**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #117-eR2-22xxxxx**

**Electronic meeting, Feb 21st – March 4th, 2022**

**Agenda item:** 8.11.2.6

**Source:** CATT

**Title:** Report of [Pre117-e][611][POS] Open issues on positioning accuracy enhancements (CATT)

**Document for:** Discussion and Agreement

# 1 Introduction

This is the report of following offline discussion:

* [Pre117-e][611][POS] Open issues on positioning accuracy enhancements (CATT)

The expected output of this offline discussion will include:

* TPs for running CR (LPP and RRC)
* Proposals for running CR
* Open issue list, including been resolved, still left, and new identified.

Note: No company tdocs are expected on the open issues which are discussed in section 3, as guided by Chair: [Pre117-e] discussions for Company inputs without tdoc.

Deadline for comments (from companies): Monday 2022-02-14 1800 UTC;

Proposals for review (from companies): Thursday 2022-02-17 1200 UTC.

# 2 Contact Information

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Qualcomm | [sfischer@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:sfischer@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | yinghaoguo@huawei.com |
| Apple | Sasha Sirotkin <ssirotkin@apple.com> |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | rthomas7@lenovo.com |
| ZTE | pan.yu24@zte.com.cn |
| Xiaomi | lixiaolong1@xiaomi.com |
| Intel | Yi.guo@intel.com |
| CATT | lijianxiang@catt.cn |
| Liu Yang | liuyangbj@oppo.com |
| Nokia | mani.thyagarajan@nokia.com |
| vivo | panxiang@vivo.com |
| Ericsson | [Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com](mailto:Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com)  [Fredrik.gunarsson@ericsson.com](mailto:Fredrik.gunarsson@ericsson.com) |

# 3 Discussion

The open issues which are captured in the Report of email discussion [Post116bis-e][634][POS] Positioning open issues list (Intel) [3] and Summary of [Post116bis-e][628][POS] 37.355 running CR (Qualcomm) [4] will be further discussed here one by one.

## 3.1 Mitigation of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing delays

**Background of Mitigating UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing errors:**

For DL-TDOA, RSTD measurements are impacted by UE Rx/TRP Tx timing errors;


For UL-TDOA, RTOA measurements are impacted by UE Tx/TRP Rx timing errors;

For Multi-RTT, UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements are impacted by UE/TRP Tx/Rx timing errors;

A UE may have multiple Tx/Rx RF chains (e.g., multiple Tx/Rx antenna panels):

* Different UE Tx/Rx RF chains may have different Tx/Rx timing errors
* Differentiation of the timing measurements from different Tx/Rx RF chains does not eliminate the impact of Tx/Rx timing errors

For example, when a RSTD measurement is obtained from the same UE Rx RF chain, the RSTD is not impacted by UE Rx timing errors. However, if a RSTD is obtained from two TOAs measured from two different UE Rx RF chains, the RSTD measurement is impacted by the difference of the Rx timing errors of the two UE Rx RF chains.



### 3.1.1 UE Tx TEG association for Multi-RTT via LPP

The inclusion of report UE Tx TEG association for Multi-RTT via LPP was proposed by CATT in R2-2200300, and Qualcomm in R2-2200959. For multi-RTT case, UE Rx-Tx measurement is related to UE Rx TEG and UE Tx TEG, or UE RxTxTEG. Only if UE reports Tx TEG IDs, the LMF needs to know the UE Tx TEG association of the reported Tx TEG IDs. The LMF does not need to know the UE Tx TEG association of un-reported Tx TEG IDs.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  *Confirm and modify the working assumption with the following modifications:*   * *For mitigating UE Tx timing errors for Multi-RTT, subject to UE’s capability, support the LMF to request a UE to provide the association information of UL SRS resources for positioning with Tx TEGs directly to the LMF if the UE supports multiple Tx TEGs for Multi-RTT.*   + *~~FFS: whether to support the LMF to forward the association information to the serving and neighboring gNBs~~*   + *UE should report its capability of supporting multiple UE Tx TEGs for Multi-RTT directly to the LMF.* * *Note: For mitigating UE Tx timing errors when both UL-TDOA and Multi-RTT, or UL-TDOA and DL-TDOA are used, the UE should provide the association information of UL SRS resources for positioning with Tx TEGs, subject to UE capability (in the bullets above):*    + *to the serving gNB if a request to provide the association information is received from the gNB*   + *to the LMF if a request to provide the association information is received from the LMF.* * *~~FFS: Mitigation of UE Tx timing errors when Multi-RTT, UL-TDOA and/or DL-TDOA are used.~~* |

The UE Tx TEG association request and report for Multi-RTT which was required by RAN1 can be briefly summarized as follows according to RAN1 LS[1]:

1. There is no configurable periodicities and change of TxTEG request for Multi-RTT from RAN1.
2. How to indicate the association information of UL SRS resources for Multi-RTT with Tx TEGs?

For multi-RTT case, periodic reporting was also discussed, but not agreed in RAN1. Since the UE can report the Tx TEG directly to the LMF when the UE reports the UE Rx-Tx, some companies in RAN1 think there is no need to specifically configure periodic reporting. So there is no periodic reporting request from RAN1.

**Question 1: Do companies agree that no configurable periodicities and no change of TxTEG request for Multi-RTT from RAN1? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | 1. I can not see why a TxTEG depends on the positioning method (i.e., should be independent on e.g., UL-TDOA or Multi-RTT since it only provides the SRS/TEG association.).  2. It is unclear what "configurable periodicities" mean. For any LPP positioning method, dependent on UE capabilities, periodic reporting can be supported.  3. A TxTEG change within a measurement report (i.e., within Response Time) can be indicated with a time stamp (see Question 2). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The existing periodical LPP reporting for the Multi-RTT method can be directly used. Note that for Multi-RTT, the SRS-TEG association reporting, if any, shall always be reported along with the UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement report for Multi-RTT. |
|  |  | While we don’t see the need for periodical reporting of UE Tx TEG association, there is also no need to explicitly forbid such reporting, which LPP signalling allows (as QC mentioned).  In summary: nothing needs to be changed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | No strong view, but can follow the RAN’1 guidance on point 1. |
| ZTE | Yes | For multi-RTT, just follow the LPP Multi-RTT provide location information. No additional periodicities should be configured except for measurement report periodicities |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We should follow RAN1 agreement and LPP already can provide periodic report. |
| Intel |  | The question is not clear. But we agree with Huawei, the existing periodical LPP reporting can be used, and TEG association reporting shall always be reported along with the UE Rx-Tx time different measurement. |
| CATT | Yes | We may follow RAN1 agreement and LPP already support periodic report. There is nothing to be changed. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Our understanding is there is no periodic reporting for multi-RTT but it is there for UL-TDOA. |
| vivo | Yes | Following the RAN1 agreement, no additional configurable periodicity is needed. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with Huawei, ZTE, Xiaomi. We should follow RAN1 agreement and LPP already can provide periodic report. |

How to indicate the association information of UL SRS resources for Multi-RTT with Tx TEGs?

For multi-RTT case, UE Rx-Tx measurement is related to UE Rx TEG and UE Tx TEG, or UE RxTxTEG. If UE reports RxTx TEG ID, but not UE Tx TEG ID, then UE does not need to report the UE Tx TEG association. Only if UE reports Tx TEG IDs, the LMF needs to know the UE Tx TEG association of the reported Tx TEG IDs. The LMF does not need to know the UE Tx TEG association of un-reported Tx TEG IDs.

There are two options to indicate the association of UL SRS resources for Multi-RTT from two companies [7][5]:

* **Option a):** report the association of UL SRS resources directly in NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation [7].

-- ASN1START

NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16,

nr-NTA-Offset-r16 ENUMERATED { nTA1, nTA2, nTA3, nTA4, ... } OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

ueTxTEGList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxNumOfUE-TxTEG-1-r17)) OF UETxTEG-r17-IEs OPTIONAL

]]

}

UETxTEG-r17-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {

ueTxTEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfUE-TxTEG-1-r17),

srs-PosResourceAssociationBitmap-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64)) OPTIONAL,

...

}

maxNumOfUE-TxTEG-1-r17 INTEGER ::= 7 FFS

The bitmap can show the association for the SRS resources within 64bit which is the maximum of resourceid. ‘1’ indicates that this resoureceid is associated with the TxTEG-ID, ‘0’ indicate none.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| resourceid | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | … | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 |
| association | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | … | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* **Option b):** report the association of UL SRS resources together with UE TxTEG ID in NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 [5].

NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-Multi-RTT-MeasElement-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-UE-RxTxTimeDiff-r16 CHOICE {

k0-r16 INTEGER (0..1970049),

k1-r16 INTEGER (0..985025),

k2-r16 INTEGER (0..492513),

k3-r16 INTEGER (0..246257),

k4-r16 INTEGER (0..123129),

k5-r16 INTEGER (0..61565),

...

},

nr-AdditionalPathList-r16 NR-AdditionalPathList-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,

nr-TimingQuality-r16 NR-TimingQuality-r16,

nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result-r16 INTEGER (0..126) OPTIONAL,

nr-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurements-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 OPTIONAL,

NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

srs-PosResourceSetId-r17 INTEGER (0..15) OPTIONAL,

srs-PosResourceId-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNumOfPosSRSResourcesPerTxTEG-r17)) OF

INTEGER (0..63) OPTIONAL,

Both Option a and Option b is workable.

Option a reports the association of all the related UE TxTEG IDs in *nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info* out of the measurement report list.

Option b reports the association of UL SRS resources together with UE TxTEG ID in NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16.

But Option a can save more on air resources compared with option b. Since UE TxTEG association is irrelevant with TRP (receiving channels in UE), UE TxTEG association can be moved out of the *NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16*.

There is no requirement on the change of TxTEG in Multi-RTT according to the LS [1], hence there is no need to report the timestamp to indicate the TxTEG change.

**Option a) Report the association of UL SRS resources directly in NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation.**

**Option b) Report the association of UL SRS resources together with UE TxTEG ID in NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16.**

**Question 2: Which option do you prefer on report of association of UL SRS resources with UE TxTEG for Multi-RTT? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Modified (a) | Huawei suggested a similar solution to (a) in R2-2201722 (Summary of [Post116bis-e][628][POS] 37.355 running CR (Qualcomm)), row 8 of the Excel sheet, which does not need a 64-bit bitmap (which would be inefficient if there is only a small number of resources per TEG), and which can be extended to include a time stamp in the case the SRS/TEG association changes during the measurement report (Response Time):  NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16,  nr-NTA-Offset-r16 ENUMERATED { nTA1, nTA2, nTA3, nTA4, ... } OPTIONAL,  ...,  [[  nr-SRS-TxTEG-Set-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxTxTEG-Sets-r17)) OF  NR-SRS-TxTEG-Element-r17 OPTIONAL  ]]  }  NR-SRS-TxTEG-Element-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-TimeStamp-r17 NR-TimeStamp-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need OP  nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17),  srs-PosResourceSetId-r17 INTEGER (0..15) OPTIONAL,  srs-PosResourceId-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNumOfPosSRSResourcesPerTxTEG-r17)) OF  INTEGER (0..63),  ...  } |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option a with modication | Same view with QC for a modified version of Option a  For the IE NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17, we suggest to move the SRS-TxTEG association out of the per-TRP meas. info. For example, NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info may only contain the TEG ID related info, while SRS and TxTEG association can be placed under NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation.  This is because the same SRS can be used to derive the Tx time for the UE Rx - Tx time difference measurement for multiple TRPs, and reporting duplicated SRS resource ID for each TRP increases overhead.  For example, we may have following (Note that SRS resource set ID is not useful since only SRS resource ID can be used to uniquely identify the SRS)  NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16,  nr-NTA-Offset-r16 ENUMERATED { nTA1, nTA2, nTA3, nTA4, ... } OPTIONAL,  ...  [[  nr-SRS-TxTEG-Info-r17 SEQUENCE (SZIE(1..nrMaxNumOfTxTEGs-r17)) OF NR-SRS-TxTEG-Info-r17  ]]  }  NR-SRS-TxTEG-Info-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17),  nr-SRS-CarrierInfo-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxSRS-Carrier-r17)) OF NR-SRS-CarrierInfo-r17  }  NR-SRS-CarrierInfo-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-CarrierPointA-r17 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15,  srs-PosResourceIdList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNumOfPosSRSResourcesPerTxTEG-r17)) OF  INTEGER (0..63)  } |
| Apple | a | OK with modifications proposed by QC and HW |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Fine with proposed changes by HW and QC |
| ZTE | a | Agree with QC on the changes with nr-TimeStamp-r17 mentioned by RAN1 |
| Xiaomi | a |  |
| Intel | Modified option a | We are fine with Huawei’s suggestions. |
| CATT | a | We are also fine with the modification proposed by QC, except the srs-PosResourceSetId-r17 as FFS which is waiting for the reply LS from RAN1. |
| OPPO | Option a-like is preferred | Since UE TxTEG association is irrelevant with TRP (receiving channels in UE), UE TxTEG association is not neede to be included in NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16. Agree to reduce the overhead for the Option a. |
| Nokia | B | In option B, you can explicitly signal the SRS resource set ID to which the SRS resource belongs. Not sure how this is signalled in Option A. Question is, whether the SRS resources can be from different SRS resource sets or not? |
| vivo | Modified option a | OK with HW’s version. But we are wondering about the usage of CarrierPointA. |
| Ericsson | a | However, the signaling should be as below   * The association may only be needed to represent based upon resource set level; i.e if all resources in that resource set belong to the same TEG. * Besides; multiple resource sets also can be associated with the same TEG.   UE-TxTEG-AssoiciationList-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrOfTEG-ID-r17)) OF UETxTEG-Assoiciation-r17  UE-TxTEG-Association-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  ue-TxTEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxUE-TxTEG-ID),  nr-TimeStamp-r17 NR-TimeStamp-r17,  srs-PosResSetAssociationList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1.. maxNrofSRS-PosResourceSets)) OF SRS-PosResSetAssociation-r17  }  SRS-PosResSetAssociation-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  associatedSRS-PosResourceSetID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNrofSRS-PosResourceSets-1-r16),  assocaitedSRS-PosResourceIdList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1.. maxNrofSRS-PosResources)) OF AssociatedSRS-PosResourceId-r17 OPTIONAL  }  AssociatedSRS-PosResourceId-r17 ::= INTEGER (0..maxNrofSRS-PosResources-1-r16) |

### UE Tx TEG association for UL-TDOA via RRC

The serving gNB request a UE to provide the association information of UL SRS resources for positioning with Tx TEGs to the serving gNB if the UE supports multiple UE Tx TEGs. The Tx TEG association information reporting can be two modes according to the LS [1]:

1. single request/response mode
2. based on a configured periodicity(The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2)
   * It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps).
   * It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * *For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:*   + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period*      - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*     - *It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed*   + *The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2*   + *Note: Tx TEG association information reporting by single request/response mode is assumed already supported with the previous agreement.* * *Send an LS to RAN2/RAN4 (cc: RAN3)*   + *to RAN2, including the following RAN1’s agreement related to the reporting of the UE Tx TEG, for RAN2 to work on the signaling*   + *to RAN4 for checking the agreement and work on how to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed* |

Meanwhile RAN2 reached the agreement on the association for UL-TDOA as below:

For UL-TDOA, RRC signalling is used to convey the information about signalling for association of UL SRS resources with UE Tx TEGs ID to the gNB. For multi-RTT, LPP is used. FFS which RRC message(s) are used.

The UE Tx TEG association request and report for UL-TDOA based on the previous discussion can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Which RRC message for single request/response mode?
2. Which RRC message for configured periodicity report?
3. What are the values of the configurable periodicities?
4. How to config the request of association information of UL SRS resources?
5. How to indicate the association information of UL SRS resources for positioning with Tx TEGs?

1). Which RRC message for single request/response mode?

There are options of single request / report according to the contributions and discussion at 116bis-e meeting:

**Option a) UE TxTEG Report Config in SRS-Config IE to configure reporting (request)**

**Option b) RRC UEAssistanceInformation (reponse)**

**Option c) New RRC message (response)**

**Option d) RRCReconfigurationComplete (reponse)**

**Question 3: Which signaling option you prefer for single request/response mode on report of association of UL SRS resources with UE TxTEG via RRC? Please provide your preference for signalling details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | c | Since this is a (very) specific positioning feature, which should not be mixed with other (essential) RRC functions.  Another option could be to use the *LocationMeasurementIndication* message. The UE could push a *LocationMeasurementIndication* when the TxTEG changes.  A Reqest could be included in the SRS-Config. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | A b c d | Option a) within the RRCreconfiguration message, indication for Tx TEG request should be sent to the UE if SRS-config is included.  Option b) for UL-TDOA if the association may be change during the LCS procedure.  Option c) for UL-TDOA for periodic reporting.  Option d) for UL-TDOA if the association is static during the LCS procedure but the UE needs to report the association once SRS is configured ot the UE via RRCReconfiguation |
| Apple | b | Furthermore, we think that specifying multiple signalling options would be the worst. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | a, c | Agree prefer that response should use a new RRC message |
| ZTE | A c | We see the latest RAN1-related running CR uses a new IE and that is clear |
| Xiaomi | a c |  |
| Intel | A and C | For request, RRCreconfiguration can be used;  For response, no strong opinion on whether a new message or UAI to be used.  We can leave it to RRC running CR Rapporteur. So far new message is introduced, i.e option C. |
| CATT | a c | The request can be configured in SRS-Config from gNB, and the response can be a new RRC message to gNB. |
| Nokia | A and C | It makes sense to configure the reporting of TEG association to SRS-P as part of SRS-Config IE. For the response, it is better to have a new RRC message to isolate the assistance information for positioning from the UEAssistanceInformation message. That message is already serving too many purposes. |
| vivo | a  b or c | Either b or c is acceptable for the response. Agree with Apple that no need to introduce it in multiple RRC messages. |
| Ericsson | C | Unfortunately, b does not work as b does not support periodic reporting and only trigger based which then needs to be defined as part of OtherConfig in RRC. |

2). Which RRC message for configured periodicity report?

There are options of configured periodicity report according to the contributions and discussion at 116bis-e meeting:

**Option a) UE TxTEG Report Config in SRS-Config IE to configure reporting (request)**

**Option b) RRC UEAssistanceInformation (response)**

**Option c) New RRC message (response)**

**Option d) RRCReconfigurationComplete (response)**

**Question 4: Which signaling option you prefer for configured periodicity report of association of UL SRS resources with UE TxTEG via RRC? Please provide your preference for signalling details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | c | I don't think a periodic report is needed, since this information may not change often. A report when the TxTEG changes should be sufficient. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C | There is no existing RRC message that can be proper for reuse here. |
| Apple | other | Similarly to QC, we don’t see the need for periodic reporting at all. RAN1 are very clear in their LS (which is unfortunately badly formulated) that what they really need is the reporting when such association changes only. Hence periodic reporting would be a waste of signaling and air interface resources. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | A,c | If there is a need for periodic reporting. |
| ZTE | A c | Periodic report is needed in RRC. If a lot of SRSs are configured and if no periodic resources, UE will be triggered more than once for each change (first SR - resource allocation on the network side - upload) with large delay and resource waste.  If the association has a slow change, NW can configure a larger periodicity |
| Xiaomi | a c |  |
| Intel | A and C | For request, RRCreconfiguration can be used;  For response, no strong opinion on whether a new message or UAI to be used.  We can leave it to RRC running CR Rapporteur. So far new message is introduced, i.e option C. |
| CATT | a c | Clarifications on the report:  Only the change of TxTEG will be reported in the configured periodicity report. The report seems an event trigger report when the associated TxTEG changes. However too many RRC message indicating the change to gNB without the configured periodicity report if the change of TxTEG in some UEs are too frequent. It will bring a disaster to network.  So UE only can report the change at the moment when the report is permitted by the configuration. Take the EventTriggerConfig for example, the reportInterval and reportAmount is configured for event report.  EventTriggerConfig::= SEQUENCE {  eventId CHOICE {  …  },  rsType NR-RS-Type,  reportInterval ReportInterval,  reportAmount ENUMERATED {r1, r2, r4, r8, r16, r32, r64, infinity},  reportQuantityCell MeasReportQuantity,  maxReportCells INTEGER (1..maxCellReport),  ..., |
| Nokia | A and C | Same comment as for Question 3. |
| vivo | a  b or c | Either b or c is acceptable for the response. Agree with Apple that no need to introduce it in multiple RRC messages.  Besides, we think the two modes can be supported with a unified RRC design, i.e., reportAmount equals 1 indicates a single request/response mode. |
| Ericsson | A | A can be used; as agreed by RAN1 there is periodic reporting for UL-TDOA procedure. That is gNB can configure the periodical reporting as part of SRS-Config. |

3). What are the values of the configurable periodicities?

It was discussed by both CATT in R2-2200300 and Ericsson in R2-2201069. The values of configurable periodicities are both proposed to config in *SRS-Config* IE as the below values:

UE-TxTEG-ReportConfig ::= SEQUENCE {

reportAmount-r17 ENUMERATED {r1, r2, r4, r8, r16, r32, r64, infinity},

reportingInterval-r17 ENUMERATED {noPeriodicalReporting, ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240, ms20480, NULL1, NULL2, NULL3, NULL4},

...

----------Editor Notes: reportingInterval-r17 should be discussed by RAN2.

}

txTEG-PeriodicalReporting ENUMERATED {ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240} OPTIONAL -- Need R

**Option a): noPeriodicalReporting, ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240, ms20480**

**Option b): ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240**

**Question 5: Which option do you prefer for of the configurable periodicities on report of association of UL SRS resources with UE TxTEG via RRC? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | other | If periodic reporting is required, the reporting interval should be aligned with the SRS periodicity. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | b | Not clear there should be value of noPeriodicReporting. If the intention is for a single request and response, the value of report amountcan be set to 1 |
| Apple | Other | As we explained above, periodic reporting is not needed. It should rather be event-triggered. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | b | Ok with b |
| ZTE | b |  |
| Xiaomi | b |  |
| Intel | Other | Tend to agree with Qualcomm the reporting intervals should be aligned with SRS periodicity. |
| CATT | b | Only the change of TxTEG will be reported in the periodic report. reportAmount and reportingInterval are still required in event trigger configuration. reportingInterval can be larger than SRS periodicity because the changes will be recorded with stamp.  We also agree with Huawei that the value of noPeriodicReporting can be deleted because reportAmount can be set as 1 to require single request and response. |
| OPPO | a | We should leave a possibility that the report is one-shot, where noPeriodicalReporting should be set. Option b seems not able to achieve this target. |
| Nokia |  | I am not sure if we can randomly choose some values like this. To us, the periodicity of reporting should take into account how often the UE Tx TEG can change and impacts to latency. With regards to the former, RAN1 said RAN4 should decide when the Tx TEG association is changes. So, we can leave this issue of value range for reporting interval for periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG FFS pending RAN4 decision. |
| vivo | b | noPeriodicalReporting is not needed as the reportAmount can be 1.  As to QC’s comment, we think the interval can be longer than the SRS periodicity as the TxTEG report may include a list of associations for multi SRS. |
| Ericsson | B | As SRS periodicity may be based upon order of ten milliseconds; for such periodicity if RRC UL message Tx is not a good design option; i.e RRC may not be suitable.  One option is to align it with gNB RxTx measurement; and the options a and b does so.  Further from RAN1 agreement it is clear it is periodical reporting that is needed.   * *For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:*   + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period* |

4). How to config the request of association information of UL SRS resources?

the ***UE-TxTEG-ReportConfig***  IE indicates that both single response and periodic reporting is requested and comprises the following subfields:

- ***reportingAmount*** indicates the number of periodic location information reports requested. Enumerated values correspond to 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, or infinite/indefinite number of reports. If the *reportingAmount* is '*infinite/indefinite'*, the target device shou-ld continue periodic reporting until the SRS is released. The value 'r1' indicates the single request/response.

- ***reportingInterval*** indicates the interval between the second RRC message which reports UE TxTEG association and the first report UE TxTEG association. The value '*noPeriodicalReporting*' indicates the single request/response.

UE-TxTEG-ReportConfig ::= SEQUENCE {

reportingAmount-r17 ENUMERATED {r1, r2, r4, r8, r16, r32, r64, infinity, NULL1, NULL2, NULL3, NULL4},

reportingInterval-r17 ENUMERATED {noPeriodicalReporting, ms120, ms240, ms480, ms640, ms1024, ms2048, ms5120, ms10240, ms20480, NULL1, NULL2, NULL3, NULL4},

...

}

**Question 6: Do you agree the reportingAmount and reportingInterval to config the UE TxTEG for both single request / report and configured periodicity report? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | *reportingAmount* cannot be predicted. The TEGs are needed for the duration of the positioning session/SRS transmission.  See also our response to Questions 4 and 5. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No , see comments | Ok with reporting Interval, but how to obtain the reporting amount is unclear. |
| ZTE | No with reportingAmount, yes with reportingInterval | Agree with QC that *reportingAmount* cannot be predicted. As we mentioned before periodic report is needed in RRC to reduce delay and radio resources when lots of SRS is configured and association needs to be reported |
| Xiaomi |  | Fine with reportingInterval. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Only the change of TxTEG will be reported which seems an event trigger report.  Take the EventTriggerConfig for example, the reportInterval and reportAmount is required in EventTriggerConfig. |
| OPPO |  | At least one-shot reporting should be supported |
| Nokia | Yes, with comments | IE structure is fine but not sure if a *reportingAmount* to limit the periodic reporting to a finite duration is needed. This looks like an additional functionality than what RAN1 LS indicated must be done for periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG. |
| vivo | Yes | If the gNB can not predict a precise amount, the value of reportAmount can be infinity. |
| Ericsson |  | txTEG-PeriodicalReporting should be considered periodical until SRS is released.: i.e it should not be limited to only 2 reports (1st and 2nd) but it is periodic until SRS is released. |

5). How to indicate the association information of UL SRS resources for positioning with Tx TEGs?

It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps) [1].

The change is explained by vivo in R2-2200330 [8]: The following Figure 2 shows a simple example. It is observed that in SRS instance 1, 2 SRS resources associated with the same Tx TEG, namely, {SRS resource 0→Tx TEG0; SRS resource 1→Tx TEG0}; however, in SRS instance 2, due to the UE flips, the Tx TEG association information is changed, namely, {SRS resource 0→Tx TEG0; SRS resource 1→Tx TEG1}. After that, the Tx TEG association does not change till SRS instance 5.



**Figure 2 UE Tx TEG(s) change associated with SRS resource(s)**

Assuming the UE reports the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources periodically as Figure 3.



**Figure 3 periodical Tx TEG change report**

That’s the reason why RAN1 recommend the timestamp to *indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period.*

There are two options on how to indicate the the change of the Tx TEG association from two companies [8] [7]:

**Option a: Indication of associationInformationChange is introduced [8]**

|  |
| --- |
| TxTEGAssociationInformation ::= SEQUENCE {  srs-ResourceId SRS-ResourceId,  initialTEG INTEGER (1.. maxNrofTEG), OPTIONAL,  associationInformationChange CHOICE {  noChange ENUMERATED { true } OPTIONAL,  tegChangeList SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofChange)) OF TEGChange OPTIONAL,  }  TEGChange ::= SEQUENCE {  changedTEG INTEGER (1.. maxNrofTEG),  timeStamp INTEGER (0..maxPeriod),  } |

**Option b: Each of association information of UL SRS resources with timestamp [7]**

UE-TxTEG-Report-v17xy-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {

ue-TxTEG-UL-TDOA-r17 UE-TxTEG-UL-TDOA-r17 OPTIONAL,

nonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL

}

UE-TxTEG-UL-TDOA ::= SEQUENCE {

ue-TxTEG-List-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1.. maxueTxTEGReport-r17)) OF UE-TxTEG-r17-IEs

}

----------Editor Notes: maxueTxTEGReport-r17 depend on the configurable period and should be discussed by RAN2.

UE-TxTEG-r17-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-TimeStamp-r17 NR-TimeStamp-r17 OPTIONAL,

ueTxTEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0.. maxNumOfUE-TxTEG-1-r17),

srs-PosResourceAssociationBitmap-r17 BIT STRING (SIZE (64)) OPTIONAL,

...

}

maxueTxTEGReport-r17 ::= INTEGER FFS

NR-TimeStamp-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-SFN-r17 INTEGER (0..1023),

nr-Slot-r17 CHOICE {

scs15-r17 INTEGER (0..9),

scs30-r17 INTEGER (0..19),

scs60-r17 INTEGER (0..39),

scs120-r17 INTEGER (0..79)

},

...

}

maxNumOfUE-TxTEG-1-r17 INTEGER ::= 7

Option b seems more straightforward to report the association of UE TxTEG and complete the whole ASN.1 design. Since each change with timestamp during the report period can be recorded in *ue-TxTEG-List-r17*, it seems no need to indicate the change additionally.

**Option a): Indication of associationInformationChange is introduced**

**Option b): Each of association information of UL SRS resources with timestamp**

***Question* 7: Which option do you prefer for the change of the Tx TEG association report during the configured period? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | b | A simple timestamp should be sufficient, and probaly needed anyhow since RAN1 agreement says: "UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning **that have already been transmitted** during the configured period". I.e., the timestamps are about something that happened in the past, and there is "no commitment" about the future (which is impossible anyhow; see also our response to Question 6). |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | B in principle | Option a is too complicated, and use of “no change” in delta signaling will create dependency across multiple UL RRC messages, which is not robust.  For b), we think the use of bitmap to indicate the associated resources requires further discussion. In fact, it is not clear how SRS in different CCs are mapped to the bitmap. |
| Apple | A in principle | We think that what RAN1 are really after is only the indication when the association changes. If that’s the case, what would be the use of a timestamp? The network would know the time when such indication is received from a UE anyway. |
| ZTE | Option b | Agree with rapporteur option b is straightforward. For one periodicity, the timestamp indicates when Tx TEG associated with the SRS resource has changed. |
| Xiaomi | Option b |  |
| Intel | B | Agree with Qualcomm and Huawei, b is simple. |
| CATT | Option b |  |
| OPPO | b | Dependency across multiple UL RRC message should be avoided, which requires memory overhead at both UE and gNB. |
| Nokia | None | For Rel-17, we can simply live with periodic reporting and oneshot (request/response)/on-demand reporting of UE Tx TEG that allows gNB to get the up-to-date information. Periodicity of reporting can be decided based on what RAN4 decides about when UE Tx TEG changes.  Also, in RAN4 LS R4-22026585 they say that RAN4 agreed:  The UE Tx TEG association between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning is up to UE implementation, so it is not necessary nor practical to define the condition when the TEG association is changed. |
| vivo | A | B is not simple with a small amount of SRS with different periodicities.  A is straightway to fulfill the following RAN1 request:   * + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period*   There is no robustness issue for delta signaling with initial TEG in each report.  Besides, the gNB TX TEG info is also per PRS resource, we prefer to align them.  A can updated as follows:  UE-TxTEG-Report-v17xy-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {  ueTxTEG-AssociationList-r17 UETxTEG-AssociationList-r17 OPTIONAL,  nonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL  }  UE-TxTEG-AssoiciationList-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1.. maxNrofSRS-PosResources-r16)) OF UETxTEG-AssoiciationPerSRS-r17  UETxTEG-AssoiciationPerSRS ::= SEQUENCE {  srs-PosResourceId-r16 SRS-PosResourceId-r16,  initialTEG INTEGER (1.. maxNumOfUE-TxTEG),  associationInformationChange CHOICE {  noChange ENUMERATED { true } OPTIONAL,  tegChangeList SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofChange)) OF TEGChange OPTIONAL,  }  TEGChange ::= SEQUENCE {  changedTEG INTEGER (1.. maxNumOfUE-TxTEG),  nr-TimeStamp-r17 NR-TimeStamp-r17,  }  NR-TimeStamp-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-SFN-r17 INTEGER (0..1023),  nr-Slot-r17 CHOICE {  scs15-r17 INTEGER (0..9),  scs30-r17 INTEGER (0..19),  scs60-r17 INTEGER (0..39),  scs120-r17 INTEGER (0..79)  },  ...  } |
| Ericsson | b | Option A is optimization and not needed. RAN1 has asked for periodical reporting.   * *For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:*   + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period* |

### Broadcast of TRP Tx TEG info

The agreement has been reached after the online discussion at 116bis-e meeting as below:

Agreements:

Proposal 2.1-3: to include the association information of DL PRS resources with TRP Tx TEG ID in posSIB.

This open issue is recored in Report of email discussion [Post116bis-e][634][POS] Positioning open issues list (Intel) [3]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support of broadcast signalling;  FFS whether existing posSIB or new posSIB should be used | **Status**: Discussion see R2-2201768. check the status of LPP email discussion 116bis-628, check the status of RRC email discussion 116bis-631 |

The existing posSIB can be found as below. The existing posSIB for UE-Based is *NR-UEB-TRP-LocationData* and *NR-UEB-TRP-RTD-Info.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| NR DL-TDOA/DL-AoD Assistance Data (clauses 6.4.3, 7.4.2) | *posSibType6-1* | *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData* |
| *posSibType6-2* | *NR-UEB-TRP-LocationData* |
| *posSibType6-3* | *NR-UEB-TRP-RTD-Info* |

LPP CR rapporteur proposed that new posSIB:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| NR DL-TDOA/DL-AoD Assistance Data (clauses 6.4.3, 7.4.2) | *posSibType6-5* | *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* |
|  |  |

**Option a): existing posSIB *NR-UEB-TRP-LocationData* or *NR-UEB-TRP-RTD-Info* for the TRP Tx TEG info.**

**Option b): new *posSibType6-5* *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* for the TRP Tx TEG info.**

**Question 8: Which option do you prefer for** **TRP Tx TEG for broadcast? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | If *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* is kept separate: Option (b)  If *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* is moved to *NR-UEB-TRP-RTD-Info*: Option (a) (obviously)  In general, different info should be in different posSIBs. Different posSIBs can be mapped to the same posSI message. The UE would know from the scheduling info what is provided in a posSI before reading the posSI. If the TRP Tx TEG-Info is incldued in *NR-UEB-TRP-LocationData*, a UE would only know whether the *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* is provided or not after the UE had obtained and decoded the whole posSI. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | b |  |
| Apple | b |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | b |  |
| ZTE | b |  |
| Xiaomi | b |  |
| Intel | B |  |
| CATT | b |  |
| OPPO | b |  |
| Nokia | See comments | The TEG enhancement is for timing measurement-based methods only. Not for DL-AoD method. So, the posSIB type that is used (new or existing) should clarify this point. Using an existing posSIB type 6-1 is preferred if it would avoid adding one more posSIB type to the already long list of posSIBs. TEG info is better suited to be placed in posSibType6-1 since it is like a PRS assistance data. TEG info can be optional to make it usable only when TEG enhancement feature is deployed in the network. |
| vivo | b |  |

The definition of *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* can be found as below according to the running CR [5]:

*– NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info*

The IE *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* is used by the location server to provide the association information of DL-PRS Resources with TRP Tx TEGs.

– *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info*

The IE *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* is used by the location server to provide the association information of DL-PRS Resources with TRP Tx TEGs.

-- ASN1START

NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..nrMaxFreqLayers-r16)) OF

NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-InfoPerFreqLayer-r17

NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-InfoPerFreqLayer-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..nrMaxTRPsPerFreq-r16)) OF

NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-InfoPerTRP-r17

NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-InfoPerTRP-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL, -- Need ON

dl-PRS-TEG-InfoSet-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxSetsPerTrpPerFreqLayer-r16)) OF

DL-PRS-TEG-InfoPerResource-r17,

...

}

DL-PRS-TEG-InfoPerResource-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxResourcesPerSet-r16)) OF

DL-PRS-TEG-InfoElement-r17

DL-PRS-TEG-InfoElement-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

dl-prs-trp-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfgNB-TxTEGs-1-r17),

...

}

-- ASN1STOP

|  |
| --- |
| *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* field descriptions |
| ***dl-PRS-ID***  This field specifies the DL-PRS ID of the TRP for which the TRP Tx TEG information is provided. |
| ***nr-PhysCellID***  This field specifies the physical Cell-ID of the TRP for which the TRP Tx TEG information is provided, as defined in TS 38.331 [35]. |
| ***nr-CellGlobalID***  This field specifies the NCGI, the globally unique identity of a cell in NR, of the TRP for which the TRP Tx TEG information is provided, as defined in TS 38.331 [35]. |
| ***nr-ARFCN***  This field specifies the NR-ARFCN of the TRP's CD-SSB (as defined in TS 38.300 [47]) corresponding to *nr-PhysCellID*. |
| ***dl-PRS-TEG-InfoSet***  This field specifies the TRP Tx TEG ID associated with the transmissions of each DL-PRS Resource of the TRP. It follows the resource association of this DL-PRS Resource of the TRP. |

One comment was captured in R2-2201722 Summary of [Post116bis-e][628][POS] 37.355 running CR (Qualcomm) [4]: Association between DL-PRS assistance data and NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info should be clarified. This may apply to some similar Rel-16 elements as well, since there is no resourceSetID and resourceID in nr-PositionCalculationAssistance-r16. So nr-PositionCalculationAssistance-r16 follows the association (resourceSetID and resourceID) info in nr-DL-PRS-Info-r16.

**Question 9: Do companies agree the definition and description of NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info for broadcast? Please provide your preference for details for your favourable option in the comments column.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | This is independent on broadcast and should be added as a NOTE on top of all similar IEs. The proposed text would also need clarification/improvement, since it is not clear what "It follows…" mean. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | For both dedicate signalling and broadcasting |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel |  | Tend to agree “It follows the resource association of this DL-PRS Resource of the TRP.” Is not clear. |
| CATT | Yes with comments | The description of dl-PRS-TEG-InfoSet can be polished as: “the resource association of *dl-PRS-TEG-InfoSet* is the same as DL-PRS Resource of this TRP”. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Agree, but the placement of the TEI association information IE i.e., in which posSIB needs to be decided first based on Question 8. The *NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* IE described above seems to assume it will be in a new posSibType6-5. |
| vivo | See comments | dl-prs-trp-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 -> dl-PRS-TRP-Tx-TEG-ID-r17  The proposed text can be revised as :  The dl-PRS-TRP-Tx-TEG-ID in dl-PRS-TEG-InfoSet is associated with the nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID of NR-DL-PRS-Info using the same structure and order. |

### Whenther and how to restrict the PRS number in *NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17*

This open issue is recorded by Summary of [Post116bis-e][628][POS] 37.355 running CR (Qualcomm) in R2-2201722 [4].

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R1-13 | The maximum number of DL PRS resources per target TRP in a measurement report is still limited to 4. | For the NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17, the maximum number of DL PRS resources per target TRP in a measurement report is still limited to 4. How to restrict the PRS number shall be discussed. | NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17 | vivo(132) |

According to the RAN1 agreement, the number of DL PRS resources per target TRP in a measurement report is still limited to 4 as in Rel-16 as below:

**Agreement (RAN1#107-e)**

* The maximum number of reported RSTD measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG per target TRP is 4.
  + The target TRP can be the same as the RSTD reference TRP or a neighbor TRP
  + Note: The number of DL PRS resources per target TRP in a measurement report is still limited to 4 as in Rel-16.

The following options can be taken based on the companies’ input.

**Option a): revise the structure of report measurement as a measurement list per PRS resource;**

**Option b): introduce a restriction in the field description.**

**Question 10: Which options do companies agree on restricting the PRS number per target TRP in a measurement report? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option (b), if needed | I don't see a strong need for this, since this is the case in Rel-16 and I don't see why Rel-17 implementations should suddenly change. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Neither | No need to capture it in RAN2 specification.  RAN1 can handle it. |
| Apple |  | We are not sure anything is needed |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | See comments | Seems to follow the Rel-16 restriction in any case. |
| Xiaomi |  | No need to introduce additional mechanism. |
| Intel | Option b if needed. | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| CATT | Neither | Agree with Huawei. RAN1 can handle it. |
| Nokia | B, with comments | Option A is not very clear as to what the change is. Restrictions indicated through field description are always possible. Resolution for issue R1-13 can be implemented by specifying the UE behaviour as part of a field description |
| vivo | Option b | In Rel-16, the maximum number is restricted as follows:  NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..3)) OF  NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16  At least the description needs to be introduced to represent the RAN1agreement. |
|  |  |  |

### Support of RSTD measurements from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG

Two companies proposed the samilar design of RSTD measurements from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG[7][5]. Please find design in the running CR in R2-2201723 as below high light with yellow:

NR-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16

NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,

nr-RSTD-r16 CHOICE {

k0-r16 INTEGER (0..1970049),

k1-r16 INTEGER (0..985025),

k2-r16 INTEGER (0..492513),

k3-r16 INTEGER (0..246257),

k4-r16 INTEGER (0..123129),

k5-r16 INTEGER (0..61565),

...

},

nr-AdditionalPathList-r16 NR-AdditionalPathList-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimingQuality-r16 NR-TimingQuality-r16,

nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result-r16 INTEGER (0..126) OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurements-r16

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17) OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-Result-r17 INTEGER (0..FFS) OPTIONAL,

nr-los-nlos-Indicator-r17 LOS-NLOS-Indicator-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 NR-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17 OPTIONAL

]]

}

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..3)) OF

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxAddMeasTDOA-r17)) OF

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16

NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,

nr-RSTD-ResultDiff-r16 CHOICE {

k0-r16 INTEGER (0..8191),

k1-r16 INTEGER (0..4095),

k2-r16 INTEGER (0..2047),

k3-r16 INTEGER (0..1023),

k4-r16 INTEGER (0..511),

k5-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

...

},

nr-TimingQuality-r16 NR-TimingQuality-r16,

nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r16 INTEGER (0..61) OPTIONAL,

nr-AdditionalPathList-r16 NR-AdditionalPathList-r16 OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17) OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-ResultDiff-r17

INTEGER (0..FFS) OPTIONAL,

nr-los-nlos-Indicator-r17 LOS-NLOS-Indicator-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 NR-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 OPTIONAL

]]

}

-- ASN1STOP

The updated description of *nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID* based on the running CR in R2-2201723 and combine the restriction of maximum number of reported RSTD measurements in R2-2200300:

|  |
| --- |
| ***nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID***  This field provides the ID of the UE Rx TEG associated with the TOA measurement. Note, the TOA measurement refers to the TOA of this neighbour TRP or the reference TRP, as applicable, used to determine the *nr-RSTD* or *nr-RSTD-ResultDiff*. When LMF request to measure the same DL PRS with different UE Rx TEGs for RSTD measurements, the maximum number of reported RSTD measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG per target TRP is 4. |

**Question 11: Do companies agree the above stage-3 design of RSTD measurements from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG? Please also provide a brief comment for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | I'm not sure I understand the issue. This seems rather obvious? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | No | The description seems ambiguous.  If the LMF request to measure the same DL PRS with different UE RX TEGs for RSTD measurement, the restriction should be forced on the number of reported RSTD measurements obtained from different UE Rx TEGs per target TRP per DL PRS. Suggesting to improving the wording to make it clear. |
| Nokia | Yes | Is there a LMF to UE signalling impact for “*LMF request to measure the same DL PRS with different UE Rx TEGs for RSTD measurements*”? |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Better to extend the current bits; then creating a new IE |

### Support of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG/ RxTx TEG

Two companies proposed the samilar design of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG/ RxTx TEG [7][5]. Please find the updated and combined design based on the running CR in R2-2201723 high light with yellow and R2-2200300:

NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-Multi-RTT-MeasElement-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-UE-RxTxTimeDiff-r16 CHOICE {

k0-r16 INTEGER (0..1970049),

k1-r16 INTEGER (0..985025),

k2-r16 INTEGER (0..492513),

k3-r16 INTEGER (0..246257),

k4-r16 INTEGER (0..123129),

k5-r16 INTEGER (0..61565),

...

},

nr-AdditionalPathList-r16 NR-AdditionalPathList-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,

nr-TimingQuality-r16 NR-TimingQuality-r16,

nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result-r16 INTEGER (0..126) OPTIONAL,

nr-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurements-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 OPTIONAL,

...,

[[

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-Result-r17 INTEGER (0..FFS) OPTIONAL,

nr-los-nlos-Indicator-r17 LOS-NLOS-Indicator-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 NR-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17 OPTIONAL

]]

}

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..3)) OF

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxAddMeasRTT-r17)) OF

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16

NR-Multi-RTT-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r16 INTEGER (0..61) OPTIONAL,

nr-UE-RxTxTimeDiffAdditional-r16 CHOICE {

k0-r16 INTEGER (0..8191),

k1-r16 INTEGER (0..4095),

k2-r16 INTEGER (0..2047),

k3-r16 INTEGER (0..1023),

k4-r16 INTEGER (0..511),

k5-r16 INTEGER (0..255),

...

},

nr-TimingQuality-r16 NR-TimingQuality-r16,

nr-AdditionalPathList-r16 NR-AdditionalPathList-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,

...,

[[

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-DL-PRS-FirstPathRSRP-ResultDiff-r17

INTEGER (0..FFS) OPTIONAL,

nr-los-nlos-Indicator-r17 LOS-NLOS-Indicator-r17 OPTIONAL,

nr-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 NR-AdditionalPathListExt-r17 OPTIONAL

]]

}

NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-ue-RxTx-TEG-r17 CHOICE {

case1-r17 SEQUENCE {

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17)

},

case2-r17 SEQUENCE {

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17),

nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17)

},

case3-r17 SEQUENCE {

nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17),

nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17)

},

case4-r17 SEQUENCE {

nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17),

nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17),

nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17)

}, FFS

...

},

...

}

-- ASN1STOP

The updated description of *nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info* based on the running CR in R2-2201723:

|  |
| --- |
| ***nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info***  This field provides the ID(s) of the UE TEG associated with the *nr-UE-RxTxTimeDiff* or*nr-UE-RxTxTimeDiffAdditional* measurement and comprises the following subfields:  - ***srs-PosResourceSetId*** specifies the SRS Resource Set ID as defined in TS 38.331 [35] of the *srs-PosResourceId*'s.  - ***srs-PosResourceId*** specifies the SRS Resource IDs as defined in TS 38.331 [35] belonging to the *nr-ue-RxTx-TEG*.  - ***nr-ue-RxTx-TEG*** specifies the IDs of the UE TEGs and can include one of the following combinations of TEG IDs:  - ***case1*** provides the UE RxTx TEG ID;  - ***case2*** provides the UE RxTx TEG ID together with the UE Tx TEG ID;  - ***case3*** provides the UE Rx TEG ID together with the UE Tx TEG ID;  - ***case4*** provides the UE RxTx TEG ID together with both, the UE Tx TEG ID and UE Rx TEG ID; (FFS)  where the Rx TEG is used to receive the DL-PRS, the Tx TEG is used to transmit the UL SRS for Positioning, and the RxTx TEG is associated with a {DL-PRS Resource, UL SRS for Positioning Resource} pair. |

**Question 12: Do companies agree the above stage-3 design of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG/ RxTx TEG? Please also provide a brief comment for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | With our comment on Question 2, this would need to be revised, since the *nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17* is not needed anymore. However, the 4-cases should be kept simplifying the request and capabilities. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | In principle OK | According to our reply in Q2, we think that SRS resource ID related info should be outside the per-TRP information, then the field description should remove *srs-PosResourceSetId* and *srs-PosResourceId* to align with the change in ASN.1.  In addition, case 4 should be removed, since there is no such use case to report three IDs (also not agreed by RAN1). |
| Apple | OK in principle |  |
| ZTE |  | SRS and Tx TEG association is already provided in Q2. for this maybe only RxTx TEG ID and Rx TEG ID should be provided additionally |
| Intel | See comments | Agree with Huawei. |
| CATT | OK in principle | SRS resource ID related info is already removed in this version. The case4 can be deleted unless there is a RAN1 LS to indicate the case4. |
| OPPO | agree | Suggest keeping the SRS resource ID related info in the ASN.1 to keep aligned with RAN1 decision. |
| Nokia | See comments | It is confusing to map this ASN.1 implementation to the RAN1 agreements but it looks like all 4 cases mentioned in the CHOICE structure are in the RAN1 agreements list. But, if different combinations of RxTx TEG, Rx TEG and Tx TEG are possible then why not have all 3 as OPTIONAL and in the field description mention the allowed combinations, instead of a CHOICE structure? |
| vivo |  | Agree with the above to remove the Tx TEG info. |

### Support of RTOA measurements obtained from different UL SRS resources for positioning per TRP Rx TEG

Although this open issue is recorded in Report of email discussion [Post116bis-e][634][POS] Positioning open issues list (Intel), it belongs to RAN3 business and won’t be discussed here.

### Support of gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements

Although this open issue is recorded in Report of email discussion [Post116bis-e][634][POS] Positioning open issues list (Intel), it belongs to RAN3 business and won’t be discussed here:

* Support of gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different UL SRS resources per TRP Rx TEG
* Support of gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different UL SRS resources per TRP RxTx TEG

## 3.2 DL-AoD enhancement

### 3.2.1 Beam/Antanna information

As for the beam/antenna information interaction between LMF and UE, RAN2 made the following agreements, with details are FFS now.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Proposal 2.1-1: enhance LPP assistance data signalling to allow UE to request and LMF to provide TRP beam/antenna information.** |

* ***UE request of the TRP beam/antenna information***

Based on the current running CR of TS37.355, a new IE *PosCalcAssistanceRequest* is introduced for the positioning calculation related assistance information that can be requested by UE for UE-based positioning. However, some companies point out that the new *PosCalcAssistanceRequest* is not needed, since the LMF will provide the assistance data to the UE that supports the beam/antenna info for UE-based positioning, that is the legacy nr-AdType is enough with the value 'posCalc'.

-- ASN1START

NR-DL-TDOA-RequestAssistanceData-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL,

nr-AdType-r16 BIT STRING { dl-prs (0),

posCalc (1) } (SIZE (1..8)),

...,

[[

nr-PosCalcAssistanceRequest-r17 BIT STRING { trpLoc (0),

beamInfo (1),

rtdInfo (2),

beamAntInfo (3),

losNlosInfo (4),

trpTEG-Info (5)

} (SIZE (1..8)) OPTIONAL,

nr-on-demand-DL-PRS-Request-r17 NR-On-Demand-DL-PRS-Request-r17 OPTIONAL

]]

}

-- ASN1STOP

**Question 13: Do companies agree that the new R17 PosCalcAssistanceRequest for the positioning calculation related assistance information that can be requested by UE for UE-based positioning is needed? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Since there are now also more "advanced" assistance data possible, a UE may not need all UE-based assistance data in all situations. A simple differentiation between "UE-assisted" (dl-prs) and "UE-based" (posCalc) would be sub-optimal/inefficient. For example, for "low QoS" a UE may not need the TRP TEGs; or a UE may not need both, bore-sight beam directions and antenna pattern at the same time, etc. Or a UE may have some assistance data already stored from previous session and/or broadcast, etc. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | TRPlocation, beam info and RTD info are introduced in R16. Why R17 CR should include it? If considered beneficial, should be discussed under R16 CR correction.  Also for R16, there is no such request for UE-based DLTDOA and DLAoD, not sure why such request should be added for R17 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Provides a unfied structure for both R16 and R17 assistance data that may be applied for UE-based positioning. |
| ZTE | No | Why does UE need to ask for such calculating information? If UE has the related high capability(reported in advance), LMF will naturally send UE the advanced calculating information.  Also in previous specs UE does not ask information for calculating position no matter the UE is of high or low capability. |
| Xiaomi | No | In rel-16, there is no such request from UE, and it is a reasonable assumption that LMF will provide this information to UE based on positioning mode and UE capability. |
| Intel | Yes | Based on agreements “**Proposal 2.1-1: enhance LPP assistance data signalling to allow UE to request and LMF to provide TRP beam/antenna information.**”, Should not we already agreed this?, i.e. Yes. |
| CATT | No | In R16, there is no such request from UE for UE-based DL-TDOA and DL-AOD, we are wondering why it is needed R17 now?. |
| OPPO | No | PosCalcAssistanceRequest is not needed |
| Nokia | Yes, with comments | The RAN2 agreement quoted above, i.e., Proposal 2.1-1, allows UE to request the LMF for beam/antenna information. So, in principle we agree that signaling support like the one shown here is needed. However, this section is about DL-AoD enhancement but the ASN.1 shown is for DL-TDOA. In LPP CR, there is also the NR-DL-AoD-RequestAssistanceData which includes nr-PosCalcAssistanceRequest-r17. We agree with that. Since this question is about beam/antenna information, we assume the relevancy of discussion is about beamAntInfo bit in nr-PosCalcAssistanceRequest bitstring. |
| vivo | No | We think agreement 2.1-1 is for Advanced DL-AoD beam information only. Other common enhancements shall be discussed in R16 TEI if essential. |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comment | Agree with Nokia |

Further, as for the new R17 *PosCalcAssistanceRequest*, the first three bits, i.e., the bit 0 of trpLoc, the bit 1 of beamInfo and the bit 2 of rtdInfo, refer to the positioning assistance information introduced in Rel-16. According to email rapporteur’s view, the R17 positioning calculation assistance information request should include the R16 information.

**Question 14: Do companies agree that the new R17 PosCalcAssistanceRequest should not be used to request the R16 positioning calculation assistance information? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | See comment to Question 13. This is already sub-optimal in Rel-16, since for DL-AoD for example, a UE may usually not need the RTD's (but RTD's would be needed for hybrid DL-AoD and DL-TDOA), etc.. Different use cases may require different sets of assistance data.  This is in principle not different compared to e.g., A-GNSS assistance data request. |
| Huawei, HiSiclion | Yes | See our comments to Q13 |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | Agree with Rapporteur’s view |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi |  | See our comments to Q13 that the PosCalcAssistanceRequest is not needed. |
| Intel | No |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | No | Seems an unnecessary enhancement on top of R16 spec. |
| Nokia | No i.e., UE can request R16 assistance info | LPP rapporteur can clarify this but my understanding is, UE can now request specific items in NR-PositionCalculationAssistance. Earlier, the UE could only request everything as a whole that was defined under NR-PositionCalculationAssistance. If this level of granularity for the UE request is needed, then some clarification can be provided whether the old posCalc bit in nr-AdType field can be used from Rel-17 or not. Given that additional info like beam/antenna info, expected LoS/NLoS and TEG info are now added to NR-PositionCalculationAssistance, it makes sense to allow UE to ask for specific info from NR-PositionCalculationAssistance. |
| vivo | Yes | The first three bits is not needed. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

Besides, in the current running CR, a unified *nr-PosCalcAssistanceRequest-r17* and *nr-PosCalcAssistanceSupport-r17* is introduced for both DL-TDOA and DL-AOD. However based on RAN1 agreement, the beam/antenna information request is only supported in UE-based DL-AOD. In this sense, we may need to restrict the UE request of beam/antenna information only for DL-AOD.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD:  • Support gNB providing the beam/antenna information to the LMF.  o The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD |

Further, the rtdInfo and trpTEG-Info are only applicable to TDOA related positioning method, and not applicable to DL-AOD.

Based on above analysis, it is better to use different bit map/request for DL-TDOA and DL-AoD, and also the bit map/support indication for DL-TDOA and DL-AoD.

**Question 15: Do companies agree that the new R17 bit map/request, and also the bit map/support indication for DL-TDOA and DL-AoD should be different? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | It's already the same in Rel-16. Position calculation is often "hybrid". Which assistance data are needed for position calculation depends on UE implementation and use case. See also comemnt to Question 14. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | See Q13 |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | See comments | Separate bit map/requests is reasonable if the UE requests for ADs if separate positioning methods are used. In the case of requesting AD for hybrid positioning, its more natural if they bit map/request and bit map/support indication are the same for both DL-TDoA and DL-AoD. |
| ZTE |  | Same principle as Q13 |
| Xiaomi |  | See our comments to Q13 |
| Intel | No | No strong opinion on whether common or different highlevel IE should be used. We just need to ensure, the network shall not ask TEG if DL-AoD is used. But it does not mean separate IE must be used. |
| CATT |  | See Q13 |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Nokia | Yes, in-principle | Agree that beam/antenna info is a DL-AoD enhancement and TEG info is for timing measurement-based methods and needs to be clarified in the ASN.1 implementation. |
| vivo | No | The common bit map is not essential. To be specific:  trpLoc (0), not needed;  beamInfo (1), not needed;  rtdInfo (2), not needed;  beamAntInfo (3), for DL-AoD only;  losNlosInfo (4), should be common capability similar with NR-DL-PRS-QCL-ProcessingCapability  trpTEG-Info (5) for DL-TDoA only; |
| Ericsson | Ye |  |

* ***LMF provision of the TRP beam/antenna information***

As for the provision of beam/antenna information from LMF to UE, the following open issues are addressed based on the following RAN2 agreements and running CR of TS37.355:

1. FFS to extend the R16 NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo to include the TRP beam/antenna information or a new IE introduced
2. FFS both the azimuth and elevation can be optional
3. FFS the peak power value that is used as the reference for other resource powers on a specific angle is not provided
4. FFS the value ranges relative power of the DL-PRS Resource

a). FFS to extend the R16 NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo to include the TRP beam/antenna information or a new IE introduced

As for how to provide the beam/antenna information from LMF to UE, either a new IE, e.g., *NR-TRP-BeamAntennaInfo* in running CR of TS37.355, or to extend the R16 NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo, e.g., reuse the frequency layer and TRP specific information, can work.

**Option a: New IE to carry the TRP beam/antenna information, e.g., *NR-TRP-BeamAntennaInfo* in running CR of TS37.355;**

**Option b: Extend the R16** **NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo to carry the TRP beam/antenna information, e.g., reuse the frequency layer and TRP specific information (TRP ID, ARFCN etc.).**

**Question 16: Which options do companies agree on supporting LMF to provide the TRP beam/antenna information to UE? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | (a) | (b) seems not feasible and/or complex, since both have a different purpose:  The existing *NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo* provides the bore-sight direction for each resource of a set of a TRP of a PLF.  The TRP beam/antenna information provides the relative power of PRS Resources per angle per TRP (across sets).  A UE may also not need both assistance data at the same time. In addition, the *NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo* is also needed for UE-assisted DL-AoD. So separating them would also be cleaner. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | b | We suggest to extend the current NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo IE for this. |
| Apple | a |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | a | No strong view, though a is preferred. Although it would seem that R16 NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo may be extended, also share the view that additional complexity may be added to the existing IE for adding the TRP beam/antenna information. |
| ZTE | a | New IE corresponding to new function seems more clear |
| Xiaomi | a |  |
| Intel | b | B is what we did for LTE/NR RRC extension. A is similar to UMTS RRC, i.e. critical extension. But we can follow majority view. |
| CATT | b |  |
| OPPO | a |  |
| Nokia | A | The existing NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo is about spatial direction of PRS resources while the new NR-TRP-BeamAntennaInfo is about relative power level between PRS resources and hence are different information. So, it makes sense to define the TRP beam/antenna info using a new IE as in the current running LPP CR. |
| vivo | b | The new information can be regarded as an extension of R16 Beaminfo. Option a may imply we need to introduce a separate IE for each release. |
| Ericsson | a | B could work as described in R2- 2201066, but probably suboptional. However, the draft signaling in the running CR is not efficient so needs to be analyzed. |

b). FFS both the azimuth and elevation can be optional

One company point out that the both azimuth and elevation can be optional with the understanding that at least one should be provided, with the reason that in Rel-17 linear array was agreed for UL methods, where only elevation angle in the LCS can be useful.

**Question 17: Do companies agree that both the azimuth and elevation within the TRP beam/antenna information from LMF to UE can be optional? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | One angle seems always be needed. For a linear array, one would still need one azimuth angle (e.g., 120 degress) and a list of elevation angles (or the other way around). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For the current form, we think that both azimuth and elevation can be optional with the understanding that at least one should be provided (this is because in Rel-17 linear array was agreed for UL methods, where only elevation angle in the LCS can be useful), and that RAN1 agrees that the peak power value that is used as the reference for other resource powers on a specific angle is not provided |
| Apple | No | Agree with QC |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | Seems either azimuth and/or elevation will be needed |
| ZTE | No | Agree with QC |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| Intel | ? | We can make both optional, and clarify at least one should be provided. |
| CATT |  | Maybe can further check with RAN1. |
| OPPO | no | Agree with QC |
| Nokia | Yes | Fine to have both as optional. |
| vivo | Yes | Agree with intel. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Fine to have both as optional |

c). FFS the peak power value that is used as the reference for other resource powers on a specific angle is not provided

The following agreements were made by RAN1 on TRP beam/antenna information. According to the agreements as highlightend in yellow, it seems that the peak power per angle which is used as the reference for other resource powers on a specific angle is not provded. But since this is RAN1 leading topic, maybe we need to check with RAN1.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  From the RAN1 perspective, for the TRP beam/antenna information to be optionally provided by the LMF to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD:  • The LMF provides the quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.  o The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle  o For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.  o Note: the peak power per angle is not provided  • Note: up to RAN3 to decide how the TRP beam information is provided to the LMF for both UE-assisted and UE-based  • Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3 to decide on the signaling details |

**Question 18: Do companies agree that the peak power value that is used as the reference for other resource powers on a specific angle is not provided, or further check with RAN1? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No/Ask RAN1 | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This is clear from RAN1 agreements. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | This has already been clear in the R1 agreement above  We suggest to adopt the format as shown below because we may target the power difference between PRS resources in a resource set.  NR-PRS-AngleListSet-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1.. nrMaxSetsPerTrpPerFreqLayer-r16)) OF  NR-PRS-AngleElement-r17  NR-PRS-AngleElement-r17 ::= SEQUENCE{  dl-PRS-AoD-r17 INTEGER (0..359) OPTIONAL, -- Need ON  dl-PRS-ZoD-r17 INTEGER (0..180) OPTIONAL, -- Need ON  dl-PRS-ResourceID-Primary-r17 INTEGER (0..63),  dl-PRS-InfoSecondaryList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxPRS-ResourceID-Secondary)) OF DL-PRS-InfoSecondary-r17,  ...  }  DL-PRS-InfoSecondary-r17 ::= SEQUENCE{  dl-PRS-ResourceID-r17 INTEGER (0..63),  dl-PRS-PeakPowerDiff-r17 INTEGER (0..31),  ...  } |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | As per the RAN1 agreements |
| ZTE | Yes | RAN1 indicates clearly that providing the difference is enough |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

d). FFS the value ranges relative power of the DL-PRS Resource

The value ranges of the relative power of DL-PRS resource are now FFS. From email rapporteur’s view, this should be decided by RAN1.

**Question 19: Do companies agree that the value ranges of the relative power of DL-PRS resource should be decided by RAN1? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | No strong view, but this does not look challenging and could also be defined by RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | RAN1/4 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Prefer to let RAN1 decide. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | But then RAN1 should provide input based on an analysis, otherwise, RAN2 could just as well provide this. |

### 3.2.2 DL-AoD positioning with RSRPP

Based on the current running CR, it appears that if RSRPP is reported, UE should always report RSRP. However, some companies argue that in R17, the RSRPP and the RSRP can be both optional, i.e., UE only report RSRPP, but without RSRP to LMF. And if it is, a new variant need to be introduced to carry the optional RR17 RSRP and RSRPP.

**Question 20: Do companies agree that both the RSRPP and RSRP can be optional within the measurement results info provided by UE to LMF for DL-AOD in R17? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | This would create fragmentation of DL-AoD positioning/UEs.  RSRP is the "basic" measurement for DL-AoD and mandatory in Rel-16 for UEs supporting DL-AoD. The RSRPP is an enhancement in Rel-17.  If we would do this, we would have two different versions of DL-AoD. I also cannot see a reason why a UE capable of measuring the RSRPP could not also report the RSRP. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes. | We noticed that RSRP is mandatory for the field *nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result* in *NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement* and for the field *nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff* in *NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement*. At least we can keep the mandatory presence of RSRP in nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result, but for the power measurement from additional PRS resources, there is no such need to also mandate RSRP reporting if RSRPP is requested. |
| Apple | No | Agree with QC, no reason not to provide RSRP |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No | At least RSRP can be mandatory in our view. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with other companies that RSRP is mandatory |
| Xiaomi | No | RSRP is mandatory. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Huawei. We do not touch Rel-16 part. Only for power measurements, we can make it optional. But we can follow majority view. |
| CATT | No | Agree with QC |
| OPPO | No | RSRP is mandatory. |
| Nokia | Yes | RSRPP is subject to UE capability and should be optional and I see it as optional in the current running LPP CR. So, not sure what the issue is here. If in doubt, we should ask RAN1 for clarifications on this issue. |
| vivo | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | Same view as QC |

Further, the value ranges of the RSRPP are now FFS. From email rapporteur’s view, this should be decided by RAN1.

**Question 21: Do companies agree that the value ranges of the RSRPP should be decided by RAN1? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm |  | I think this will be RAN4, and I assume this will be a similar (or even the same) mapping table as the RSRP. We also need an "absolute" and "relative" version (for the additional measurements). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | See RAN4 LS R4-2119414 |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | RAN1/RAN4 |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

### 3.2.3 Expected angle assistance

As for the expected angle value and uncertainty information interaction between LMF and UE, RAN2 made the following agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Proposal 2.1-6: enhance LPP assistance data signalling to allow UE to request and LMF to provide the expected angle value and uncertainty.** |

As for details of the provision of expected angle assistance (expected angel value and uncetainty), the following open issue are addressed.

1. FFS the angle assistance information should be per TRP
2. FFS the angel assistance information should be included in NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataPerTRP-r16 (like expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty)
3. FFS the value ranges and may be decided by RAN1

a). FFS the angle assistance information should be per TRP

**Question 22: Do companies agree that the angle assistance information (expected angel value and uncetainty) should be per TRP? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes | This is a mistake in the current draft LPP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Yes. This is similar to timing search window. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | RAN1 agreements does not mention that expected angle assistance is per TRP but it makes sense that it is per TRP. If in doubt, we should check with RAN1. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

b). FFS the angel assistance information should be included in NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataPerTRP-r16 (like expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty)

Further based on input of Q22, if the angel assistance information shuld be per-TRP, there are two options on providing the expected angel assitstance information to UE:

**Option a: New IE to carry the expected angle assistance information, e.g., *NR-DL-AoD-ExpectedAngleAssistance* in running CR of TS37.355;**

**Option b: Extend the R16 IE NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataPerTRP-r16 to carry the expected angle assistance information (like expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty), with restrictions that it is only applied for DL-AOD positioning method.**

**Question 23: Which options do companies agree on supporting LMF to provide the angel assistance information (expected angel value and uncetainty) to UE? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | a | Different assistance data should be kept separate. It will become confusing/complex if we start merging different assistance data types into DL-PRS assistance data. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option b | To our understanding, this also works for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT, but we can wait for RAN1 on guidance whether this can be useful for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT. |
| Apple |  | No strong view, slight preference for a |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | a | Also prefer a cleaner solution via separate IE |
| ZTE | b | Expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty is only used for DL-TDOA and it is not a separate IE. |
| Xiaomi | b | We prefer to use a unified IE. |
| Intel | b |  |
| CATT | b if it also apply for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT | Better to check with RAN1 on whether this also works for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT, before we decided it. |
| OPPO | Option b | It should be implemented in a similar way as nr-DL-PRS-ExpectedRSTD-r16 and nr-DL-PRS-ExpectedRSTD-Uncertainty-r16. |
| Nokia | A | We prefer the angle assistance to be kept separate from PRS assistance used for timing measurements. |
| vivo | b |  |
| Ericsson |  | No strong view |

c). FFS the value ranges and may be decided by RAN1

The value ranges of the expected angle assistance information are now FFS. From email rapporteur’s view, this should be decided by RAN1.

**Question 24: Do companies agree that the value ranges of the expected angle assistance (expected angel value and uncetainty) should be decided by RAN1? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | There seems a typo in this Question. I assume "relative power of DL-PRS resources" should be "expected angle assistance information".  No strong view, but this does not look challenging and could also be defined by RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon |  | Is the question indended to address the value range of the angle? |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | No strong view , RAN1 or RAN2 could decide the value ranges. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

### 3.2.4 DL-PRS Resource Priority List

As for the priorization of DL-AOD reporting, RAN2 made the following agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Proposal 2.1-4: include in the LPP assistance data the information about subset of PRS resources for the purpose of prioritization of DL-AOD reporting.** |

As for details of the provision of subset of PRS resources for the purpose of prioritization of DL-AOD reporting, the following open issue are addressed.

1. FFS the provision of the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list should be included in NR-DL-PRS-Resource-r16 IE?
2. FFS any further description of UE behaviour needed related to the measurements and/or reporting?
3. FFS generaral encoding of the IE could be improved?

a). FFS the provision of the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list should be included in NR-DL-PRS-Resource-r16 IE

There are two options on providing the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list to UE:

**Option a: New IE to carry the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list information, e.g., *NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSubset* in running CR of TS37.355;**

**Option b: Extend the R16 IE NR-DL-PRS-Resource-r16 to carry the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list information information, with restrictions that it is only applied for DL-AOD positioning method.**

**Question 25: Which options do companies agree on supporting LMF to provide the R17 DL-PRS resource priority list to UE? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option | Comments |
| Qualcomm | (a) | Same as for Question 23. Different assistance data types should be kept separate. It will become confusing/complex if we start merging different assistance data into DL-PRS assistance data. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | b | Current LPP spec adopts option a but we think it is not necessary |
| Apple | A | Agree with QC |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | a | Prefer separate IE to be defined |
| ZTE | b |  |
| Xiaomi | b |  |
| Intel | b | B is what we did for LTE/NR RRC extension. A is similar to UMTS RRC, i.e. critical extension. |
| CATT | b |  |
| OPPO | b |  |
| Nokia | A | Current implementation in the running LPP CR is good. |
| vivo | b |  |
| Ericsson | b |  |

b). FFS any further description of UE behaviour needed related to the measurements and/or reporting?

Based on RAN1 agreements, the following agreements are associated with the prioritization of DL-AOD reporting, as highlightend in yellow.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) reporting, the LMF may indicate in the assistance data (AD), one or both the following:  • option 1: subject to UE capability, for each PRS resource, a subset of PRS resources for the purpose of prioritization of DL-AOD reporting:  o a UE may include the requested PRS measurement for the subset of the PRS in the DL-AoD additional measurements if the requested PRS measurement of the associated PRS is reported   The requested PRS measurement can be DL PRS RSRP and/or path PRS RSRP.  o UE may report PRS measurements only for the subset of PRS resources.  o Note: The subset associated with a PRS resource can be in a same or different PRS resource set than the PRS resource  • option 2: subject to UE capability, for each PRS resource, the boresight direction information.  • Note: Either case does not imply any restriction on UE measurement  • FFS: prioritization of the PRS resources and resource subsets to be measured |

Some companies point out that the above two behaviours are different and which one to perform shall be clarified in the TS, i.e., up to UE implementation or indicated by the LMF in the location information request.

**Question 26: Do companies agree that further description of UE behaviour needed related to the measurements and/or reporting is needed related to the prioritization of DL-AOD reporting? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comment | No strong view, but I think this is not needed. The description from the assistance data should be enough, and a UE can only report what it was able to measure anyhow. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Up to R1 to define |
| Apple |  | No strong view |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Probably | May be up to RAN1 to decide the UE behaviour. The last bullet is still an “FFS: prioritization of the PRS resources and resource subsets to be measured” |
| ZTE |  | Agree with Lenovo |
| Xiaomi |  | We are fine to left to RAN1. |
| Intel | See comment | Agree with Qualcomm. It is not needed. |
| CATT |  | Fine to left to RAN1. |
| OPPO |  | Up to RAN1 |
| Nokia | Yes | The UE behaviour highlighted in the RAN1 agreement above can be captured under *NR-DL-AoD-SignalMeasurementInformation* in the additional measurements related field description. |
| vivo | Yes | Further clarification is essential to avoid different UE behaviors. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Same view as Nokia |

c). FFS generaral encoding of the IE could be improved?

Further, one company point out that the current structure of 'nr-DL-PRS-ResourcePriorityList is quite reduent as not every resource shall be associate wih one subset.

**Question 27: Do companies agree that generaral encoding of the IE could be improved? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm |  | It must fit to the "master" *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData* at the end (similar to other assistance data). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | See reply to Q25 |
| Intel |  | See reply to Q25. |
| Nokia | Maybe | Optimizations can be considered later after the CR is implemented in the specification but before ASN.1 freeze. |
| vivo | Yes | As not every resource shall be associated with one subset. Prefer to introduce NR-nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSubsetList and each PRS resource subset is identified by a resource subset ID, each PRS resource can associate with a resource subset ID.  NR-DL-PRS-Info-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..nrMaxSetsPerTrpPerFreqLayer-r16)) OF  NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSet-r16,  ...,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSubSetList SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..nrMaxSubSetsPerTrpPerFreqLayer)) OF  NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSubSet,  }  NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSubset::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSubsetID NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSubsetID,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceInSubsetlist SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..nrMaxResourcePerSubset)) OF NR-DL-PRS-ResourceInSubset,  }  NR-DL-PRS-ResourceInSubset ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16  }  NR-DL-PRS-Resource-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSubsetID NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSubsetID OPTIONAL,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16,  } |
| Ericsson | Yes | Could to be careful in analyzing this |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 Multipath/NLOS mitigation

### 3.3.1 LOS/NLOS indicator

On the LOS/NLOS indicators which are reported to the LMF for DL and DL+UL positioning measurements, the issues that whether the LOS/NLOS indicator for the UE measurements have a per resource indicator and a per TRP indicator is addressed based on companies’ input.

**Question 28: Do companies agree that the LOS/NLOS indicator for the UE measurements have a per resource indicator and a per TRP indicator? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | No | The measurement has a LOS/NLOS indicator. What should a per TRP/per Resource mean in the measurement report? I also cannot see this from the RAN1 agreements. |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | RAN1 agreement   * For DL-AoD and Multi-RTT one LoS/NLoS indicator can be associated with each DL PRS RSRP and/or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, respectively, and reported by UE for each TRP * For DL-AoD and Multi-RTT one LoS/NLoS indicator can be associated with each TRP in the measurement report from the UE * For DL-TDOA one LoS/NLoS indicator can be associated with each RSTD measurement performed with a target TRP and one LoS/NLoS indicator is associated with the RSTD measurement performed with a reference TRP   For DL-TDOA one LoS/NLoS indicator can be associated with each target TRP and one LoS/NLoS indicator can be associated with the reference TRP in the measurement report |
| Apple | No |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Agree has been already agreed by RAN1 |
| ZTE | Yes | LOS/NLOS indicator is shown in each measurement element, in this way for DL-TDOA, it can be associated with target TRP and Reference TRP, for multi-RTT and DL-AoD, it can be associated with TRP. That is aligned with RAN1’s agreement |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel |  | Based on RAN1 agreements, Seems it is per TRP indicator. And not per resource indicator. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | No | If our understanding is correct, the location measurement result is provided per TRP, which is also associated to a RS resource ID.  For example, for the DL-TDOA measurement result, the UE feedbacks the NR-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16 consisting of different NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement for each TPR, and each NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement IE includes the nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 and nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID too. So including the NLOS/LOS indicator in each NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement seems possible to address this problem, as the LOS/NLOS indicator is implicitly associated with per TRP per resource. |
| Nokia | Yes, comments | RAN1 agreements (particularly from RAN1#106-e) on LoS/NLoS indicator seems to vary depending on the positioning method. In some cases, it is per resource and per TRP while in other cases it is per TRP or per measurement. We need to align with RAN1 agreement on a case-by-case basis. |
| vivo | Yes | Agreeement:  For UE-based positioning, support the following options for LoS/NLoS indicators within positioning assistance data:  Option 1: LMF associates UE-based LoS/NloS indicators with each DL PRS resource for each TRP  Option 2: LMF associates UE-based LoS/NloS indicators with each TRP  Note: For option 1, one LoS/NloS indicator is associated with one DL-PRS resource |
| Ericsson | Yes | Same comment as Nokia, also that RAN1 agreement is about UE measurements, which means that it is also per additional path. |

### 3.3.2 FFS the PRS-RSRPP request for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT

According to the running CR of TS37.355, the PRS-RSRPP request for DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT only apply to the first path. However, it seems that such request also applis to additional paths, as highlightend in yellow.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  • Support the LMF to request DL PRS-RSRPP together with timing measurement as part of DL-TDOA and multi-RTT reporting enhancements  o Note: This applies to the first path and also to additional paths. |

**Question 29: Do companies agree that the request of DL PRS-RSRPP also applies to the additional paths besidesthe first path? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm |  | Not quite clear what the issue is. The additional path itself is a separate request/capability and the RSRPP request for the additional path is already supported in the draft LPP:  additionalPathsDL-PRS-RSRP-Request-r17 ENUMERATED { requested } |
| Huawei, HiSIlicon | Yes | Maybe the question can be reworded to avoid confusion:  **Question 29: Do companies agree that the request of DL PRS-RSRPP also applies to the additional paths *besides* the first path? Please provide also a brief justification for your answer.** |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Should follow the agreement has been made. |
| Nokia | Yes | It looks like RAN1 agreed in RAN1#107-e the quoted agreements. |
| vivo | Yes |  |

# Reference to dependency (FFS in RAN1)

This section is for information, i.e. no questions to answer. The references to dependency are summarized here, waiting for further information from RAN1.

## 4.1 Mitigation of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing delays

1. C1-1: whether srs-PosResourceSetId-r17 is required in UE TxTEG
2. C1-2: ueRxTxTEG-ID-group

FFS: A triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}

1. C1-3: Timestamp of a UE measurement instance (R1-A3)

FFS: The measurement instances are within a [configured] measurement time window

FFS: Each UE measurement instance can be configured with N instances of the DL-PRS Resource Set

## 4.2 DL-AoD enhancement

1. C2-1：FFS on the value range of relative power of the DL-PRS Resource (R1-A2)
2. C2-2：FFS on value range of RSRPP (R1-A1)
3. C2-3：FFS on value range of expected angle assistance (expected angel value and uncertainty) (R1-A4)

## 4.3 PRU and others

1. C3-1: all interaction between PRU (work as UE) and LMF depend on RAN1

# Open issue lists

This section is for information, i.e. no questions to answer. All the open issues discussed in section 3 are summarized here, in order to track the open issues.

## 5.1 Mitigation of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing delays

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Description** | **Corresponding questions** |  | **Status(resolved/left/new)** |
| A1-1  (R1-1) | How to report UE Tx TEG association for Multi-RTT via LPP, including what the maximum numbers of the change of TxTEG to be supported within one reporting.  IE: *NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ->NR-UE-RxTx-TEG-Info-r17* | Question 1/2 (section 3.1.1) |  |  |
| A1-2 | How to design UE Tx TEG association request and report for UL-TDOA via RRC, including which RRC message, what the periodicity and intervals are, what the maximum number of ueTxTEGReport in one message.  IE: *UE-TxTEG-Report-v17xy-IEs* | Question 3/4/5/6/7 (section 3.1.2) |  |  |
| A1-3  (R1-12, R2-A4) | Whether existing posSIB or new posSIB should be used to provide TRP TxTEG.  IE: *posSibType6-5 NR-DL-PRS-TRP-TEG-Info* | Question 8/9 (section 3.1.3) |  |  |
| A1-4  (R1-13) | The maximum number of DL PRS resources per target TRP in a measurement report is still limited to 4. How to restrict the PRS number shall be discussed.  IE: *NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementsExt-r17* | Question 10 (section 3.1.4) |  |  |
| A1-5 | Support of RSTD measurements from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG | Question 11 (section 3.1.5) |  |  |
| A1-6 | Support of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE Rx TEG  Support of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements obtained from different DL PRS resources per UE RxTx TEG | Question 12 (section 3.1.6) |  |  |

## 5.2 DL-AoD enhancement

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Description** | **Corresponding questions** | **Status(resolved/left/new)** |
| A2-1  (R1-2) | Should we have a bit for each assistance data element (incl. the Rel-16 ones)? Should the bit map/request be different for DL-TDOA and DL-AoD?  Same for capabilities. | Question 13/14/15 (section 3.2.1) |  |
| A2-2  (R1-3) | Should the beam pattern info be included in Rel-16 NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo?  Any changes needed to support linear arrays? (FFS both azimuth and elevation can be optional) | Question 16/17/18 (section 3.2.1) |  |
| C2-1  (R1-A2) | FFS on the value range of relative power of the DL-PRS Resource | Question 19 (section 3.2.1) |  |
| A2-3  (R1-4) | Do we need a DL-AoD variant which supports the Rel-17 RSRPP measurement only? | Question 20 (section 3.2.2) |  |
| C2-2  (R1-A1) | FFS on value range of RSRPP | Question 21 (section 3.2.2) |  |
| A2-4  ( R1-5) | Needs to be per TRP.  Should this be included in NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataPerTRP-r16 (like expected RSTD and expected RSTD uncertainty)? | Question 22/23 (section 3.2.3) |  |
| C2-3  (R1-A4) | FFS on value range of expected angle assistance (expected angel value and uncertainty) | Question 24 (section 3.2.3) |  |
| A2-5  (R1-6) | Should this be included in NR-DL-PRS-Resource-r16 IE?  Any further description of UE behaviour needed?  General encoding of the IE could be improved? | Question 25/26/27 (section 3.2.4) |  |

## 5.3 Multipath/NLOS mitigation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Description** | **Corresponding questions** | **status** |
| A3-1  (R1-8) | Should the LOS/NLOS indicator for the UE measurements have a per resource indicator and a per TRP indicator? | Question 28 (section 3.3.1) |  |
| A3-2 | FFS this not only for first path? (From\_R1-2112976\_pos\_parameter\_Summary.xlsx) | Question 29 (section 3.3.2) |  |

# 6 Conclusion

**TBD**

# 7 Reference

1. R2-2200092 LS on the reporting of the Tx TEG association information (R1-2112968; contact: CATT) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_pos\_enh-Core To:RAN2, RAN4 Cc:RAN3
2. R2-2200095 LS on updated Rel-17 LTE and NR higher-layers parameter list (R1-2112977; contact: Ericsson) RAN1 LS in Rel-17 NR\_pos\_enh, To:RAN2, RAN3 Cc:RAN4
3. R2-2202005 Report of email discussion [Post116bis-e][634][POS] Positioning open issues list (Intel) Intel Corporation
4. R2-2201722 Summary of [Post116bis-e][628][POS] 37.355 running CR (Qualcomm)
5. R2-2201723 Running LPP CR for NR positioning enhancements draftCR Qualcomm Incorporated
6. R2-2201768 Summary of [AT116bis-e][612][POS] Positioning accuracy enhancements (Apple) Apple discussion NR\_pos\_enh-Core
7. R2-2200300 Discussion on LPP and RRC signaling impact of mitigating UE and TRP RxTx timing delays CATT discussion Rel-17 NR\_pos\_enh-Core
8. R2-2200330 Discussion on accuracy enhancements vivo discussion Rel-17 NR\_pos\_enh-Core
9. 3GPP TS38.305 : “Stage 2 functional specification of User Equipment (UE) positioning in NG-RAN” V16.7.0
10. 3GPP TS38.331: “Radio Resource Control (RRC) protocol specification(Release 16)”. V16.7.0
11. 3GPP TS37.355: “LTE Positioning Protocol (LPP)”. V16.7.0

# 8 Annex

TBD