- | --- |
| *rsrpp*  | The field is mandatory present if the field *nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-ResultDiff-r17* is absent; otherwise it is optionally present, need ON. |
| *rsrp* | The field is mandatory present if the field *nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r17* is absent; otherwise it is optionally present, need ON. |

However, the current text is correct. I.e., either *nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r17* or *nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-ResultDiff-r17* must be present. |
| Qualcomm | 6.4.3 | *NR-AggregatedDL-PRS-ResourceInfo-Element:*The *NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16* is mandatory present. But the Set ID would be the same for all additional measurements? I think the set ID can also be OPTIONAL, but present in the first element. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

Based on company feedback, the following is proposed:

# 4 References