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# Introduction

This document provides the a summary of the issues and proposals for “AI 8.2.3 Potential positioning enhancements [1-26]) for the following discussion:

[102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Pot-Pos-Enh] Email discussion/approval on potential positioning enhancements until 8/21; address any remaining aspects by 8/27 – Ren Da (CATT)

It covers the following aspects:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Enhancements of DL positioning reference signals    1. New DL PRS transmission patterns and additional DL PRS configuration    2. Simultaneous transmission and reception DL PRS with other signals/channels    3. DL PRS processing with aggregated DL PRS resources    4. New DL reference signals for positioning    5. DL PRS muting enhancements    6. Multi-port DL PRS transmission 2. Enhancements of UL positioning reference signals    1. New UL SRS transmission patterns (Issue closed)    2. Simultaneous transmission of UL SRS for positioning with other signals/channels    3. UL SRS transmission with aggregated SRS resources    4. Enhancement of SRS cyclic shift patterns    5. Power control for SRS for positioning    6. Mitigation of interference between UL SRSs    7. New UL reference signals for positioning    8. Multi-port transmission of UL SRS for positioning 3. Enhancements of UE/gNB measurements    1. Multipath mitigation    2. Additional enhancements of UE/gNB measurements    3. Other issues related to the UE/gNB measurements 4. Enhancements of positioning methods and measurement procedure    1. UE positioning in idle/inactive states    2. On-demand DL PRS for positioning (Issue closed)    3. On-demand UL SRS for positioning    4. Methods for reducing timing measurement errors    5. Methods for reducing angular measurement errors    6. Enhancements on E-CID positioning    7. Methods for reducing positioning latency    8. Measurement gap    9. UE-based positioning    10. UE positioning in DRX state    11. Beam-management of positioning    12. Additional proposals for increasing the network and UE efficiency    13. Additional positioning methods    14. SRS transmission time    15. Others 5. Architecture and signalling enhancements    1. Additional proposals |

The following highlights will be used in this summary:

* The Pink highlights are proposals and issues for discussion with high priority in this email discussion
* The Yellow highlights are proposals and issues for discussion with medium priority in this email discussion
* The Dark Yellow highlights are proposals and issues for discussion with low priority in this email discussion
* The Turquoise highlights are offline consensus/conclusion based on offline discussion or comments
* The Grey sections are issues that have been discussed/revised/ resolved in this meeting email discussion

Note: The fact that a proposal is listed with a priority in this summary for this meeting should not be interpreted as a suggestion that the proposal will have the same priority in other meetings.

# Enhancements of DL positioning reference signals

## New DL PRS transmission patterns and additional DL PRS configuration

Background

In Rel-16, full staggering patterns are supported for DL PRS transmission, with at least 2 OFDM symbols per DL PRS resource. The minimum DL PRS transmission bandwidth is 24 PRBs. For reducing the positioning latency, minimizing the interference, and optimizing the resource usage, many companies propose supporting partial staggering and non-staggering DL PRS transmission pattern, e.g., 1-symbol PRS transmission, and smaller DL PRS transmission bandwidth in Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 1:
  + The enhancement of PRS should include studying
    - Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping
* (Sony)Proposal 3:
  + Support PRS configuration with 1 symbol PRS transmission.
* (Sony)Proposal 4:
  + A mechanism to control or to mitigate interference of PRS transmission in a densified network shall be studied.
* (CATT)Proposal 1:
  + In Rel-17 support DL PRS bandwidth smaller than 24 PRBs at least for one of the DL PRS resource sets in a TRP in a positioning frequency layer
* (Intel)Proposal 1:
  + RAN1 to study new DL PRS transmission schedules aiming to randomize set of TRPs/gNBs transmitting in the same set of resources
* (OPPO) Proposal 2:
  + Study to enhance the RE mapping of DL PRS resource to resolve the interference issue and increase the capacity of DL PRS resource.
* (CMCC) Proposal 1:
  + The following DL PRS enhancements should be considered:
    - Non-full staggering DL PRS resource pattern
    - Comb-N size enhancements
* (Samsung)Proposal 1:
  + New PRS pattern should be studied to avoid collision between multiple TRPs and two PRS patterns can be configured simultaneously and separated in time, frequency or space domain
* (Fraunhofer)Proposal 5:
  + Consider interference for Rel-17 NR positioning including interference from positioning RSs or other interference sources.
* (LGE)Proposal 8:
  + Support 1-symbol PRS resource for Rel-17 NR positioning.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 10:
  + Allow configuration of DL-PRS with any combination of comb-factor and symbol length, including symbol length 1.

Feature lead’s view

Considering the potential benefits for positioning enhancements (e.g., reduction of the latency) and the relatively small impact on the speciation, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-1

* Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the additional PRS RE mapping patterns (e.g., 1-symbol DL PRS transmission)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | Do not support 1-symbol DL PRS. Further optimization of the number of PRS symbols and support of the 1-symbol PRS to our view does not provide an essential latency reduction. At the same time, it may increase the complexity of implementation by reduction of the time budget available for the signal reception.  Support introduction of additional comb sizes for 2-symbol DL PRS.  FFS: if additional comb sizes are needed for 4-symbol DL PRS. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay in principle but we should attempt to avoid long discussion of RE mapping that occurred in Rel-16. In our view 1-symbol DL PRS could make sense but partial staggering of currently supported comb-size and symbol lengths would require strong justificiation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We support partial staggering since Rel-16, even though some companies act quite emotionaly ☺  Again, if partial staggering is re-considered for downlink part, comb-8 has a good structure to support it. Let’s rationally think more about it.  Font size 8 is too small !!! so I adjust my part to be size 9… |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We assume that the above proposal means that additional comb-sizes can be considered. We are generally OK to investigate further partial staggering and not-staggering, however, the proposal needs to point out that there are complexity issues that need to be discussed.   * Specifically, main issue with partial/no-staggering is the aliasing. It has been proposed that in some indoor deployments, the reception of PRS would be very close in time, so the aliasing would be less likely. * Also, what is the point of the “FFS” bullet in a proposal that says: “will be investigated”. This is further study proposal, so the FFS would not really make sense.   Updated proposal from our side:   * ***Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including additional PRS RE mapping patterns (e.g., 1-symbol DL PRS transmission).***    + ***Study methods/signaling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS*** |
| OPPO | Support. The new design may be benefical for some deployment with limited propagation delay, e.g., indoor case |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the study of different PRS RE mapping schemes. |
| LG | In the current proposal, it seems that discussions on support of the additional comb-size and number of symbols for PRS resource configuration is not included. Our first preference is to discuss the necessity on the support of the additional comb-size and symbols following the Rel-16 design principle, called as staggered pattern, but we are also OK to further study on the new RE pattern in the current phase. |
| ZTE | We assume intra-slot repetition (which has been supported in Rel-16 for full-staggered RE mapping) for “partial-staggered RE” mapping should also be discussed. |

FL Comments

Proposal 2-1 seems supported by most companies based on the feedback received so far. To address the comments/concerns, the proposal is modified as follows:

### Proposal 2-1 (Revision 1)

* Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + the methods/signaling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS RE mapping will be included in the studied

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support |
| Qualcomm | Maybe it was not clear in our previous reply, but we consider this medium priority in the DL PRS processing enhancements. Our reasoning: If this is introduced to reduce latency, then many additional aspects need to be further optimized (e.g. MG request, PRS processing capabilities, Triggering of PRS, Architecture enhancements). In other words, if these are optimized, whether the PRS is 12 symbols or 2 symbols would not change the latency much. We assume that the intention is to increase efficiency in some indoor deployment scenarios. |
| Ericsson | Support in principle. But we prefer the updated proposal formulated by Qualcomm in their earlier response which is copied below:  **Updated proposal:**   * ***Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including additional PRS RE mapping patterns (e.g., 1-symbol DL PRS transmission).***    + ***Study methods/signaling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS*** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. Update from Ericsson is also ok to us. |
| MTK | For QC’s revised proposal, as we said “additional PRS RE mapping patterns”, it may indicate for several aspects including new comb size, symbol number and so on. So we prefer to remove the e.g.  **Updated proposal:**   * ***Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including additional PRS RE mapping patterns ~~(e.g., 1-symbol DL PRS transmission).~~***    + ***Study methods/signaling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS*** |
| ZTE | Support MTK’s version. |
| SS | We support in general but propose to further change it as below  **Updated proposal:**   * ***~~Partial staggering and non-staggering~~ New PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including additional PRS RE mapping patterns ~~(e.g., 1-symbol DL PRS transmission).~~***    + ***Study methods/signaling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS*** |
| LG | Sharing the similar view with Ericsson. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the Ericsson proposed update. |
| SONY | Support the updated version from Ericsson. |
|  |  |

FL Comments

Based on the comments received, it seems we may get the support from majority if we use the version proposed by QC/E///, but avoid mentioning specifically (1-symbol DL PRS transmission).

### Proposal 2-1 (Revision 2)

* Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including
  + additional PRS RE mapping patterns
  + methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Fine with FL proposal |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | Okay |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Intel | Support. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We think it is important that 1 symbol PRS is included and not sure why it has been removed? We think that proposal may have benefit and that the other RE mapping discussion will likely not be fruitful. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Nokia. We prefer to keep 1 symbol PRS in the proposal. |

FL Comments

Discussed in GTW. The proposal is updated online as follows:

### Proposal 2-1 (Revision 3)

Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, including

* Additional PRS RE mapping pattern
* 1-symbol DL PRS pattern
* Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We suggest clarify that singling out 1-symbol PRS does not mean that other symbol durations are precluded. |
| MTK | Looking at the description “with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths”, 1 symbol is not precluded  We suggest whether we can make decision on simply considering 1 symbol with multiple comb factors. If we can get consensus for this, we just pursue 1 symbol. It is easy for every company. If it cannot be agreed, We consider not to have 1 symbol on the sub-bullet |
| CATT | In our point of view, the three sub-bullets just point out the three candidate possible enhancements for the main sentence, and the main sentence covers a wide range of potential enhancements. Therefore, in order to clarify, what about adding the wording “not limit” as follows, Proposal 2-1 (Revision 3) Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, ~~including,~~ which may include, but not limited to the following:   * Additional PRS RE mapping pattern * 1-symbol DL PRS pattern * Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS. |
| Intel | We do not see a clear reason to mention 1-symbol PRS in the list specifically.  It is already covered by the general formulation at the beginning saying that “different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17” |
| LG | Support the current proposal. We are supportive of 1-symbol DL PRS considering low latency measurement, and we prefer to keep in the current proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to hear from the proponents of this proposal what KPI’s they expect to be improved by this investigation? From our view any enhancement should improve the KPIs in the SID. From our view 1 symbol PRS is the only potential enhancement covered by this enhancement that may be worth RAN1 investigating. Will accuracy be improve by having comb 8 – 8 symbol PRS? |
| FL’s comments | For HW’s comment, my understanding is the main bullets “with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths”, as also commented by Intel. means other symbol durations are not precluded.  For MTK’s comment, we could try but it is unlikely that we could have the agreement to only support 1-symbol DL PRS.  For CATT’s comment, yes, the proposed change may address HW’s concern.  For Nokia’s comment, my understanding is that the intention of proposal with more than 1-symbol is at least related to the reduction of the DL PRS interferences. |
| OPPO | Support CATT’s update since it seems a good compromise |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with CATT’s change. |
| vivo | Support if other companies can agree with that，otherwise，we prefer the proposal is the same as proposal 3-1 (Revision 1), and remove the first and second sub-bullet. |
| ZTE | Agree with Huawei and MTK. We can live with CATT’s version as a compromise. |
| Ericsson | As mentioned by Nokia, 1 symbol DL PRS pattern is a key enhancement that is worth investigating with regards to low latency measurement. Hence, we prefer to keep 1-symbol DL PRS in the proposal. We are ok with CATT’s updated version. |
| MTK2 | Question to CATT and the supporters. Looking at the proposal *Proposal 2-1 (Revision 3)* *Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, ~~including,~~ which may include, but not limited to the following:*   * *Additional PRS RE mapping pattern* * *1-symbol DL PRS pattern* * *Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS.*   What is the difference between the first and second subbullets? In our view, 1-symbol DL PRS pattern has been included in “additional PRS RE mapping pattern”.  We are not objecting 1 symbol case. Without further clarification on the relationship between 1st and 2nd subbullets. We don't see the need to have a specific item for 1 symbol case. It is also okay for us to remove 1st and 2nd subbullets |
| LG | Same view with Nokia and Ericsson. The revised proposal from CATT is OK to us.  If we need to discuss the difference between the first bullet and other parts, we think the first bullet can include partial staggering non-staggering, and 1-symbol, so the following modified proposal.  Additional PRS RE mapping pattern with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to the following:   * Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping * 1-symbol DL PRS pattern * Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS. |
| CMCC | By reading the main bullet, our understanding is that 1-symbol DL PRS along with other symbol length and comb size are included. Howver, since companies share some concerns on precluding 1-symbol DL PRS, we are ok with CATT’s updates. |

FL comments

It seems it may not help too much to continue email discussion on this. I think we can have two alternatives. Based on the feedbacn, I include two alternatives in the revision. We may take a survey on the supporting companies for each of them. Also, several companies consider this is a low priority. So, please also indicate whether you think this is a high/medium/low priority when providing the response.

### Proposal 2-1 (Revision 4)

Select one of the following alternatives:

|  |
| --- |
| **Alt. 1:**   * Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to the following   + Additional PRS RE mapping pattern   + 1-symbol DL PRS pattern   + Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS. * Supported by: CATT, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, CMCC, SS (removed the first subbullet)   **Alt. 2:**   * Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to the following   + Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS. * Supported by: vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, CMCC, Intel |

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Not sure why this is still high priority. Potential benefits are very unclear at this point. We don’t recommend spending more online time to discuss this. |
| CATT | We support Alt-1. About MTK’s concern in the comments for Revision 3, in our point of view, the first bullet in Alt-1(i.e., Additional PRS RE mapping pattern) means different RE pattern from Rel-16, such as stair-like RE pattern, non-staggering RE pattern, and so on. So the first bullet focuses on RE pattern, but not the number of symbols. The second bullet in Alt-1(i.e., 1-symbol DL PRS pattern) focuses on the new option of number of symbol for PRS, that is one symbols case which got a lot of attention from companies. Therefore, the two bullets have different focuses of enhancements. |
| vivo | Support Alt.2 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with either way. |
| ZTE | Alt2. |
| Ericsson | We suppart alt-1. We don’t really see a huge difference with alt2, since the the list says “may include”, but we feel it still is progress to have examples in the agreement. |
| CMCC | Both are fine to us. Slightly prefer Alt. 1 according to companies’ feedbacks previously. |
| Intel | Alt. 2. |
| SS | We support Alt 1 but would like to remove 1 symbol bullet. |
| LG | Alt.1. |
| Sony | Alt.1 |
| Qualcomm | Alt. 1 without first subbullet.. BUT, we really don’t want to spend too much time; it is low priority for us. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it seems the majority view is to take Alt.1. Let us try one more time to see if we can reach a consensus on it. If we cannot reach the consensus, we may need to have further discussion in the next meeting.

### Proposal 2-1 (Revision 5)

* Partial staggering and non-staggering PRS RE mapping with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to the following
  + ~~Additional PRS RE mapping pattern~~
  + 1-symbol DL PRS pattern
  + Methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering PRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Simultaneous transmission and reception of DL PRS with other signals/channels

Background

For Rel-16, it was agreed in RAN1#99 that UE is not expected to process DL PRS in the same OFDM symbol where other DL signals and channels are transmitted to the UE. For reducing the positioning latency and improving the network and UE efficiency, many companies propose to support simultaneous reception DL PRS and other signals/channels and to define the priority rules for the reception of the DL PRS and other DL signals/channels for supporting different postioning scenarios.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 1:
  + The enhancement of PRS should include studying
    - Simultaneous reception of PRS along with other signals/channels
* (Huawei) Proposal 4:
  + The enhancement of UE procedure of receiving PRS should include studying
    - Flexible PRS multiplexing with other signals/channels
* (vivo) Proposal 3:
  + Introduce the priority indications of PRS for low latency positioning in Rel-17.
* (vivo) Proposal 4:
  + PRS FDM multiplexing with other DL signals and channels at RB level outside of PRS time-frequency grid should be studied in Rel-17 .
* (vivo) Proposal 18:
  + Priority rules for positioning measurement and report can be considered in Rel-17 positioning.
* (CATT) Proposal 9:
  + Introduce the PRS measurement restriction. Those DL PRS resources within the measurement restriction may not be measured by UE.
* (Intel) Proposal 12:
  + RAN1 to study mechanisms for prioritization of transmissions carrying reference signals and channels w/ control signaling for positioning vs other NR reference signals and channels
* (Lenovo) Proposal 2:
  + Priority indications can be considered as potential enhancements in order to reduce the positioning latency for high priority scenarios.
* (CAICT)Proposal 1:
  + The priority of PRS for low latency positioning could be considered in Rel-17, and implicitly or explicitly indicated to the positioning UEs based on the positioning service latency requirement.
* (InterDigital) Proposal 1:
  + Study mechanisms supporting prioritized transmission of PRS and SRS for positioning
* (InterDigital) Proposal 2:
  + Rel-16 URLLC prioritization mechanisms is used as a baseline for prioritized transmission of PRS and SRS for positioning.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 15:
  + For the purpose of enhanced efficiency, study further PRS processing without MG and DL/UL PRS prioritization over other channels and procedures.

Feature lead’s view

In Rel-17 we need to support very-low positioning latency in some scenarios, e.g., time-critical positioning service, while not to cause any significant performance degradation on data communication services in most scenarios. There is a need to support simultaneous transmission and reception of DL PRS with other signals/channels and define the corresponding priority rules, which allow the network to use different configurations to support different scenarios. Thus, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-2

* Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol will be investigated in Rel-17
* Priority rules will be investigated for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels when DL PRS and other signals/channels are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support the first bullet. Second bullet should be something to be considered as part of first bullet and hence there is no need to single out this as a separate agreement. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | Do not support.  In our view simultaneous transmission of DL PRS with other signals/channels will deteriorate the performance of measurements and positioning accuracy. Therefore, in order avoid additional multiplexing prioritization of DL PRS transmission over other DL signals/channels should be considered. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | If we consider new prioritization rule in Rel-17, we should consider UE capability of simultaneous reception together. For the first bullet is this meant from the same TRP or from different TRPs? If from the same TRP then interference to DL PRS from neighboring TRPs needs to be considered. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | For simultaneous reception, it may impact UE implementation. We are okay to further investigate in Rel-17. It doesn’t mean we support this at this moment |
| CMCC | Support. To our understanding, the simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signal/channels includes two dimensions, RB-level FDM and RE-level time-frequency flexible multiplexing, we support to study both in Rel-17. And for the flexible multiplexing, the priority rule of DL PRS and other signal/channels should be considered. |
| Qualcomm | In Rel-16, PRS is happening only within MG. Going from that type of operation, to allowing FDMing of PRS and other signals entails at least the following problems:   * PRS processing timelines. A UE in Rel-16 can dedicate all the hardware/BB processing to process the PRS, since there is no other procedure happening concurrently. * Interference across channels: PRS may be received outside the CP. A UE is doing just one FFT operation, so if PRS is received outside the CP, there will be interference to the other channels. * We assume that we are talking about PRB-level FDMing and we don’t even comment about the RE-level FDMing (inside the same PRB).   Having said the above, we can propose an alternative proposal that is trying to ask companies to investigate this feature under some reasonable setup:  ***Updated Proposal:***   * ***Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol(s) will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:***   + ***Priority rules will be investigated for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels***   + ***Interference introduced across FDMed channels/signals due to time misalignment (e.g. reception outside the CP) and methods/ransmissi to mitigate it.***   + ***PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels*** |
| OPPO | Support further study assuming that UE complexity/capability and positioning performance are taking into account. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally support the study of multiplexing DL-PRS with existing channles/signals, however issues such as interference (including with other channels/signals and other TRPs) and lower hearability would have to be firstly addressed. Second bullet regarding priority rules seems to be a follow-up once the study of multiplexing DL-PRS with existing channles/signals is considered feasible. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | For this issue, simultaneous transmission of PRS and other signals may negatively affect to the accuracy performance, so this issue needs to be discussed together with the accuracy effect by simultaneous PRS transmission/reception. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | We want to check following two questions,   * If the first bullet is only for serving cell? * If above proposals are only applicable to DL PRS within measurement gap? |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |

FL Comments

For Proposal 2-2, it seems most companies support it. For Intel’s concern on the performance deterioration, I’d agree that is one of the issues that need to be investigated. For Nokia’s question on the same TRP or different TRPs, my understanding is that we are discussing the same TRP here. For FW’s comment on the link between the two bullets, yes, two bullets are linked and can be combined. I assume the suggested updates from QC may address the comment. For QC’s comments on the DL PRS processing timeline and the potential interferences across channels (also pointed out by Intel), I assume these are the potential issues that need to be investigated (also ransmissi to many other proposed enhancements in this document). We could include them in the proposal.

### Proposal 2-2 (Revision 1)

* Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:
  + Priority rules for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels
  + Interference across FDMed channels/signals due to time misalignment (e.g. reception outside the CP) and methods/ransmissi to mitigate it.
  + PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support |
| Qualcomm | A couple of additional comments based on the replies seen above:   * It seems even RE-level FDMing is considered by some companies. We don’t see how that will be useful. We think it is reasonable to ask to limit the scope to “at least for PRB-level FDMing”. * When we are talking about “simultaneous transmission of PRS” and other signals, it means that we are talking about PRS reception outside the MG, shouldn’t that be clarified?   We consider this low priority in the DL PRS enhancement section (Section 2 in this summary). |
| Ericson | Ok with the proposal if the following concern is addressed. In an indoor factory scenarios, multiple TRPs may belong to the same serving cell. Hence, it may be better to replace ‘same TRP’ with ‘TRPs within the same serving cell’. Please see updated proposal below:  **Updated proposal:**   * Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the ~~same TRP~~* TRP(s) in the serving cell will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:   + Priority rules for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels   + Interference across FDMed channels/signals due to time misalignment (e.g. reception outside the CP) and methods/ransmissi to mitigate it.   + PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support with FL’s proposal. As for Ericsson’s update, we suggest deleting “serving” cell because we are also considering the multiplexing PRS with SSB from the same non-serving cell. |
| MTK | From “same TRP”, why the FDMed channel/signal may have time misalignment? The FDMed channel/signal are transmitted from the same place and we doubt there is significant time misalignment?  If “same TRP” is replaced by “TRP(s) within the same serving cell”, then the time misalignment could be significant since different channel/signal come from different TRPs  Basically the meaning of “same TRP” and “TRP(s) within the same serving cell” could be different. If “same TRP” is preferred, then the sub-bullet for interference issue due to time misalignment could be removed.  Let’s check other companies’ view. |
| ZTE | We don’t think it’s a high priority issue.  - Agree MTK’s view on time misalignment.  -We try to understand “PRS processing timeline” here, does it mean PRS processing capability impact on Rel-16? |
| SS | Support. It may largely avoid the waste of time frequency resources. |
| LG | We understand the necessity of the discussion, but we are questionable how to specify features related to simultaneous transmission from the perspective of a TRP, described in the main bullet, and it is somewhat up to gNB implementation. Rather, we may need to discuss simultaneous reception of PRS and other RS/Channels. In case of PRS, each PRS resource is explicitly associated with a single TRP, but other RSs and/or channels are not. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay in principle with the updated proposal from Ericssion but we see this topic as low priority. We doubt that accuracy or latency will be improved. |
| SONY | Support the FL’s proposal. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, although majority companies support the proposal, 3 companies consider it as a low priority and one company does not support it. Based on the comments (e.g., MTK and ZTE), I removed the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets, which may also help the clarification the main intention of the proposal, and modified the 1st sub-bullet to make it clear the FDM is in RB-level but not RE-level. I assume this is the intention of the proponents.

### Proposal 2-2 (Revision 2)

* Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:
  + Priority rules for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We prefer to add back the sublet proposed by QC “• PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels”  The reason is that simultaneous reception of multiple signals heavily affect UE processing capacity.  Reply to ZTE’s comment: This is potential enhancement for R17. Thus it is not related to R16 UE capability |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | We are okay with OPPO to add the third subbullet back |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Intel | Support. We assume that the priority rules will be used to prevent simultaneous transmission of DL PRS with other signals/channels. |
| Futurewei | Support with the condition that we either add other sub-bullets or not having any sub-bullet at all. |
| LG | Support for study, but we are still questionable how to specify features related to simultaneous transmission from the perspective of a TRP, so we prefer to discuss simultaneous reception of PRS and other RS/Channels. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with comments from LG. |
| Ericsson | Ok. But this may be done in the work item phase as well. Not much to study in the SI phase. |

FL Comments

For Intel’s comments, my understanding is that the intention of the proposal is to allow the simultaneous transmission of DL PRS with other signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol, but investigate the rules for the UE reception.

For LG and Nokia’s comments, in Rel-16, a TRP is not supposed to send Rel-16 DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g., SSB) in the same OFDM symbol. The proposal is to support that and then investigate the OFDM symbol.

For OPPO, MTK and FW’s comments on whether to include the “PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels”. The bullet was excluded due to the question raised previously by ZTE. I am adding back the bullet, and hopefully it can be accepted by all companies.

For E///’s comment, yes, this issue could also be discussed in WI. However, given the interests from many companies, it might be better to start the discuss in SI if we can reach an agreement to do so.

### Proposal 2-2 (Revision 3)

* Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:
  + Priority rules for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels
  + PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. At least from our perspective, we can evaluate the positioning accuracy impact for  The case when 20 PRBs of PRS are punctured by SSB occupancy |
| MTK | We support, and also want to check our understanding that it include both “within measurement gap” and “measurement without gaps”? |
| Intel | Support. |
| LG | We have the similar comment as above. Support for study with low priority, but we are still questionable how to specify features related to simultaneous transmission from the perspective of a TRP since PRS is configured with a specific TRP but other RSs/Channels are not, so we prefer to discuss simultaneous reception of PRS and other RS/Channels. We understand that there are other issues such as time misalignment if we do not restrict the discussion on simultaneous transmission, but, in our understanding, it might be difficult to restrict a simultaneous transmission of PRS and other signals/channels to a single TRP in RAN1 spec. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Qualcomm | Low priority. It is written from gNB perspective, “ransmission” whereas I assume this should be about “Rx perspective”. We are also confused by the “same TRP” terminology. PRS is transmitted by multiple TRPs; I though the intention initially is to discuss PRS + serving-cell signals being on the same symbols, assuming that “PRS processing outside MG” is considered within scope for Rel-17. However, this is not the case from the replies above:   * HW/HiSi wants to analyze the effect of SSB puncturing partially some PRS * MTK seems to be considering the aboe for the case of “within MG”. Why would we have other signals within MG?   Can someone please provide explicitly examples of what is the plan to discss here?   * PRS reception outside MG? * PRS reception FDMed from TRP-X with other signals from serving TRP? * SSB collision with PRS?   Also, what is the purpose of doing this study? Is it accuracy, efficiency or latency? |
| FL’s comments | For MTK’s comments: My understanding is that it is without MG, and from UE’s perspective DL PRS and other DL signals/channel are in the same symbol  For LG/QC’s comments: yes, agree that we need to revise the proposal from the UE’s perspective, e.g.,   * Priority rules for UE reception will be investigated in Rel-17 when DL PRS and other signals/channels are transmitted from the *same serving TRP(s)* at the same OFDM symbols.   For QC’s questions: My understanding is that the scenario is more related to the UE reception when DL PRS and/or other DL signals are transmitted from the same symbol(s) from the serving TRP(s). In Rel-16, DL PRS and/or other DL signals are assumed to be transmitted from the same symbol(s) from the serving TRP(s), at least DL PR S and SSB are not sent in the same symbols from the same cells. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| OPPO | The wording “from the TRP(s) in the serving cell” seems better than “from the *same serving* TRP(s)” since UE usually does not need to consider the priority of the signals from neighbouring cells for the reception of the signals from the serving cell. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To QC, from our perspective, always allowing PRS and SSB to be TDMed will limit the transmission opportunities for PRS, thus the latency will probably be affected, especially for the 5ms window used for SSB transmission.  To CATT, I guess we are saying two different things. We cannot accept the proposal, I am afraid. The suggested proposal is as follows   * Simultaneous transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g. SSB) in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:   + Accuracy impact due to PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs   + Simultaneous PRS and SSB Rx processing   + Priority rules for PRS-RRM and SSB-RRM/BM/RLM * Simultaneous reception of DL PRS from the serving TRP and neighbouring TRPs and other signals/channels from the serving cell in the same OFDM symbol(s)will be investigated in Rel-17 by considering at least the following aspects:   + Priority rules for the processing of DL PRS and other signals/channels   + PRS processing timelines if the UE is expected to receive/process simultaneously PRS and other signals/channels |
| vivo | The main and first sub-bullet is okay for us  For the second sub-bullet, I agree with Huawei’s opinion. We wonder whether the PRS processing time will be increase or not if PRS from the neighboring cell and other signals/channels from serving cell is received /processed simultaneously. If yes, we think the current second sub-bullet is not appropriate. |
| ZTE | Support with low priority. From our understanding, “from the same serving TRP(s) “ should be replaced by “from the same serving cell or the same non-serving cell”. |
| Ericsson | We tend to agree with latest comments from LGE and Qualcomm. For other channel/signals (e.g., PDCCH, PDSCH, CSI-RS, SSB, etc), RAN1 specs do not define transmission of these channels/signals from a TRP. These signals/channels are associated with a TCI state, but RAN1 specs does not associate the reception of these other channels/signals with a TRP as such. So, like Qualcomm, we are also confused by the term “same TRP”.  This should be a low priority item for now. As we commented above, this can be discussed during the work item phase. Note that in UL, Proposal 3-2 (proposed conclusion) concludes that collision handling for UL can be further discussed in the WI phase but not in the SI phase. We suggest a similar conclusion for this proposal. |
| MTK2 | To QC, during MG, no data is received. But it doesn’t mean UE will not observe other signals.  If this item is to focus on “measurement without gaps”, need to further think about just to maintain same active DL BWP? Or BWP switching for larger BW would also be considered.  If this section is only to consider the “priority rule” for “measurement without gaps”, we think BWP switching issue could be more critical for “measurement without gaps”  Also looking at section 5.8 for measurement gap enhancement. There is a subbullet,   * + DL PRS reception without measurement gap   We feel that section 2.2 could be merged into section 5.8 |
| CMCC | We are basically fine with HW’s updated proposal. |
| FL’s additional comments | For OPPO’s comments, share the same view that using “serving TRP” is better;  For HW’s comments, yes, we may need to clarify the enhancements in DL PRS transmission, although the specification are defined from the reception’s perspective. Howeever, the proposed subbullets for the first main bullet are all related to UE reception, and thus maybe better to be included under the second main bullet  For E///’s comments, my understanding the scope of this proposal is much larger than simply define priority rules for DL PRS reception. It would be helpful to start discussion in SI  For MTK’s comments, I think it bring up another scope of the consideration. The DL PRS transmission BW may be much larger than the transmission BW of other DL signals/channels. However, the proposal is not simply the reception of Rel-16 DL PRS without measurement gap, and thus may not simply included in Section 5.8.  proposal   * FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g. SSB) in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same serving TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include   + DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels * At least the following aspects will be investigated in Rel-17 if DL PRS from the serving TRP and neighbouring TRPs and other signals/channels from the serving cell are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol(s):   + Simultaneous processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels   + Priority rules for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels, including     - Impact on positioning acuuracy due to PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs     - Impact on data communication (e.g., RRM, RLM) when higher priority is given to the processing/reception of DL PRS |

FL Comments

For OPPO’s comments, share the same view that using “serving TRP” is better;

For HW’s comments, yes, we may need to clarify the enhancements in DL PRS transmission, although the specification are defined from the reception’s perspective. Howeever, the proposed subbullets for the first main bullet are all related to UE reception, and thus maybe better to be included under the second main bullet

For E///’s comments, my understanding the scope of this proposal is much larger than simply define priority rules for DL PRS reception. It would be helpful to start discussion in SI

For MTK’s comments, I think it bring up another scope of the consideration. The DL PRS transmission BW may be much larger than the transmission BW of other DL signals/channels. However, the proposal is not simply the reception of Rel-16 DL PRS without measurement gap, and thus may not simply included in Section 5.8.

### Proposal 2-2 (Revision 4)

* FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g. SSB) in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same serving TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include
  + DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels
* At least the following aspects will be investigated in Rel-17 if DL PRS from the serving TRP and neighbouring TRPs and other signals/channels from the serving cell are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol(s):
  + Simultaneous processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels
  + Priority rules for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels, including
    - Impact on positioning accuracy due to PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs
    - Impact on data communication (e.g., RRM, RLM) when higher priority is given to the processing/reception of DL PRS
  + FFS: Issues related to BWP switching and measurement gaps

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We still have concerns with the first bullet. Partially puncturing PRS in a subset of RBs is really an unnecessary complication, we don’t think we need to spend time to study it. |
| Futurewei | Aspects that have been listed are not strictly only positioning accuracy and latency issues. It affects other system aspects wrt to SSB and RLM/RRM. It is not clear how we can do those studies. This should not be prioritized at this time. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Vivo | Support in principle  Pls check the wording of ‘accuracy’ |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Reply to QC:  LTE already supports it. We think it is important factor that may influence positioning accuracy. In addition, PRS with frequency layer aggregation may also experience such puncturing due to guard band.  For the first bullet, we think “serving” should be removed.   * FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g. SSB) in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the serving TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include   + DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels |
| ZTE | We are not supportive of puncturing in both bullets, we are open to study priority rules without affecting RRM and RLM. |
| Ericsson | we have concerns with this proposal. The proposals mentions too many specific enhancements like partially puncturing DL PRS. We prefer these specific solutions to be removed at this stage. Also, what is a serving TRP? Note that in Rel-16 Multi-TRP features, multiple TRPs may belong to a serving cell. In this case, which one would be the serving TRP. We suggest the following changes. Overall we feel this issue is more suitable for work item phase. Note that this proposal is the DL counterpart of Proposal 3-2 (proposed conclusion) which we concluded will be discussed in WI phase. We prefer to deprioritize both Proposals 2-2 and 3-2 in the study item phase.  **Proposal 2-2 (Revision 4)**  * FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels ~~(e.g. SSB)~~ in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s)*from the same ~~serving~~TRP* will be investigated in Rel-17~~, which may include~~   + ~~DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels~~ * At least the following aspects will be investigated in Rel-17 if DL PRS ~~from the serving TRP and neighbouring TRPs~~ and other signals/channels ~~from the serving cell~~ are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol(s):   + Simultaneous processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels   + Priority rules for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels~~, including~~     - ~~Impact on positioning acuuracy due to PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs~~     - ~~Impact on data communication (e.g., RRM, RLM) when higher priority is given to the processing/reception of DL PRS~~   + ~~FFS: Issues related to BWP switching and measurement gaps~~ |
| CMCC | Support |
| Intel | Do not support.  We think that puncturing of PRS is not a good idea for study, it obviously impacts the accuracy, and impact depends on how many PRBs are punctured and whether UE is aware of puncturing. |
| SS | Support |
| InterDigital | Thank you very much for organizing the discussion. We have one proposal. Is it possible to combine two bullets to agree as one package? It seems like the first bullet can be discussed under the 2nd bullet, if descriptions related to TRPs and serving cells are relaxed. Our modification is indicated in purple. The list contains possible topics for a study, so from our perspective, we do not see any issues studying these aspects.  At least the following aspects will be investigated in Rel-17 if DL PRS from the serving TRP and/or neighbouring TRPs and other signals/channels from the serving cell are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol(s),   * FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels (e.g. SSB) in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) *from the same serving TRP* ~~will be investigated in Rel-17~~, which may include   + DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels * Simultaneous processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channel * Priority rules for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels, including   + Impact on positioning accuracy and latency due to PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs   + Impact on data communication (e.g., RRM, RLM) when higher priority is given to the processing/reception of DL PRS * FFS: Issues related to BWP switching and measurement gaps   Other aspects are not precluded |

FL Comments

It seems the main controversy point is the “DL PRS being partially punctured in overlapping RBs of other signals/channels”, and the sub-sub-bullets on more details on the issues to be investigated, e.g., (RRM, RLM). The modification proposed by E/// seems addressed some of the concerns. For InterDigital’s comment, yes, the intention is to agree two main bullets in one package. But, some companies prefer removing the details of subbullets for now.

### Proposal 2-2 (Revision 5)

* FDM transmission of DL PRS and other signals/channels in PRB-level in the same OFDM symbol(s) from the same TRP will be investigated in Rel-17
* At least the following aspects will be investigated in Rel-17 if DL PRS and other signals/channels are transmitted in the same OFDM symbol(s):
  + Simultaneous processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels
  + Priority rules for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | As previously mentioned, we do not have an issue with the proposal technically, and eventually once the signals and potential enhancements are specified, we will discuss collision rules and multiplexing possibilities. However, clearly this is something for the work item stage of this work. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We cannot accept keeping “serving” in the first bullet. At least for SSB from the non-serving cell/TRP, since UE is already aware of its presence, we should also include PRS and SSB transmission on the same symbol for the same non-serving TRP.  To our understanding, PRS transmission is associated with a TRP, and a TRP may belong to a cell, and if the cell the TRP belongs is the serving cell (PCI/NG-CGI), the TRP is the serving TRP; otherwise it is non-serving TRP. |
| Vivo | Agree with Huawei to remove ‘serving’ |
| Sony | Support |
| Qualcomm | Low priority, no need to spend too much time online. We are OK to remove serving |
| FL’s response | For Ericsson’s comments, my understanding is that the scope of this proposal is larger than simply define priority rules for DL PRS reception. The proposal suggests supporting FDMed transmission of DL PRS and other DL signals/channels. |
|  |  |

FL Comments

## DL PRS processing with aggregated DL PRS resources

Background

The positioning measurement accuracy is tightly related to the available DL PRS resources in both the time and frequency domain. In NR Rel-16, the maximum bandwidth is 272 PRBs within a frequency layer and up to 4 frequency layers can be configured. However, Rel-16 does not provide the mechanism to support the coherent reception of the DL PRS from multiple frequency layers. Thus, the effective bandwidth of the received PRS is still limited to individual frequency layers. Many companies propose to investigate DL PRS processing with the aggregated DL PRS resources to increase the effective bandwidth of the received PRS for the enhancement of positioning accuracy.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 1:
  + The enhancement of PRS should include studying
    - PRS aggregation
* (ZTE)Proposal 1:
  + Rel-17 enhancements should consider joint measurement based on different frequency units, e.g. allow joint measurement based on DL PRS from different positioning frequency layers.
* (Intel)Proposal 5:
  + RAN1 to study scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers by UEs
* (BUPT)Proposal 2:
  + NR positioning should support the Carrier Aggregation for PRS.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 5:
  + Simultaneous reporting or processing of multiple frequency layers can improve the positioning accuracy.
* (MTK) Proposal 3-1
  + Study the impact of channel spacing, timing offset and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous CA
* (MTK) Proposal 3-2
  + Study whether interband CA can be utilized for LOS detection due to different path loss and reflection properties over different bands
* (MTK)Proposal 3-3:
  + Study whether intra-band non-contiguous CA can be utilized under conventional receiver and under advanced receiver providing super resolution, and the corresponding requirement on timing offset and power imbalance among CCs.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 2:
  + For the purpose of improved accuracy, study further DL PRS bundling in frequency domain, with considerations for both licensed and unlicensed operation and “PRS stitching” in both intra-band and inter-band scenarios.

Feature lead’s view

Considering the potential for the enhancement in positioning accuracy with the aggregating DL PRS resources, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 2-3

* The benefits and the issues associated with aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers of the same or different bands for improving positioning performance for both intra-band and inter-band scenarios will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include
  + the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers by Ues
  + the impact of channel spacing, timing offset and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios
    - FFS: unlicensed bands

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | Support.  Unlicensed band are not considered, at least in Rel.17. |
| vivo | In general, we could be open to further study of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers. However, according to the SID, such study in RAN1 should be accompanied with evaluation as in objective 1.c.   1. Study enhancements and solutions necessary to support the high accuracy (horizontal and vertical), low latency, network efficiency (scalability, RS overhead, etc.), and device efficiency (power consumption, complexity, etc.) requirements for commercial uses cases (incl. general commercial use cases and specifically (I)IoT use cases as exemplified in section 3 above (Justification)):    1. Define additional scenarios (e.g. (I)IoT) based on TR 38.901 to evaluate the performance for the use cases (e.g. (I)IoT). [RAN1]    2. Evaluate the achievable positioning accuracy and latency with the Rel-16 positioning solutions in (I)IoT scenarios and    3. identify any performance gaps. [RAN1]    4. Identify and evaluate positioning techniques, DL/UL positioning reference signals, signalling and procedures for improved accuracy, reduced latency, network efficiency, and device efficiency. Enhancements to Rel-16 positioning techniques, if they meet the requirements, will be prioritized, and new techniques will not be considered in this case. [RAN1, RAN2]   In order to have a meaningful study, we think the andwidth for evaluation should be decided first. Are we assuming the same Iiot and/or commercial use cases? What is the target of comparison? 100 MHz BW vs. 50 + 50 MHz CA? Without a clear target of comparison, how can we measure “performance benefits”?  About the 2nd sub-bullet, is the list complete? Prefer not to list at all. About the FFS under the 2nd sub-bullet, we didn’t find any mentioning of “unlicensed bands” in the SID. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support to discss further. But aggregation of DL PRS needs further clarification whether it means one PRS resource configured across multiple CC or multiple of PRS reosuces each configured for each CC. The later one would be supported without any specification impact, but we need to confirm whether UE can support simultaneous reception of PRS across multiple CCs where each CC can use different DL beam. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Support. And we have same view as Intel that unlicensed band is not considered in Rel-17  For CA and for vivo’s question, we think the intention of CA is to reach the total BW larger than the max BW of a single carrier |
| CMCC | Support the 2 main bullets. Regarding the unlicensed bands, it may be suspicious of ensuring the measurement quality of DL PRS from our point of view, and we prefer to keep the agregation within the licensed band. |
| Qualcomm | Supportive, but a few comments to have a more constructive discussion:   * We don’t see why the “FFS: Unlicensed bands ” is needed. We assume that the intention is to say that no “unlicensed specific” discussions would happen in Rel-17. But already Rel-16 supports PRS in unlicensed bands, and any generic proposal of aggregation of PFLs can also be applicable to these cases without having to make any special consideration. * The aspects of phase coherency across the positioning frequency layers (PFLs) is not written. It is not just power imbalance, but to coherently combine PFLs there is impact of phase discontinuities that need to be discussed.   **Proposal : Update the feature lead proposal as follows:**   * ***~~The benefits and the issues associated with~~ Aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers of the same or different bands ~~for improving positioning performance~~ for both intra-band and inter-band scenarios will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include***   + ***the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers by Ues***   + ***the impact of channel spacing, timing offset, phase offset, and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios***     - ***~~FFS: unlicensed bands~~***   + ***PRS processing timelines and UE complexity considerations*** |
| OPPO | Support in principle. We also think no dedicated/specific work for unlicensed bands in R17 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support, there are positioning accuracy benefits for aggregating multiple frequency layers, which are worthwhile to investigate. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | Support of the FL’s proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Support and remove FFS. |
| ZTE | Support and suggest to have a note here,  Note: The aggregation may also include that measurement is based on multiple DL positioning frequency layers received in a TDMed way. |

FL Comments

For Proposal 2-3, it seems most companies support the investigation.

About the bullet “FFS: unlicensed bands”, I intend to avoid the discussion of any issues especially associated with the DL PRS in “unlicensed bands” in the SI, since there is a proposal to “study further DL PRS bundling in the frequency domain, with considerations for both licensed and *unlicensed* operation…”. Given that Qualcomm also proposes to remove the bullet in the proposed updates of the proposal, I am happy to remove it in the updated proposal. About the vivo’s comment on the scenarios, my understanding is that for the investigation of Rel-17 enhancements, we will not be limited to the agreed scenarios for the performance evaluation, but any practical CA scenarios. I assume the “performance benefits” could be investigated, for example, with separated 50 and 50 MHz carriers, and combined 50+50, as already discussed in some papers. For Qualcomm’s comments on phase offset, I assume this is an important issue to be considered. About processing timelines and UE complexity considerations, especially the latter, I assume these are more general issues, which also need to be considered in other enhancements even they are not explicitly mentioned.

Proposal 2-3 (Revision 1)

* Aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers of the same or different bands for improving positioning performance for both intra-band and inter-band scenarios will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include
  + the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers by Ues
  + the impact of channel spacing, timing offset, phase offset, and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios
  + PRS processing timelines and UE complexity considerations

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support.  We consider this highest riority in the DL PRS enhancement section (Section 2 in this summary). One main reason is that it is clear how the BW associates to accuracy (at least in some scenarios) |
| Ericsson | We are open to study this. But we agree with the comments made by vivo above. When we say improving positioning performance, we first need to define a baseline to access the performance benefit of this feature. Will we compare 50 MHz + 50 MHz CA with aggregated DL PRS against 100 MHz with no DL PRS aggregation? |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with FL’s proposal. |
| MTK | **One question to QC**. For “phase offset” added by QC, this is a constant unkown value? Because any freqeucny error between CC may also introduce timing varying phase offset. Timing offset can also be treated as having phase offset. Because any delay of a path is to have linear phase rotation with a slope in frequency domain  For E/// and vivo question, we don't think we need to compare 50M + 50M CA against 100M SC. The intention of CA is to reach the total BW larger than the max BW of a single carrier. So we can add a sub-bullet to say, for example,   * The aggregated bandwidth under CA is larger than the max bandwidth of a single carrier   So, 100M+ 50M is valid  Also in section 3.3 (aggregated SRS), the frequency error is added by E///. If uplink side agrees to add this impairment, then the downlink side may add it as well. |
| ZTE | Support with high priority.  We think even RSs from different intra-band and inter-band are received in a TDMed way, joint measurement is also possible. And this method will have low spec impact. So we propose to revise the proposal as following,   * Aggregating/combining multiple DL positioning frequency layers of the same or different bands for improving positioning performance for both intra-band and inter-band scenarios will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include   + the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating/combining multiple DL positioning frequency layers by UEs   + the impact of channel spacing, timing offset, phase offset, and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios   + PRS processing timelines and UE complexity considerations |
| SS | OK but the bullets points may not needed. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | Support for study |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar view as Samsung. Sub-bullets might not be needed at this stage. |
| SONY | Support |

FL Comments

It seems the proposal is close to be stable. For Samsung’s and Nokia’s comments to remove the sub-bullets, I would suggest keeping them unless there is a strong opinion to remove them, given that we already spent the effort in the discussion on what may need to be included. For MTK’s comments on the ‘phase offset’, I assume as can use the term here for and discuss the details later. We may also add the impact of the frequency errors as discussed here. For ZTE’s suggestion on adding ‘combining’, I assume aggregating has the same meaning of ‘combining’ here.

Proposal 2-3 (Revision 2)

* Aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers of the same or different bands for improving positioning performance for both intra-band and inter-band scenarios will be investigated in Rel-17, which may include
  + the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers
  + the impact of channel spacing, timing offset, phase offset, frequency error, and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios
  + PRS processing timelines and UE complexity considerations

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Okay. For the FL comment on these potential impairments, QC, please respond if you see the messages |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | As we commented before, whatever performance “benefits” are in comparison to a baseline. Let’s be clear about the baseline, so that we can conduct evaluation study. |
| Intel | Support. Do we need to discuss the models for the errors mentioned in bullet 2? |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the main bullet only. First subbullet is obvious. We think first we need to agree there is benefit before moving to the details of the second sub-bullet. Third subbullet bring very little value. |
| Ericsson | Ok |
| **FL’s response** | For vivo’s comments on the baseline scenario, I assume the intention is for the comparison the performance gain for the cases with/without the support for DL PRS aggregation. It may be nice to have the ‘baseline’ scenario, but may not be necessary. For example, one may simply show that aggregating two 100MHz carriers has better performance than not aggregating them.  For Intel’s comments on the error modelling, yes, I think it is important for the further investigation after the proposal is agreed.  For Nokia’s comments on the sub-bullets, these issues mentioned in sub-bullets 2 and 3 are closely related whether the potential performance gain of shown in the simulation can be achieved is real, and whether it is practical to implement DL PRS aggregation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL comments

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## New DL reference signals for positioning

Background

For improving the positioning performance (e.g., reducing the interference), several companies propose introducing new DL positioning reference in Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (CATT)Proposal 13:
  + Consider supporting NR carrier phase DL positioning in Rel-17. The reference signals for DL carrier phase measurements can be:
    - C-PRS (sinusoidal signals)
* (ZTE)Proposal 3:
  + To better manage the interference, introduce orthogonal cover code (OCC) for positioning reference signals can be considered in Rel-17.
* (LGE)Proposal 7:
  + NR should consider cyclic shift based SFN transmission of PRS.
    - Need to study on benefit of the simultaneous transmission of a common PRS sequence with different intentional cyclic time-domain delays.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 13:
  + cyclic shifts for DL PRS is considered in rel17, with configurable cyclic shifts and configurable maximum number of cyclic shift.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 17:
  + TRS is a candidate for positioning in release 17.

Feature lead’s view

The design of the DL positioning reference signals is of the key importance for all positioning methods that use the DL PRS measurements. Significant efforts were spent in Rel-16 for the development DL PRS reference signals. Suggest further investigating the benefits of introducing new DL positioning reference signals if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-4

* The benefits and the need of introducing new DL positioning reference signals for positioning enhancements can be investigated.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. In order to support new positioning methods or improve the performance of measurements, new DL positioning reference signals maybe needed. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support the proposal being categorized as medium priority. |
| Intel | Do not support.  From the performance evaluation results presented by different companies we see that the target performance can be achieved with the existing physical signal structure. In our view the focus of further enhancements should be on the procedures targeting latency reduction and additional measurements. Introduction of additional DL positioning reference signals will complicate the design, which is not required to achieve the target performance. |
| vivo | Low priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | Only support to consider legacy RS to be used for positioning purpose. We do not agree to introduce totally new RS for positioning as this would be a huge specification impact and we have not seen much justification. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | For downlink, we prefer not to consider cyclic shift thing. SRS having cyclic shift is because it considers to multiplex more Ues to increase capacity. So we think there is difference between downlink and uplink  For CATT proposal for RS for carrier phase, as we said during on line, carrier phase measurement is quite promising and challenging. The integer ambiguity could be ignored under limited space for IIOT scenario, unlike to receive GPS signal. However, the multi-path under a limited space with obstacles could be the concern. Also we find there are many UE implementation issue. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are not supportive of the proposal as written above for a similar reasoning with Intel. To be more specific, for the purpose of improved accuracy, it seems performance results across companies are very positive, and it doesn’t seem like we need new reference signals. If the purpose is “network efficiency”, e.g., reuse TRS, we can be more open to discuss it, but then the scope of the proposal needs to be reduced. |
| OPPO | Support the study |
| CATT v2 | For Intel and Qualcomm’s comments, we want to say that current simulation results from different companies are based on perfect conditions. If we introduce the real conditions, such as inter-gNB synchronization errors, gNB and UE Rx/Tx calibration errors and other real error modelling, the target performance can not be achieved with the existing physical signal structure. Therefore, in our point of view, the benefits and the need of introducing new DL positioning reference signals for positioning enhancements can be studied in Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | It could be considered as low priority issue and also prefer to follow the one of the guidelines of the SID objective 1d:  “*Enhancements to Rel-16 positioning techniques, if they meet the requirements, will be prioritized, and new techniques will not be considered in this case*” |
| LG | We would like to ask FL to consider the reuse of andwidt RS as a different issue. For this issue, it is very difficult to discuss the totally new DL PRS design, so we suggest reducing the scope into modification on the current PRS. |
| Fraunhofer | Low andwidt. |
| ZTE | To better manage the interference, introduce orthogonal cover code can be considered. |
| SS | Support |

FL Comments

For Proposal 2-4, given that several companies have explicitly expressed their concerns on introducing new DL positioning reference signals in Rel-17, and we have so many other high-priority issues to be resolved, suggest keeping the proposal as a medium priority for now. We may further discuss the proposal if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-4 (Revision 1)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Agree to focus on high-priority issues at current stage. |
| MTK | Low priority |
| ZTE | OK |
| SS | We should initiate the discussion in this meeting at least. |
| Fraunhofer | Agree with FL comment |
| Futurewei | Low priority |
| Ericsson | This should be low priority |
| Sony | Low Priority |

## DL PRS muting enhancements

Background

Flexible DL PRS muting pattern in time-domain is supported with the granularity of DL RS resource set. One company proposes to study the enhance the DL PRS muting with the granularity of DL RS resource, and one company proposes to study the enhance the DL PRS muting in the frequency domain.

Submitted Proposals

* (OPPO) Proposal 3:
  + Study to support DL PRS resource-specific muting.
* (Samsung)Proposal 5:
  + Frequency domain muting should be studied

Feature lead’s view

DL PRS muting is an effective approach to reduce DL PRS interference. DL PRS muting with the granularity of DL RS resource and/or the frequency domain may further reduce the DL PRS interference. Suggest further investigating the benefits of introducing new DL PRS muting enhancements if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-5

* The enhancements of DL PRS muting, e.g., DL PRS resource-specific muting and Frequency domain muting can be further investigated

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We prefer the notions of PRS resource-specific muting and frequency domain muting being clarified before agreeing studying. |
| Intel | Do not support further muting enhancements. Open to consider modifications of DL PRS transmission schedule leading to additional randomizations across time-frequency occasions.  We think that other methods, including the resources randomization over different (colliding) gNBs could be considered as an alternative. The DL PRS muting mechanism improves performance, however it happens at the expense of extra latency and reduced density of  transmissions on the same spectrum resources. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not support frequency domain muting. We would introduce various schemes to achieve further flexibility on PRS resource configuration in Rel-17. But to avoid too complicated operation or specification, we suggest PRS resource as the minimum unit of RRC configuration of L1 signal based control. We are not sure what value this proposal really brings. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Don’t support |
| CMCC | Support. On top of the resource set specific muting, and resource repetition specific muting, other muting enhancements can be studied to further randomize the interference among DL PRS from different TRPs. |
| Qualcomm | Do not support studying further FDM-ed type of muting. With regards to resource-specific muting, we assume that it means, that different PRS resources of the same set have a different muting pattern. If that is the case, we are OK to look into it further, but as lower priority. |
| OPPO | Support to andw DL PRS resource-specific muting.  Reply to Huawei: QC’s interperattion on resource-specific muting is andwid to us. As we know multiple DL PRS resources in one set are used to support Tx beam sweeping operation and the TRP can apply different Tx beams on different DL PRS resources in one set. The purpose of muting PRS resource is to mute one PRS resource transmission temporarily so that the UE is able to receive other PRS resource transmitting on the same time and frequency resource. In multi-beam system, the PRS resources are highly beamformed. One UE does not receive all the PRS resource with good signal strength. Thus, for that UE, we do not need to mute the PRS resources transmitted with Tx beam not aligned with the UE, from which the UE only experiences weak signals. |
| LG | We would like to first clarify the the DL PRS resource-specific muting and frequency domain muting.   * In case of DL PRS resource-specific muting, does it mean that muting is configured with each PRS resource level ?, so each PRS resource within a PRS resource set has different muting patten.   In case of frequency domain muting, does it mean that some frequency resources within a PRS resource can be muted, i.e., partial muting of a PRS resource or PRS resource set ? |
| Fraunhofer | Do not support. We don’t see this issue as an important enhancement. |
| ZTE | We do not support frequency domain muting. We are open to study if current PRS muting is flexible enough. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback so far, 2 companies do not support the consideration of further enhancements of DL PRS muting in Rel-17. 7 companies are interested in the DL PRS resource-specific muting enhancements, but only a few companies support frequency domain muting. Suggest further discussion on whether to include the investigation of PRS resource-specific muting in Rel-17 only if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 2-5 (Revision 1)

* The PRS resource-specific muting can be further investigated.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority overall |
| Ericsson | In our view, resource specific muting is a low priority given how flexible muting already is for PRS. We do not support prioritizing this issue in Rel-17. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK for us of taking the interpretation of PRS resource specific muting as QC explanied. |
| MTK | It is low priority. |
| ZTE | OK |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Low priority |
| LG | We suggest that “the PRS resource-specific muting can be further investigated **with the low priority**”. Then we can support it. |
| Nokia/NSB | Low priority. Not sure there is much value to this proposal. |
| SONY | Support with low priority |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Support.  When coupled with low latency requirements, PRS resource-specific muting is helpful to improve network efficiency and reduce positioning latency. |
| InterDigital | Support |

FL Comments

Based on the 2nd round feedback, 7 companies support it while 7 other companies support with low priority. One company is not supportive.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We support to investigate it in Rel-17. Since no companies object to this proposal, we prefer to continue to discuss it as FL proposal. |
| MTK | Low priority. And let’s eventually see whether we can discuss this after a tons of other items |
| InterDigital | PRS muting configured per resource will add flexibility to configuration. We support the study. |
| Ericsson | As we indicated above, we do not support the proposal. So, we prefer not to continue the discussion further in the study item phase. |
| Sony | Same view as CATT |

## Multi-port DL PRS transmission

Background

In Rel-16, DL PRS is transmitted on one antenna port only. For Rel-17, there are proposals to support DL PRS transmission from more than 1-port with the potential to improve the measurement accuracy (e.g., multipath mitigation).

Submitted Proposals

* (Futurewei)Proposal 2:
  + For the purpose of improving accuracy, methods to identify NLOS and the corresponding mitigation methods should be studied including the usage of polarization transmissions and measurements
* (Sony)Proposal 2:
  + Support the study on enhanced beam operation for positioning, including PRS transmission with more than one antenna port (i.e. 2 antenna ports) and the usage of legacy reference signal for positioning (TRS, CSI-RS).
* (Spreadtrum)Proposal 2:
  + For Rel-17 positioning enhancement, 2-port PRS should be further studied.

Feature lead’s view

The multi-port transmission of the positioning reference signals was discussed in Rel-16, but without a clear conclusion of the potential benefits. The main motivation for proposing multi-port DL PRS transmission again seems related to the support of the multipath mitigation. Thus, the multi-port DL PRS transmission may be investigated as part of the investigation of the multipath mitigation.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Agree to FL’s view. |
| Intel | The multi-port DL PRS transmission can be considered and its performance benefits can be evaluated. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Yes, we can investigate and conclude for this study item. Whether to go for multipl-port PRS design may depend on the conclusion |
| CMCC | Support. From our perspective, the real environment of IioT scenario is full of NLOS paths, by enabling the multi-port DL PRS to further help the NLOS identification and mitigation is beneficial. |
| CEWiT | Agree with FL’s view |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Agree with FL. |

FL comments

Suggest multi-port positioning DL PRS transmission be investigated as a part of the investigation of the multipath mitigation.

# Enhancements of UL positioning reference signals

## New UL SRS transmission patterns

Background

In Rel-16, full staggering patterns are supported for UL SRS for positioning. For reducing the positioning latency, minimizing the interference, and optimizing the resource usage, several companies propose supporting partial staggering and non-staggering UL SRS transmission patterns as well as the frequency hopping in Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 2:
  + The enhancement of SRS should include studying
    - Partial staggering and non-staggering SRS RE mapping
* (CMCC) Proposal 4:
  + The non-full staggering UL SRS for pos resource pattern should be considered.
* . (OPPO) Proposal 4:
  + Study the enhancement of SRS resource for positioning to support larger transmission andwidth, e.g., support frequency-hopping, larger Comb size
* (OPPO) Proposal 6:
  + Study the enhancement of RE mapping of SRS resource for positioning to resolve the interference issue and increase the capacity of SRS resource for positioning.
* (CATT) Proposal 5:
  + Frequency hopping of SRS-Pos for positioning should be supported in Rel-17 in order to obtain better positioning accuracy.

Feature lead’s view

Considering the potential benefits for positioning enhancements and the relatively small impact on the speciation, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 3-1

* Partial staggering and non-staggering RE mapping and frequency hopping of SRS for positioning will be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We suggest to make frequency hopping as a separate proposal which needs more discussion to us. We support partial staggering and non-staggering RE mapping of SRS for positioning. |
| Intel | Open to support, if it is justified by performance evaluation in the relevant/agreed scenarios. The focus of investigation should be on 1-symbol.2-symbols UL SRS to improve latency and signal multiplexing ratio. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Same comments as to proposal 2-1 in terms of RE patterns. We are unclear why frequency hopping is included in this same proposal. Is there a relation? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Again, we support partial staggering for both downlink and uplink since Rel-16. Some partial staggering case for SRS is supported in Rel-16. We are okay to extend for more cases |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are OK to consider further in Rel-17 such scenarios. We think that this proposal can include the patterns of SRS for MIMO (which we assume are the “non-staggered RE” patterns discussed). |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the study of different SRS RE mapping schemes. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Frequency hopping should be a separate issue. We assume intra-slot repetition (which has been supported in Rel-16 for full-staggered RE mapping) for “partial-staggered RE” mapping should also be discussed. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, it seems the investigation of partial staggering and non-staggering RE mapping of SRS for positioning are supported by all companies, but somce companies may have the concerns on the investigation of frequency hopping of SRS for positioning. I assume we need to investigate the aliasing issues as partial staggering and non-staggering of DL PRS. For the transmission of frequency hopping of SRS for positioning, we can list it as a separate proposal with medium priority based on the comments (see Section 3.8).

Proposal 3-1 (Revision 1)

* Partial staggering and non-staggering RE mapping of SRS for positioning with different combinations of comb-factors and symbol lengths will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + the methods/signalling for addressing potential time-domain aliasing due to the partial/non-staggering RE mapping will be included in the studied

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| MTK | Support the proposal |
| ZTE | OK |
| SS | Support in general but propose to change to “New RE mappting of …” |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | OK for the study |
| Nokia/NSB | We see this as low priority and wish to avoid long repeat of discussion during Rel-16. Proponents need strong justification (i.e., accuracy improvement or other benefit) to re-open this in our view. |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Support |

FL Comments

Proposal 3-1 (Revision 1) seems stable. Nokia’s concern is reasonable. Introducing new mapping patterns should be carefully justified, which may be further discussed during the WI.

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Transmission of UL SRS for positioning with other signals/channels

Background

The collision rule of PUSCH and periodic and semi-periodic SRS for positioning is already defined in Rel-16. The collision rule of PUSCH and a-periodic SRS for positioning is under discussion in Rel-16. To reduce the positioning latency for some scenarios, additional priority rules may need to be introduced in Rel-17 for a-periodic SRS/on-demand SRS.

Submitted Proposals

* (CMCC) Proposal 5:
  + The collision rule of PUSCH and AP SRS for pos should be studied.
* (vivo) Proposal 8:
  + Introduce the priority indications of SRS-PosResource for low latency positioning in Rel-17.
* (InterDigital) Proposal 1:
  + Study mechanisms supporting prioritized transmission of PRS and **SRS** for positioning
* (InterDigital) Proposal 2:
  + Rel-16 URLLC prioritization mechanisms is used as a baseline for prioritized transmission of PRS and SRS for positioning.

Feature lead’s view

In Rel-17 we need to support very-low positioning latency in some scenarios, e.g., time-critical positioning service, while not to cause any significant performance degradation on data communication services. There is a need to define the priority rules, allowing the network to use different configurations to support different scenarios. Thus, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 3-2

* Simultaneous transmission of UL SRS for positioning together with other UL signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol will be investigated in Rel-17
* Priority rules will be investigated for the transmission of UL SRS for positioning and other UL signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support the first bullet. Second bullet should be something to be considered as part of first bullet and hence there is no need to single out this as a separate agreement. |
| CATT | Support. This issue had been also discussed in Rel-16 email thread [102-e-NR-Pos-02] (Aspect #22: Priority of SRS for Positioning), maybe we can wait for the outcome of [102-e-NR-Pos-02] and then further discuss this issue. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We do not think it should be a high priority issue.  Regarding the priority rule, we do not think that it can be handled by positioning alone. We may need to involve MIMO/eIIoT as well. |
| Intel | Support for prioritization.  In our view simultaneous transmission of UL SRS with other signals/channels will deteriorate the performance of measurements and positioning accuracy. Therefore, in order avoid additional multiplexing prioritization of UL SRS transmission over other UL signals/channels should be considered. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay in principle but have a similar view as Futurewei. Hearability reduction should be taken into account as well. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We prefer to consider priority rule |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Is this really simultaneous transmission within a single CC? Likely it is only about UL CA scenarios for which case we already have simultaneous transmission in the rel-16 spec. We don’t think it is high priority; this is really a small issue that can be tacktled in the WI if/as needed. If companies consider it for the scope of single CC simultaneous SRS, we don’t think that this should be studied further. |
| OPPO | We share the same view as QC |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | We think that priority rule is necessary to avoid ambiguous Rel-16 UE behaviour, but it seems that it is difficult to be discussed for Rel-16 UE. Then, we prefer to deprioritize this issue and discuss in the WI. |
| Fraunhofer | Support. |
| ZTE | Proposal should be clear that it’s for single CC or UL CA. We think it’s a low priority issue. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |

FL Comments

Based on the comments, we will need to clarify the proposed enhancement is for single CC or UL CA. My understanding the proposal is for single CC case, since for CA case, UE should support imultaneous transmission of UL SRS for positioning together with other UL signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol based on UE’s capability. For single CC case, if the UE is configured for UL transmission, e.g., periodic UL transmission of PUSCH, and there is another request for the UL transmission of UL SRS for positioning, e.g., on-demand transmission, there is a need to define the priority rules.

### Proposal 3-2 (Revision 1)

* Priority rules of handling the possible collision of the transmission of SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol(s) *in the same UL carrier* will be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. We also think the proposed enhancement is for single CC case. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the further clarification. Based on the above proposal, we don’t really think that there is much to investigate, and we should not spend too much online time to discuss this detail. It looks like a small TEI enhancement, and not something that we need to spend time during an SI. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Qualcomm’s comment above. This seems to be at best a matter for the work item phase. So suggest not to priorize this in the SI phase. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. We are also ok to limit the study for single CC case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with comment from Qualcomm, don’t see the point to study. We also think it should not be a high priority issue |
| MTK | QC and E/// comments are reasonable to us. We can just discuss this in WI |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| SS | OK |
| Fraunhofer | Ok with the proposal. |
| LG | We agree with Qualcomm’s view. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with QC and other companies with similar views. |
| SONY | OK with the proposal |

FL Comments

Based on the further comments, multiple companies believe this is an issue that can be handled during the WI without the need to spend time in SI to investigate, maybe we can conclude the discussion in this meeting.

### Proposal 3-2 (proposed conclusion)

* Priority rules of handling the possible collision of the transmission of SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels in the same OFDM symbol(s) in the same UL carrier can be considered in WI phase. No further discussion of this issue in SI phase.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| vivo | Support.  Priority rules for SRS for positioning have been proposed in Rel-16 due to lack of time. We think the low latency positioning in Rel-17 definitely requires priority rules. |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay. |
| ZTE | OK. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority, but if we don’t need to spend time online debating this and we can resolve it through email, we are fine. We should not debate this minor topic online. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with QC. Should not spend online time on this issue as there are many topics in this AI where similar statements could be made based on the discussion. |
| Intel | We do not support the current version of proposal, since directly going to the WI phase without study is not reasonable from the technical perspective.  It is clear that possible collision of the transmission of SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels will negatively affect the accuracy and thus it is not desired. |
| SS | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| FL response | For Intel’s comments, I think most companies have the same view that “It is clear that possible collision of the transmission of SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels will negatively affect the accuracy and thus it is not desired”. Thus, it would be great if we can have an agreement to investigate this issue. However, some companies do not think this needs to be done in SI phase. For simple priority rules, it can be done during WI, as in Rel-16. |
|  |  |

## UL SRS transmission with aggregated SRS resources

Background

The positioning measurement accuracy is tightly related to the available RF resources in time and frequency. To further improving positioning accuracy, several companies propose to support the UL SRS transmission and reception with larger bandwidth and longer duration (inter-slot SRS repetition).

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 2:
  + The enhancement of PRS should include studying
    - Simultaneous SRS transmission across CCs
* . (OPPO) Proposal 4:
  + Study the enhancement of SRS resource for positioning to support larger transmission xisting, e.g., support frequency-hopping, larger Comb size
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 3:
  + For the purpose of improved accuracy, study further SRS for Positioning bunding in time domain & inter-slot SRS repetition.

Feature lead’s view

Considering the potential for providing a significant enhancement in positioning accuracy with the aggregating multiple UL positioning frequency layers, suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 3-3

* The benefits and the issues associated with simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| Intel | Support for study. |
| Vivo | It’s not clear to us how this study is different from Rel-16 where for intra-band and inter-band CA operations, a UE can simultaneously transmit more than one SRS resources configured by *SRS-PosResource* on different CCs, subject to UE’s. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We proposal this issue to be considered together with issue 2.3, DL PRS aggregation across multiple CCs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Supportive, but we have a couple suggestions for a more constructive discussion:  ***~~The benefits and the issues associated with s~~Simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17, at least considering the following issues:***   * ***Both Intra-band and inter-band scenarios can be considered***   ***Impact of phase offset, channel spacing, timing offset, power imbalance aspects SRS across slots or CCs.*** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | Support for study. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support. We also think this issue should be considered together with issue 2.3, it’s all about frequency bundling and time bundling. |

FL Comments

For Proposal 3-3, it seems most companies support the investigation.

About the vivo’s comment, my understanding is that the proponents intend to explore the potential benefits when the SRS for positioning in all UL CCs are treated optimally instead separately in SRS transmission and reception. For Nokia and ZTE’s suggestion to treat Proposal 2-3 for DL case and Proposal 3-3 for UL case, I assume we may consider whether to combinie the statu of both in the same section due to the similarity once we have agreement to include both of them in the investigation in Rel-17. I will take the suggestions from Qualcomm as update proposal since it provides more specifically the issues that need to be considered in the investigation.

Proposal 3-3 (Revision 1)

* Simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17, at least considering the following issues:
  + Both Intra-band and inter-band scenarios can be considered
  + Impact of phase offset, channel spacing, timing offset, power imbalance aspects SRS across slots or CCs.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support. High priority for the UL SRS enhancements. It can be directly related to accuracy through increased BW and increased coverage enhancement. |
| Ericsson | We’d like to suggest the following revisions to the proposal:   * Simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17, at least considering the following issues:   + Both Intra-band and inter-band scenarios can be considered   + Impact of phase offset, channel spacing, TA and timing offset, frequency error, power imbalance aspects SRS across slots or CCs. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. Ok with revision from Ericsson. |
| MTK | We are generally okay for E/// version. But the downlink side and uplink side may somehow be aligned. Look at section 2.3,   * + the impact of channel spacing, timing offset, phase offset, and power imbalance among CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios   need to clarify the relationship between phase offset, timing offset and frequency error as we mention in section 2.3 |
| ZTE | Support with high priority. |
| SS | Support but frequency hopping hould also be included. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | We are Okay with the proposal from Ericsson |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay with revision from Ericsson in principle but at this stage it might be better to just agree main bullet and leave details for later meetings. |
| Sony | Support the revised version from Ericsson. |

FL Comments

For Proposal 3-3 (Revision 1), it seems most companies support the proposal with the revision proposed by E///. For Nokia’s proposal to remove the sub-bullets, I would suggest keeping them unless there is a strong opinion to remove them, given that we already spent the effort in the discussion on what may need to be included. To address the concern, we can change ‘at least considering’ to ‘may consider’ so we are not bonded to these sub-bullets. The proposal is also modified with the consideration of the MTK’s comments of wording alignment with Proposal 2-3.

Proposal 3-3 (Revision 2)

* Simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17, which may consider
  + the impact of channel spacing, TA and timing offset, phase offset, and power imbalance across slots or CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Frequency error should be added |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| vivo | We are still not clear about the difference between this proposal and R16 agreement where for intra-band and inter-band CA operations, a UE can simultaneously transmit more than one SRS resources configured by *SRS-PosResource* on different CCs. Are we study/evaluating the performance impact of the listed aspects to Rel-16 feature?  For proposal 2-3, we are investigating “the scenarios and performance benefits of aggregating multiple DL positioning frequency layers.” What’s the reason to not include study on applicable scenarios and performance benefits compared to a baseline? |
| Intel | Support for study. We assume that we need to discuss models for impairments. |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Ericsson | Ok |
| **FL’s response** | For vivo’s comments, my understanding is that in Rel-16 the UL SRS transmission and reception of multiple CCs can be seen as independent. For the proposed enhancement, the UL SRS transmission and reception of multiple CCs will not longer be considered as independent processes, but as if they were from one carrier with combined bandwidth. Thus, there is a need to consider the issues bullets. In addition, Rel-16 SRS transmission in each slot can also be considered as independent.  For Intel’s comments on the error modelling, yes, I think it is important for the further investigation after the proposal is agreed. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay. |
| Futurewei | Support |

FL Comments

It seems most companies support the proposal 3-3 (Revision 2). To consider the alignment with agreement of Proposal 2-3, I added the frequency error (also suggested my MTK) and the scenarios and performance benefits of the proposed enhancements

Proposal 3-3 (Revision 3)

* Simultaneous transmission and reception of the SRS for positioning across multiple CCs and multiple slots can be investigated in Rel-17, which may consider
  + The scenarios and performance benefits of the enhancement
  + the impact of channel spacing, TA and timing offset, phase offset, frequency error, and power imbalance across slots or CCs to the positioning performance for intra-band contiguous/ non-contiguous and inter-band scenarios

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| MTK | Support. |
| Intel | Support. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| LG | Support |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |

FL Comments

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Enhancement of SRS cyclic shift patterns

Background

Rel-16 SR for positioning reuses the formula of the legacy SRS cyclic shifts. The potential issues were identified in Rel-16 WI due to the staggered patterns are used in SRS for positioning. The solutions for these issues were also discussed during Rel-16 WI without reaching a consensus. Many companies propose to resolve the problem in Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 2:
  + The enhancement of SRS should include studying
    - Enhancement on cyclic shift pattern considering staggering
* (CATT) Proposal 4:
  + Symbol-specific cyclic shifts for SRS-Pos should be supported in order to keep phase continuities when a staggered SRS-Pos pattern is de-staggered for the SRS-Pos detection at the receiver.
* (MTK) Proposal 9-1
  + Increase the maximum cyclic shift number for each comb for the staggering SRS structure:
* (MTK) Proposal 9-2
  + The amount of the phase rotation applied to the Res across symbols with SRS transmission may follow the order of occupied subcarriers
* (Fraunhofer) Proposal 6:
  + For Rel-17 update the sequence generation by modifying the equations as

configured via   and

is configurable (range for *cyclicshift* is extended)

Note: the maximum value of cyclic shift is not changed

* (Fraunhofer) Proposal 7:
  + For Rel-17 SRS enhancement support:
    - a phase correction for the staggered SRS, and
    - maintain the cyclic shift step size of Rel-15.
    - Extend the range of the cyclic shift
* (Ericsson) Proposal 14:
  + The cyclic shift of the UL SRS with staggered pattern can be configured to be 1) the same in each symbol, according to REL-15 behavior or 2) per SRS resource, across all symbols in the SRS resource, according to equation 1 above.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 15:
  + The maximum number of available cyclic shifts for the SRS for positioning is configurable by the gNodeB as part of the RRC configuration.

Feature lead’s view

The issues of the cyclic shifts in Rel-16 SRS for positioning were identified and the potential solutions were also intensively discussed in Rel-16, but the issue is not resolved. Suggest resolving this issue in Rel-17.

### Proposal 3-4

* The cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning will be further investigated in Rel-17 to increase the maximum cyclic shift number for each comb for the staggering SRS structure as well as make the phase rotation applied to the Res across symbols with SRS transmission following the order of occupied subcarriers.
  + FFS: the detailed formula for the cyclic shift pattern
  + FFS: whether the maximum number of available cyclic shifts for the SRS for positioning is configurable

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. This issue had been discussed a lot in Rel-16. We believe the enhancements of cyclic shift can benefit the measurements of SRS-Pos. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We suggest to keep it general by saying that   * The issue caused by the Rel-16 cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning will be further investigated in Rel-17   + FFS: to increase the maximum cyclic shift number for each comb for the staggering SRS structure as well as make the phase rotation applied to the Res across symbols with SRS transmission following the order of occupied subcarriers.   + FFS: the detailed formula for the cyclic shift pattern   + FFS: whether the maximum number of available cyclic shifts for the SRS for positioning is configurable   + FFS: additional phase I symbols   FFS: cyclic shift hopping pattern across symbols |
| Intel | Open to study the issue and support, subject to study outcome. |
| vivo | In Rel-16, cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning has been studied and proposed. It’s not supported in Rel-16.  Whether to increase the maximum cyclic shift number for each comb should be the concluded after the study. Same applies to whether make the phase rotation applied to the Res across symbols. The wording of this proposal sounded RAN1 already agreed to increase the maximum cyclic shift number for each comb for the staggering SRS structure as well as make the phase rotation applied to the Res across symbols and the study is on the detailed patterns.  We don’t think that’s the case. We suggest this wording.   * Enhancement on cyclic shift pattern can be investigated in Rel-17.   Furthermore, our understanding is that this is related to UL SRS interference issue (in section 3.6) as well. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are O.K. to consider further enhancement on the configuration of CS per PRS resource, but we don’t see a strong reason to increase number of supported CS per comb value. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | The existing Rel-15 phase rotation pattern to achieve cyclic shift of each UE is designed for the non-staggering SRS. We support a revised phase rotation pattern for the partial staggering and full staggering SRS |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | The reason we are staggering the SRS for positioning, is because the network is not really confident where the PDP of that UE is or how much is the delay spread, so we want to avoid time-domain aliasing. If the network is confident that it can orthogonalize the Ues in cyclic shift domain, it means that the network is confident where the main path of each UE will be received. In that case, why use staggered SRS? Why not just enable in Rel-17 to configure non-staggered SRS, and add any cyclic shifts on top of that unstaggered SRS needed (if the network is so confident where each UE is located).  If the plan is to do staggered SRS and non-orthogonal SRS, there is no need to use cyclic shifts for that purpose; just change the sequence ID.  In other words, staggered SRS + cyclic shifting of Ues is not a problem that needs to be solved by adjusting the cyclic shift formula, but rather by introducing unstaggered SRS (Proposal 3-1). |
| OPPO | Support to study, at least including phase continuity issue discussed in R16 |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| Fraunhofer | Support: this issue is left open from Rel-16.  Here we distinguish two scenarios:  - High COMB factor is mainly used to increase the number of Ues sharing the same OFDM symbol orthogonally (no staggering is required) - critical link budgets (e.g. high distance or Ues with low TX power capability) 🡺 high COMB factor in combination with staggering provide a “power boosting gain”.  Without phase correction the full staggering gain can’t be achieved.    Question to the proposal from HW: what can be understood with “CS pattein across symbols” is the last FFS bullet |

FL Comments

It seems most companies are supportive for the enhancement on cyclic shift pattern for SRS for positioning, but have different views on what need to be included in the study. So, I would suggest we first make the agreement that the enhancement on cyclic shift pattern for SRS for positioning will be investigated as suggested by vivo, and then we can further discuss more details later.

### Proposal 3-4 (Revision 1)

* The enhancements of the cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning will be further investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think this is necessary if we introduce un-staggered SRS for Positioning. So, the whole scope of investigating and spending time may not be needed. Lets just introduced unstaggered SRS (Proposal 3-1) and the “problem” is solved. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think the scope of the proposal is too broad, so suggest the following change:  The enhancements to address the issue from the existing cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning will be further investigated in Rel-17. |
| MTK | Support. And in rel-16 we have designed staggered SRS |
| ZTE | Agree with QC. |
| SS | Do not support |
| Fraunhofer | Support. We should consider enhancements and not reduce Rel-16 features. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay but low priority. |

FL Comments

Based on the further comments, 4 companies think the enhancement is either low priority or not needed. Suggest lowering the proposal as medium priority for now, and continue the discussion in next week. The proposal is also modified based on Huawei’s comments.

### Proposal 3-4 (Revision 2)

* The enhancements to address the issue from the existing cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning will be further investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. To Fraunhofer, we are referring to cyclic shift hopping similar to PUCCH, i.e. each symbol may have a different CS. We believe it can reduce the correlation peaks between two SRS with different initial cyclic shifts. |
| MTK | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Change “will be” into “can be”. Some companies suggested to lower the priority, so we don’t think the proposal can be surely included in SI/WI due to limited progress through online meeting in Rel-17. |
| vivo | Support |
| Intel | Open to study the Rel.16 issue only (if any) and support changes, subject to study outcome. |
| LG | Same view with Intel |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

FL Comments

Most companies are fine with the proposal. The proposal is modified based on the suggestion from ZTE and Intel.

### Proposal 3-4 (Revision 3)

* The enhancements to address the issue from the Rel-16 cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning can be further investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | We don't have any agreement on cyclic shift (phase rotation actually) pattern in Rel-16. We only agree on max cyclic shift number for comb-8. So “Rel-16” is not appropriate. The patterns were from Rel-15. We prefer previous wording of “existing” |
| Intel | Open to study the Rel.16 issue only (if any) and support changes, subject to study outcome. Support MTK proposal to keep wording of “existing”. |
| LG | Same view with MTK |
| Fraunhofer | Agree to MTK’s comment |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think that needs to be considered separately than 3-1. The actual discussion here is: How can we multiplex orthogonally more UEs to increase UL efficiency. Prposal 3-1 covers that isues; we think it should be considered within that scope. The need of these CS study is not clear to us given the fact that non-staggered SRS will be discussed. |

FL Comments

It seems most companies prefer “existing cyclic shift” instead of “Rel-16 cyclic shift”. For QC’s comment that proposed investigation is already included in 3-1, yes, it may be so. But it has no harm to make the explicit agreement given that this issue has been discussed since Rel-16, and it would be mentioned and discussed specifically.

### Proposal 3-4 (Revision 4)

* The enhancements to address the issue from the existing cyclic shift patterns for SRS for positioning can be further investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | OK. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| MTK | Support.  To QC, in our view, unless we can specifically say that the multiplexing of UE under staggering pattern is not supported, Otherwise, it is very valid to investigate this issue |
| Intel | Open to study the Rel.16 issue only (if any) and support changes, subject to study outcome. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We still that this is not needed. I don’t understand the answer from MTK: We can still cyclic shift UEs with staggering patern;, maybe they are not orthogonal but why is that a problem? We can have UEs non-orthogonally transmitting SRS, which is actually much more likely than orthogonally transmitting them.  To repeat myself: In order to cyclic shift UEs, and expecting to really orthognalize them after the IFFT operation the network needs to know where each UE is approximately located, in which case the staggering is not needed either way. There is no need to optimize the CS orthogonalization in a staggered SRS pattern. What about the following?   * Enhancements to increase **multiplexing capacity of UEs** for SRS for positioning can be further investigated in Rel-17. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. |
| SS | Do not support |
| Fraunhofer | Support.  To address the issue raised in QC’s comment on the need CS enhancements to separate UEs with cyclic shift given a staggered pattern:  For positioning we want to receive the signal at several TRPs. The ToA difference of signals from UEs sharing the same REs and transmitting (nearly) orthogonal signals by using different cyclic depends on the timing advance and the distance (TA can be adjusted for one TRP only). Especially in scenarios with high ISD or channels with high delay spread an overlap of the channel impulse response may result. For this case staggering in combination with phase correction helps to maintain the orthogonality after destaggering.  To show this in an example: for the figures COMB=8 with staggering over 8 symbols is assumed. The first 4 subplots of each figure show the correlations per OFDM symbol for 4 of the 8 OFDM symbols of a staggered SRS transmission. The 5th subplot the destaggered signal without and with phase correction.  1st figure Destaggering without modification:    **2nd figure: Destaggering with phase correction:**    Obviously without enhancement the UEs **cannot** be distinguished. |

FL Comments

Given that two companies have explicitly said “do not support” the proposal, and the deadline of the email discussion is tomorrow, it seems difficult to reach a consensus for this proposal in this meeting. Suggest further discussion in next meeting.

## Power control for SRS for positioning

Background

In Rel-16, open-loop power control is supported for SRS for positioning, i.e., the Tx power of SRS for positioning is based on the path loss estimation, but not subject to TPC command from the gNB. This could potentially result in interference with other UL signals/channels. Several companies propose to support close-loop for SRS for positioning in Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 5:
  + The enhancement of UE procedure of transmitting SRS should include studying
    - Closed-loop power control of SRS for positioning
* (vivo)Proposal 7:
  + PHR based on SRS-PosResource should be introduced in Rel-17.
* (OPPO) Proposal 5:
  + Study the enhancement of uplink power control of SRS for positioning
    - Support closed-loop power control on SRS for positioning.
    - Support configuring power control parameter per SRS resource for positioning
* (Spreadtrum) Proposal 3:
  + For Rel-17 positioning enhancement, close loop power control can be further studied
* (Nokia)Proposal 4:
  + RAN1 to study enhancements on transmit power control for UL and UL+DL positioning methods, e.g., study a new procedure for how serving gNB gets TPC parameters from neighbor gNBs/TRPs.
* (TCL) Proposal 3:
  + Support Closed-loop power control for the transmission of SRS for positioning.

Feature lead’s view

Without the close-loop power control on SRS for positioning, the UE closes to a cell may create a significant interference for the reception of the UL signals/channel from other Ues by the same cell. The issue may get worse when the number of positioning Ues increases. Suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 3-5

* Close-loop power control of SRS for positioning will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: whether the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | The provided justification is not convincing for us, more study is needed. In general, closed loop power control is not well aligned with the low latency framework. |
| vivo | Close-loop power control is only one aspect of power control enhancement, we propose to change the wording of Proposal 3-5 to   * Enhancement of power control of SRS for positioning will be investigated in Rel-17. |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree that the TPC procedure for SRS for positioning can be investigated as we highlight in our Tdoc. However, we are not sure that closed loop is the only method. If agreeable we would rather see that RAN1 identifies this general area as being investigated. Proposed revision:  Power control enhancements of SRS for positioning will be investigated in Rel-17:   * + FFS: closed-loop power control   + FFS: whether the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Low priority |
| CMCC | Support. We believe that by introducing close loop power control of SRS pos, especially those towards the neighboring cell, can help mitigate the interference to other Ues (in serving and neighboring cells). Details of who and how to schedule of the TPC command, along with other issues w.r.t PHR can be further considered. |
| Qualcomm | We are also not convinced that there is any room for improvement here. Let alone that, unless there are architecture enhancements that enable tight and low-latency coordination between TRPs inside the NR Positioning Architecture, we don’t think that CL-based Power control will be implementable.  In other words Proposal 6.1 on Positioning architecture that enables fast/tight coordination between TRPs is a prerequise for considering closed-loop power control (and other advanced features that are being discussed, e.g., AP-PRS, low-latency, etc) |
| OPPO | Support |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | Support for study and OK to the revised proposal from Nokia/NSB. |
| Fraunhofer | We support to study enhancement for the UL PC procedure in Rel-17 and not limit it to closed-loop power control. |
| ZTE | Low priority. It’s hard to be done in non-ideal backhaul environment among TRPs. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, 9 companies are fine to investigate this issue with high-priority, while 4 companies either consider it as low priority or are not convinced as needed to be investigated in Rel-17. xistin companies suggest the investigation should not be limited to close-loop power control, but more general power control enhancements. Suggest having further discussion on whether this issue will be investigated with high priority.

### Proposal 3-5 (Revision 1)

* Power control of SRS for positioning will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: closed-loop power control
  + FFS: whether the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see how this can be considered high priority. It is either low priority, or not much to be enhanced, unless clearly we have network architectures that can exploit this. Companies that propose this feature do not seem to be proposing enhancements to ensure tight coordination between gNBs, so we prefer to not debate on this; ask companies to provide more details and evaluations on how they envision the coordination to be happening. |
| Ericson | This should be low priority. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support the proposal and it could be high priority. Enhancement could be further discussed/investigated but we see the benefits of power control of SRS only from serving cell perspective without tight coordinitions with other gNBs. |
| MTK | Low priority |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support. |
| LG | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We are also okay to add investigating coordination between gNBs if it address the concern from QC side. Further proposal:   * Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements will be investigated in Rel-17.   + FFS: closed-loop power control   + FFS: whether the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs     - Note: FFS includes coordination between gNB/TRPs. |
| SONY | Support with low priority |

FL Comments

Based on the received comments, suggest lowering the proposal to medium priority for now, and continue the discussion in next week. The proposal is also modified based on Nokia’s comments.

### Proposal 3-5 (Revision 2)

* Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: closed-loop power control
  + FFS: whether the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs
  + FFS: whether include coordination between gNB/TRPs

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support in principle.  We prefer to remove the last sub-bullet “whether include coordination between gNB/TRPs” since we don’t think it is valuable f to introduce tight coordination between gNB/TRPs just for power control of positioning , which will lead to much standardization effort and deployment cost. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Change “will be” into “can be”. Some companies suggested to lower the priority, so we don’t think the proposal can be surely included in SI/WI due to limited progress through online meeting in Rel-17. |
| vivo | Support the main bullet. As we commented before, we prefer not to list sub-bullets of FFS as they are not complete aspects identified. For example, PHR based on SRS for positioning as one aspect of power control enhancement is not listed. So either ad more FFS or remove them all. |
| Intel | Low priority. |
| LG | OK |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We are okay with ZTE’s proposed change and too address vivio’s concern it is fine to add FFS: PHR for SRS for positioning. |
| Ericsson | Low priority |

FL Comments

For OPPO’s proposal to remove the last bullet, suggest keep it there for now, since it is “FFS”. The proposal is modified based on the proposals from vivo/ZTE/Nokia.

### Proposal 3-5 (Revision 3)

* Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include
  + closed-loop power control
  + the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, and/or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs
  + coordination between gNB/TRPs
  + PHR for SRS for positioning.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| MTK | We think this as low priority. But as compared to the item of “muting enhancement” (section 2.5), this power control item could be higher than that |
| Intel | Low priority. Suggest adding a bullet:  Investigate closed-loop power control impact on the latency requirement. In our view it may affect the latency requirement significantly. |
| LG | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Agree on investigating the PC enhancements. Enhancement can imply a better reception at neighbouring TRPs and/or reducing the number of SRS transmissions. Suggest to add a bullet capturing enhancement to Rel-16 SRS for positioning procedure   * Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include but not limited to:   + closed-loop power control   + the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, and/or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs   + coordination between gNB/TRPs   + PHR for SRS for positioning   + Enhancements on Rel-16 SRS-Pos procedure. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority. Unclear gains; coordination might not be possible; numerical results are missing to try to motivate power control enhancements. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the revision from Fraunhofer. From our reading of the contributions most (if not all) companies assume full TX power from UE in their evaluations of UL or UL+DL techniques. Clearly performance will be impacted if lower TX power is used by UE. We see a clear gap here the RAN1 should investigate. |
| Xiaomi | support |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| ZTE | Low priority. Prefer to keep FFS for all sub-bullets. |
| Ericsson | We prefer not to discuss coordination between gNB/TRPs which can be handled by proprietary signalling. So there is no need to discuss coordination aspect. Overall, this is low priority from our perspective. |
| CEWiT | Support |
|  |  |

FL Comments

It seems majority companies prefer the modification proposed by Fraunhofer. For Ericsson’s comment that “coordination between gNB/TRPs which can be handled by proprietary signaling”, I assume we can decide the signaling for the “coordination between gNB/TRPs” is handled by standard or proprietary signaling after the investigation. There are three companies consider the investigation as “low priority”.

### Proposal 3-5 (Revision 4)

* Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to:
  + closed-loop power control
  + the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, and/or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs
  + the coordination between gNB/TRPs
  + PHR for SRS for positioning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Support. |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | Support. |
| LG | Support |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| Ericsson | We reiterate our previous revision’s position. We prefer not to discuss coordination between gNB/TRPs which can be handled by proprietary signalling. So there is no need to discuss coordination aspect. Overall, this is low priority from our perspective. |
| Intel | Low priority. |
| SS | OK |
| Fraunhofer | Support. We suggest to add “ Enhancements on Rel-16 SRS-Pos procedure” to the bullets |

FL Comments

6 companies support, and three companies consider it as low priority, and one suggestion is to remove the sub-bullet “the coordination between gNB/TRPs”. The proposal is revised by removing “the coordination between gNB/TRPs” to see if it can be accepted.

### Proposal 3-5 (Revision 5)

* Power control of SRS for positioning enhancements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to:
  + closed-loop power control
  + the TPC is generated from the serving gNB/TRP only, and/or also from the neighbor gNBs/TRPs
  + PHR for SRS for positioning
  + Enhancements on Rel-16 SRS-Pos procedure

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see how we can discuss closed-loop power control without understanding how the coordination would take place. Actually, this is the only thing that would need to be discussed. Power control is already there for MIMO SRS; if we enable MIMO SRS to be used for positioning also in Rel-17, then we would have full-blown CL power control automatically; what would be missing is the coordination between the gNBs.  I understand that some companies are interested in optimizing further the open loop power control mechanism. We can be more positive for that. However, closed loop PC without undersanding the coordination would mean there is nothing that we really have to discuss.  Therefore, we are not supportive of the above revision. |
| Ericsson | During release 16, we had many discussion regarding closed loop power control from the neighbour gnodeBs, and the majority of companies did not support it. We think the situation has not changed, and we do not support this enhancement. |
| CATT | Support.  In our point of view, closed-loop PC for SRS-Pos aiming to neighbouring gNB will face many challenges, just as pointed out by Qualcomm and Ericsson. However, it is still worth studying further in R17, considering the gain of closed-loop power control. |
| vivo | Support |

FL Comments

It seems companies have different views on whether the coordination between gNB/TRPs is needed for the enhancements of power control of SRS for positioning. It seems difficult to reach a consensus for this proposal in this meeting. Suggest further discussion in next meeting.

## Mitigation of interference between UL SRSs

Background

In Rel-16, each serving gNB decides the configuration of the transmission of SRS for positioning, and there is no support of the coordination among adjacent gNB/TRPs and LMF, which may result in the potential collision of the UL transmission of the Ues in adjacent gNB/TRPs. Thus, several companies propose to support the coordination schemes for the configurations of the SRS for positioning among adjacent gNB/TRPs and LMF to avoid a potential collision.

Submitted Proposals

* (CATT) Proposal 3:
  + Support SRS-Pos resource coordination to achieve orthogonal SRS-Pos resource assignment and SRS-Pos interference cancellation to eliminate inter-cell SRS-Pos interference in Rel-17.
* (CMCC) Proposal 6:
  + The SRS for POS coordination should be studied
* (CAICT)Proposal 3:
  + Support positioning SRS resource muting or coordination to achieve interference cancellation among different cells in Rel-17.

Feature lead’s view

Support the coordination of the configurations the SRS for positioning among adjacent gNB/TRPs and LMF may avoid the potential collisions of the SRS for positioning and reduce the UL interference.

### Proposal 3-6

* Mechanisms coordinating the configuration of SRS for positioning to achieve orthogonal SRS-Pos resource assignment and avoid potential collision of the SRS for positioning from UEs can be investigated.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK. |
| Intel | Support. |
| vivo | Low priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We are okay |
| CMCC | Support. In Rle-16, the final decision of the configuration of SRS pos is up to gNB, and potential conflicts between SRS pos with other SRS pos and UL signal/channels in serving and neighboring cells is unable to be avioided. In Rel-17, especially under IioT scenarios, further SRS pos coordination meachnism can be taken into account to further enhance the UL measurement quality. |
| Qualcomm | Not supportive of this proposal: We are not sure what needs to be studied here. Coordination of SRS looks like an implementation of each network. |
| OPPO | Resource coordination seems an implementation issue |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Not support. It’s an implementation issue. |
| Ericsson | As commented by other companies, coordination of SRS resource configurations is better to be left for implementation. We don’t see the need to discuss this proposal further in Rel-17. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, 7 companies are fine to investigate this issue, while 5 companies either consider it as low priority or as an network implementation issue. Given that the proposal is suggested as medium priority, suggest continuing the discussion on whether this issue belongs to the implementation issue and then make the decision in this week.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support to continue to discuss this issue in this week. In our point of view, SRS-Pos resource coordination among gNBs is important to achieve orthogonal SRS-Pos resource assignment and/or SRS-Pos interference cancellation in Rel-17. In order to improve the performance and efficiency of such coordination, some standard impact may be needed. |
| Fraunhofer | Agree to CATT |
| Ericsson | We would like to reiterate that SRS-Pos resource coordination among gNBs is a network implementation. We don’t see the need to continue discussion on this further in the SI. |
| Qualcomm | Not supportive |
| vivo | Same view with Ericsson and Qualcomm |

FL Comments

It seems difficult to reach a consensus for this proposal in this meeting. Suggest further discussion in next meeting.

## New UL reference signals for positioning

Background

For improving the positioning performance, there are proposals for the enhancements of Rel-16 UL reference signals

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo) Proposal 10
  + Support to reuse low PAPR RS agreed in Rel-16 MIMO for SRS sequence generation for positioning in Rel-17
* (CATT)Proposal 14:
  + Consider supporting NR carrier phase UL positioning in Rel-17. The reference signals for UL carrier phase measurements can be:
    - C-PRS (sinusoidal signals)

Feature lead’s view

The design of the UL positioning reference signals is of the key importance for all positioning methods that use the UL SRS measurements. Significant efforts were spent in Rel-16 for the development UL SRS for positioning. In Rel-17, new UL positioning reference signals may be introduced if it can provide significant benefits for positioning enhancements.

### Proposal 3-7

* New UL positioning reference signals may be further investigated for positioning enhancements.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think it should be low priority. |
| Intel | Do not support.  We think that introduction of new UL SRS reference signals in addition to the existing ones will complicate the design and implementation. At the same time, the evaluation results shown by different companies demonstrate, that we can achieve the target performance using the existing physical signal structure. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. Strong justification for a new reference signal would be needed and as of yet we have not seen it. This would also have a large specification impact. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Don’t support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are not supportive of this proposal. |
| OPPO | Not support |
| CATT v2 | For Intel and Qualcomm’s comments, we want to say that current simulation results from different companies are based on perfect conditions. If we introduce the real conditions, such as inter-gNB synchronization errors, gNB and UE Rx/Tx calibration errors and other real error modelling, the target performance can not be achieved with the existing physical signal structure. Therefore, in our point of view, the benefits and the need of introducing new DL positioning reference signals for positioning enhancements can be studied in Rel-17. |
| LG | Not support. |
| Fraunhofer | No strong motivation to support a new reference signal at this stage |
| ZTE | Not support. |
| SS | Not support |
| SONY | Do not support |
| Ericsson | Do not support |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, there are more companies that either consider it as low priority or are not convinced as needed to be investigated in Rel-17. Suggest no further discussion on the proposal in this meeting.

### Proposal 3-7 (Proposed conclusion)

* No further discussion on the proposal in this meeting.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Although we prefer to continue to discuss whether introduce new uplink positioning reference signal or not, we also can compromise to accept FL proposal 3-7, if most of companies do not support discuss this enhancement in this meeting. |
| Futurewei | Ok with this Proposal |
| ZTE | OK. |
| Ericsson | OK. |
| SS | OK |
| Sony | OK |

## Multi-port transmission of UL SRS for positioning

Background

In Rel-16, SRS for positioning is transmitted on a single antenna port. For Rel-17, there is a proposal to support the transmission of UL SRS for positioning from more than 1-port with the potential to improve the measurement accuracy (e.g., multipath mitigation)

Submitted Proposals

* (Fraunhofer)Proposal 2:
  + Study multi-port SRS transmission for positioning in Rel. 17.

Feature lead’s view

The multi-port transmission of the positioning reference signals was discussed in Rel-16, but without a clear conclusion of the potential benefits. The main motivation for proposing multi-port positioning RS transmission again seems related to the support of the multipath mitigation. The multi-port positioning RS transmission may be investigated as a part of the investigation of the multipath mitigation.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Maybe the benefit from the multi-port SRS-Pos need to be clarified. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | The benefit should be clarified. Probably 2 ports for two polarization are sufficient (same as downlink) |
| CMCC | Similar as DL, we think multi-port SRS transmission can be studied in Rel-17 to help identify and mitigate the NLOS. |
| Fraunhofer | The proposal is also related to network efficiency. In case of Ues with non-omnidirectional antenna pattern (FR2 or “non-ideal” UE antenna) the transmission over several ports in parallel reduces the number of required resources. Assuming up to 4 ports are supported by the UE the number of required resources is reduced by the factor 4. MIMO SRS already supports this functionality so why not support (or at least investigate) for positioning usage as well. |

FL Comments

Suggest multi-port positioning RS transmission be investigated as a part of the investigation of the multipath mitigation.

## Frequency hopping of UL SRS for positioning

Background

In Rel-16, UL SRS for positioning does not support frequency hopping. For minimizing the interference, there is a proposal to support the frequency hopping in the transmission of UL SRS for positioning Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (CATT) Proposal 5:
  + Frequency hopping of SRS-Pos for positioning should be supported in Rel-17 in order to obtain better positioning accuracy.

Feature lead’s view

Considering the potential benefits for positioning enhancements and the comments received (see Section 3.1), suggest investigating this issue with medium priority.

### Proposal 3-9

* Frequency hopping of SRS for positioning can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. The main objective of Rel-17 positioning study is high precision positioning performance of IioT scenarios. Therefore, it would be reasonable to configure a wider bandwidth for SRS in order to obtain better positioning accuracy. Wider bandwidth inevitably reduces the PSD of SRS and positioning accuracy. Frequency hopping of SRS should be supported together with comb transmission to boost PSD of the SRS reception at the gNB and increase positioning accuracy in Rel-17. |
| Ericsson | We are open to study this. But since this is only proposed by a single company, we can deprioritize this issue for this meeting. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| ZTE | Open to this. |
| SS | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Ericsson above. |
| LG | Same view with Ericsson. |
| Intel | Low priority. |

FL comments

* 5 companies are supportive and 4 companies consider it as low priority. No company is not supportive.

# Enhancements of UE/gNB measurements

## Multipath mitigation

Background

Positioning accuracy can be significantly degraded due to the impact of the multipath caused by NLOS signals, which is especially true for IioT scenarios. Rel-16 has introduced limited support of multipath mitigation by allows reporting multiple measurements from the same (pair of) TRPs. To further address the problem, many companies propose different solutions for Rel-17 positioning enhancements.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 3:
  + The enhancement of measurement should include studying
    - Multi-path measurements associated with angle/power measurements
    - NLOS/LOS identification
* (Futurewei)Proposal 2:
  + For the purpose of improving accuracy, methods to identify NLOS and the corresponding mitigation methods should be studied including the usage of polarization transmissions and measurements.
* (Futurewei) Proposal 3:
  + Additional measurement relative to the first detected path should be studied including its feasibility to improve AoD positioning accuracy.
* (vivo) Proposal 1:
  + The enhancements to improve positioning accuracy are needed for the NLOS scenario.
* (Sony) Proposal 5:
  + Support the study on LOS & NLOS detection mechanism at the UE and the associated signalling procedure.
* (CATT) Proposal 1:0
  + Each measurement would be associated with a LOS/NLOS identifier
* (Intel) Proposal 6:
  + RAN1 to support signaling indicating the LOS/NLOS propagation type or conditions for each link used for positioning
* (Intel) Proposal 7:
  + RAN1 to study an impact of the NLOS offset on the positioning accuracy and make a conclusion whether the NLOS offset reporting is a valuable mechanism or not
* (Intel) Proposal 8:
  + RAN1 to study benefits of the additional measurements for the first arrival path of the CIR component
    - First arrival path (FAP) power, K-factor, Doppler shift, etc
* (Samsung)Proposal 3:
  + Angle based LOS/NLOS differentiation with joint measurement should be studied
* (MTK) Proposal 5-1:
  + Study RSRP measurement for first-arriving path as accuracy improvement for DL-AoD technique
* (Spreadtrum) Proposal 3:
  + Support UE to report the RSRP value corresponding to the PRS resource transmitted with the beam covering the first arrival path
* (Spreadtrum) Proposal 4:
  + In Rel-17, study the LOS/NLOS condition measurement and reporting mechanism
* (Nokia) Proposal 5:
  + RAN1 to study NLOS identification and reporting.
* (Fraunhofer)Proposal 1:
  + Support enhanced CIR reporting for NR-Positioning in Rel-17.
* (Fraunhofer)Proposal 3:
  + Study LOS/NLOS /OLOS channel state detection methods, their associated measurements and impacts on procedures.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 1:
  + Reporting of LOS confidence and angle information of LOS path should be studied in Release-17.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 6:
  + New KPIs such as priority, time-to-alarm, the false alarm rate and number of detectable false transmitters should be considered in Release-17 study.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 5:
  + We suggest to find the LOS path during beam management procedure.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 1:
  + The network should configure values P and Q for the measurements to be performed and reported by the UE, where P is the number of paths and Q is the number of beams.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 2:
  + Magnitude, SNR, Doppler frequency, angle of arrival of every path should be reported.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 3:
  + It shall be unambiguously defined what additional paths a UE shall report.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 4:
  + LOS detection mechanisms should be studied within the Rel. 17 positioning enhancement study item.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 5:
  + Following measurements should be specified in Rel-17. These measurements can be part of rich reporting.
    - Location and magnitude of the first peak.
    - Location and magnitude of the highest peak.
    - Components of PDP/CIR around first/highest peak.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 10:
  + Introduce signaling of a threshold relative to the strongest peak for the UE search of the first peak and define the DL RSTD and UE RX-TX time difference measurements based on the first identified peak which is stronger than the strength of the strongest peak multiplied with the signaled relative threshold factor.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 11:
  + RAN1 to study network control of thresholds for the UE search for the first peak including threshold relative to the estimated noise level (aimed at avoiding noise peaks), threshold relative to the strongest peak (aimed at avoiding channel peaks with delay longer than the measurement range) and delay dependent thresholds (aimed at avoiding side peaks).

Feature lead’s view

Effective multipath mitigation techniques are essentially important to achieve high-positioning accuracy, especially for IioT scenarios. Thus, suggesting investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 4-1

* Multipath mitigation techniques will be investigated in this SI for improving positioning accuracy, which may include, but not limited to the following:
  + The methods for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification, e.g.,
    - Based on the reference signals from multi-antenna ports
    - Based on beam associated information
    - Based on channel state detection
    - Based on the reference operation
  + The measurements for supporting the multipath mitigation, e.g.,
    - Timing, angle, power K-factor, Doppler shift measurement of the first path
    - The timing, angle, power, SNR, Doppler shift, measurements of the additional paths
    - Location and magnitude of the first peak, the highest peak, components of PDP/CIR around first/highest peaks.
    - The LOS/NLOS indication and associated confidence level
  + The procedure and signaling for supporting the multipath mitigation, e.g.,
    - The assistance from the network (e.g., the possible number of paths and the number of beams, detection thresholds, etc.)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. LOS/NLOS identification is a very important issue to be solved in Rel-17 to improve the positioning accuracy. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We suggest removing all instances of “mitigation”, as “mitigation” proposed by [2] was meant to reduce the impact from NLOS BSs. |
| Intel | Support for LOS/NLOS classification and enhanced measurements for the first arrival path. As it was shown by presented simulation results, the LOS/NLOS classification is an important feature that should be supported in Rel.17 to improve positioning accuracy. |
| vivo | In AI 8.5.2, we propose to identify the performance gap for NLOS scenario as in SID objective 1.b. It seems get no echo yet.   1. Study enhancements and solutions necessary to support the high accuracy (horizontal and vertical), low latency, network efficiency (scalability, RS overhead, etc.), and device efficiency (power consumption, complexity, etc.) requirements for commercial uses cases (incl. general commercial use cases and specifically (I)IoT use cases as exemplified in section 3 above (Justification)):    1. Define additional scenarios (e.g. (I)IoT) based on TR 38.901 to evaluate the performance for the use cases (e.g. (I)IoT). [RAN1]    2. Evaluate the achievable positioning accuracy and latency with the Rel-16 positioning solutions in (I)IoT scenarios and identify any performance gaps. [RAN1]    3. Identify and evaluate positioning techniques, DL/UL positioning reference signals, signalling and procedures for improved accuracy, reduced latency, network efficiency, and device efficiency. Enhancements to Rel-16 positioning techniques, if they meet the requirements, will be prioritized, and new techniques will not be considered in this case. [RAN1, RAN2]   Without performance gap identification, how can we conclude this LOS/NLOS is an issue to solve? Furthermore, this proposal 3-6 proposes to study methods, measurements and procedures for supporting the multipath mitigation. These aspects should be the topics in WI if RAN1 concluded and recommend to specify multipath mitigation after this SI. Before the quantitative study (as xisting in SID objective 1.c) the benefits of the multipath mitigation, we don’t think this proposal can be agreeable. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support for further discussion. Prefer to first agree on the main bullet and perhaps the first tier of sub-bullets but not the detailed lists (diamond shaped bullets). Just listing the proposals from all companies in a list seems to have little value. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Different positioning techniques may have different way to mitigate the impact of multipath. We support the study and also identify the “performance gap”, as vivo mention |
| CMCC | Support the main bullet,. The listed details under each main bullet can be further discussed. |
| Qualcomm | Some of the expressions in this proposal are not clear to us. For example, “based on channel state detection”, or “based on the reference operation”. Further clarification is needed.  With regards to the measurements, we would like to add the following as another option to be studied:   * Likelihood / probability distribution reporting associated with a measurement (e.g,, RSTD, Rx-Tx, etc).   In this case, the UE, instead of reporting a single RSTD/Rx-Tx + a LOS/NLOS indication, it reports a likelihood distribution of what the RSTD/Rx-Tx may be (or in other words, multiple RSTD/Rx-Tx associated with a likelihood/probability) |
| OPPO | Support futher study since NLOS has large impact on the performance |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support that LOS/NLOS classification/identication methods need to be considered for Rel-17 positioning enhancements. For the moment, also prefer to keep the proposal at a high-level (e.g. the first bullet). |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal. |
| LG | We share the similar view on the importance of performance impact by NLOS. In our view, the listed examples for the first sub-bullet are too general while the examples for the second sub-bullet are more specific. We prefer to remove the examples of the three sub-bullets. |
| Fraunhofer | The statements ”Based on channel state detection” and “Based on the reference operation” are not clear. There are some addiational methods not listed for example: LOS/NLOS identification based on multiple time xisting measurements or based on new measurements (example phase measurements). We prefer to agree on LOS/NLOS investigation and keep the details for later discussions.  It is better to separate the LOS identification and multipath mitigations in two separate proposals. |
| ZTE | Suggest to just keep the first main bullet, it’s to hard to list all possible enhancements at this meeting. |

FL comments

Based on the feedbacks, it seems most companies are supportive to investigation of the techniques for mitigating the impact of NLOS. For Huawei’s comments, my understanding is that “multipath mitigation” is aterm commonly used to any techniques that can reduced the impact of the multipath due to the NLOS signals, but not specicially for NLOS BSs. S o, I would keep the term or now until someone comes with a better term. A number of commanies suggest to keep the main bullets, and leave the ditails for further investigation.

Effective multipath mitigation techniques are essentially important to achieve high-positioning accuracy, especially for IioT scenarios. Thus, suggesting investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 4-1 (Revision 1)

* Multipath mitigation techniques will be investigated in this SI for improving positioning accuracy, which may include, but not limited to the following:
  + The methods for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification
  + The measurements for supporting the multipath mitigation
  + The procedure and signaling for supporting the multipath mitigation

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We don’t know why our comments toward Proposal 4-1 is not reflected in the revision 1 of Proposal 4-1.  Right now, this proposal 4-1 (revision 1) proposes to study methods, measurements and procedures for supporting the multipath mitigation. However, an important aspect of applicable scenarios and performance benefits (the reason why and where we need to support this multipath mitigation, which itself is required by the SID for any identified enhancement) is not mentioned in this proposal.  This is not acceptable to us. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We actually noticed that the above proposal appears to be excluding implementation-based algorithms (e.g. outlier rejection as shown at least in QC and vivo papers), which an LMF, or UE in UE-B can use already in Rel-16 to achieve very close or meet the requirements that are being discussed, without introducing additional methods or measurements or procedures. It seems that such algorithms currently are not part of the scope of the above proposed investigation. It would be good such an aspect is captured so that we have a more clear understanding into whether any additional method/measurement/procedure would really need to be considered to be specified.  Example of a bullet to be added: “Implementation-based solutions (e.g., outlier rejection) without the need of any additional specified method/measurements/procedures/signaling.” |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Our understanding is that multi-path can be either harmful that needs to be mitigated or helpful that can assist positioning.  Reply to vivo, in our evaluation, we observed a LOS/NLOS identification helps positioning accuracy. In addition, we observed a strong reflecting path will overshadow a weak LOS path, and reporting additional path will provide the tollarance on path selection.  If it helps, we suggest the following change.   * Multipath mitigation/ulitization techniques will be investigated in this SI for improving positioning accuracy, which may include, but not limited to the following:   + The methods for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification   + The measurements for supporting the multipath mitigation/ulitization   The procedure and signaling for supporting the multipath mitigation/ulitization |
| MTK | We are generally okay for the proposal. But to identify the performace gap is also needed as mentioned by vivo. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support. |
| LG | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We are okay with QC’s suggestion of an additional bullet being added. |
| SONY | Support |

FL comments

Sorry for not responding directly to the vivo’s previous comment of “identify the performance gap for NLOS scenario as in SID objective 1.b” in the previous revision. I assume “the applicable scenarios and performance benefits” of multipath mitigation techniques are under discussion in AI 8.3.2. Evaluation results from multiple companies show clearly that NLOS can cause significant performance degradation, and some methods (e.g., LOS/NLOS detection and identification) may provide performance benefits. Maybe vivo can further explain the reason for the objection to the proposal.

The proposal is revised with the consideration of the comments from Qualcomm and Huawei.

Proposal 4-1 (Revision 2)

* Multipath mitigation techniques will be investigated in this SI for improving positioning accuracy, which may include, but not limited to the following:
  + The methods for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification
  + The measurements for supporting the multipath mitigation/utilization
  + The procedure and signaling for supporting the multipath mitigation/utilization
  + Implementation-based solutions (e.g., outlier rejection) without the need of any additional specified method/measurements/procedures/signaling.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | OK |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | As we commented multiple times, right now, this proposal 4-1 (revision 2) proposes to study methods, measurements and procedures for supporting the multipath mitigation/utilization. However, an important aspect of applicable scenarios and performance benefits (the reason why and where we need to support this multipath mitigation/utilization, which itself is required by the SID for any identified enhancement) is not mentioned in this proposal.  We propose to add the following as the first sub-bullet.   * + The applicable scenarios and performance benefits of multipath mitigation techniques |
| Intel | Support.  Please update the first sub-bullet as follows:   * + The methods/measurement/signaling for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification |
| Futurewei | Support Intel’s revision of the first sub-bullet.   * + The methods/measurement/signaling for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification   Also, we would to make sure it is clear that there is no implicit assumption that is only applicable for measurements at the UE. The study is also for UL based positioning. We would like to add a Note:   * Note: The above are applicable to DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE-based and UE-assisted positioning approaches. |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Ericsson | Support with Intel’s revision. |

FL comments

The proposal is revised based on the comments.

Proposal 4-1 (Revision 3)

* Multipath mitigation techniques will be investigated in this SI for improving positioning accuracy, which may include, but not limited to the following:
  + The applicable scenarios and performance benefits of multipath mitigation techniques
  + The methods/measurement/signaling for the LOS/NLOS detection and identification
  + The measurements for supporting the multipath mitigation/utilization
  + The procedure and signaling for supporting the multipath mitigation/utilization
  + Implementation-based solutions (e.g., outlier rejection) without the need of any additional specified method/measurements/procedures/signaling.
* Note: The above study applies to DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions for UE-based and UE-assisted positioning.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL comments

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Additional enhancements of UE/gNB measurements

Background

In addition to the measurements proposed for multipath mitigation discussed in the previous section, new types of the measurements are proposed, mainly for the enhancements of the DL/UL positioning accuracy and reliability.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 3:
  + The enhancement of measurement should include studying
    - CSI measurements
    - Rx/Tx diversity based reporting
* (CATT) Proposal 13:
  + Consider supporting NR carrier phase DL positioning in Rel-17. The reference signals for DL carrier phase measurements can be:
    - DL PRS
* (CATT) Proposal 14:
  + Consider supporting NR carrier phase UL positioning in Rel-17. The reference signals for DL carrier phase measurements can be:
    - UL SRS for positioning
* (CATT) Proposal 15:
  + Consider supporting the carrier phases measurements from two or more carrier frequencies for fast resolution of the integer ambiguity.
* (MTK) Proposal 6-1
  + Study the feasibility of carrier phase measurement at least starting from Rel-17
* (BUPT)Proposal 1:
  + NR should enhance PRS to support carrier phase measurement.
* (Intel) Proposal 9:
  + RAN1 to support received waveform reporting to enable precise UE positioning
* (Intel) Proposal 10
  + RAN1 to study whether additional physical layer measurements can benefit/support integrity of RAT-dependent positioning solutions
* (Fraunhofer) Proposal 4:
  + Consider carrier phase measurements for positioning in both UL and DL timing-based methods at least in FR1.
* (Apple)Proposal 2:
  + RAN1 to study any need of physical layer enhancements, e.g. additional measurements, in regard to enhancing positioning reliability.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 6:
  + Consider absolute time reporting in release 17 measurement reports

Feature lead’s view

Introduce new positioning measurements may offer significant enhancements to the positioning performance. Suggest investigating this issue, especially the new measurements based on existing Rel-16 NR signals, with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 4-2

* New UE/gNB measurements will be investigated to improve positioning performance, especially positioning accuracy. The new UE/gNB measurements to be investigated may include the following:
  + CSI measurements
  + Carrier phase measurements
  + received waveform reporting
  + absolute time reporting

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are not in favour of listing the sub-bullets because other than generally proposed, there are no details that have been provided for companies to consider and evaluate the feasibility of each of the proposal. We don’t object to them either, keeping it a high level agreement (the first sentence) would resolve our concerns. |
| CATT | Support to introduce carrier phase measurements to facilitate the NR carrier phase-based positioning method, if we decided to introduce the NR carrier phase-based positioning method for Rel-17. |
| Huawe/HiSilicon | We consider receiver diversity a very important tool when the positioning accuracy is <0.2m, while the scale of distributed antenna system may be larger than the accuracy.  Suggest to add a sub-bullet: Rx/Tx diversity based reporting |
| Intel | We are in favour to support receive waveform reporting. |
| vivo | Low priority. For us, if don’t consider NLOS scenario, it is unclear about the application scenarios of those techniques |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. We don’t see the need to group these proposal together as they are very widely varying in terms of spec impact and details. Perfer to take each proposed enhancement individually and then discuss. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We have interest in two items  1, carrier phase measurement,  2, receiver diversity |
| CMCC | Support the potential enhancements on the new UE/gNB measurements if benefits to positioning accuracy are clarified. |
| Qualcomm | We are not supportive of the proposal. For the purpose of improved accuracy, it seems performance results across companies are very positive, and it doesn’t seem like we need completely new measurements. |
| OPPO | Support to further study carrier phase measurement |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Low priority as we should initially determine if the existing measurements have any drawbacks in terms of achieving the target performance requirements. |
| Fraunhofer | Same view as Futuerwei. But for completeness our proposal for CIR reporting in [19] is not related to LOS/NLOS identification and is placed here “Support enhanced CIR reporting for NR-Positioning in Rel-17.” So we can add a CIR reporting sub-bullet. |
| ZTE | Low priority. It can be considered if methods for LOS/NLOS identification is not enough to meet requirement. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, 8 companies are fine to investigate this issue with high-priority (with different new measurements in their minds), while 5 companies either consider it as low priority or are not convinced as needed to be investigated in Rel-17. Based on the feedbacks, it might be better to separate these new measurements one-by-one to see if there are consensus to support some of them in Rel-17. For MTK’s proposal of “receiver diversity”, I assume it can be included in HW’s proposal “Rx/Tx diversity based reporting”.

### Proposal 4-2 (Revision 1)

* The following new UE/gNB measurements can be investigated for the enhancements of the positioning performance:
  + CSI measurements
    - Supported by: Ericsson, Huawei/HiSilicon
    - Objected by:
  + Carrier phase measurements
    - Supported by: CATT, MTK, Fraunhofer, OPPO, CEWiT
    - Objected by: Ericsson
  + received waveform reporting
    - Supported by: Fraunhofer
    - Objected by: Ericsson
  + absolute time reporting
    - Supported by: Ericsson
    - Objected by:
  + Rx/Tx diversity based reporting
    - Supported by: Huawei/HiSilicon, MTK,ZTE, LG
    - Objected by:
  + Truncated CIR reporting
    - Supported by: Huawei/HiSilicon, Fraunhofer
    - Objected by:

Additional comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | As we mentioned in above, support to introduce carrier phase measurements to facilitate the NR carrier phase-based positioning method, if we decided to introduce the NR carrier phase-based positioning method for Rel-17. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority for this meeting |
| Ericsson | Our preferences are indicated above. In our view, the two other proposals on carrier phase measurement and waveform reporting will require significant specification changes and thus we cannot support them. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Our preferences are indicated above. |
| MTK | We think carrier phase measurement is promising but also challenging. We don't expect to have any concludion for this in Rel-17. However, we think this item can continue to study from Rel-17 to later release |
| SS | Low priority |
| Nokia/NSB | Objected is a strong word. We prefer to say at this stage we do not support carrier phase measurements and waveform reporting at this stage. The other bullet we are open to study but this proposal groups many diverse topics (some of which are not so clear to us). Low priority for this meeting on the rest and suggest proponents to bring more details to the next meeting. |
| SONY | Low priority |
| vivo | Low priority. It is unclear about the applicable scenarios of those techniques. |
| Futurewei | I don’t follow we are asking for companies that ‘reject’ certain proposals. To be consistent, we either put it as High Priority or Lowest Priority. This would avoid rejecting proposals because the proponent should still be allowed to provide further studies and feasibility eventhough it is of low priority. |
| LG | Our preference is only about Rx/Tx diversity based reporting |
| CEWiT | We believe study should be started for carrier phase measurement in this SI |

FL Comments

For Ericsson and Nokia’s comments on the potential impact of the carrier phase measurement and waveform reporting, my understanding at this moment is that both of the measurements can be obtained based on Rel-16 NR references signals, and thus the impact on the specification should be similar to other proposed new measurements.

Given that different companies may have different preferences in different measurements, one way to handle this is to allow companies to further investigate the new measurements that they are interested and we can have the conclusion in next meeting on which measurements can be considered in the WI.

### Proposal 4-2 (Revision 2)

* The new UE/gNB measurements can be investigated for the enhancements of the positioning performance, which may include
  + CSI measurements
  + Carrier phase measurements
  + received waveform reporting
  + absolute time reporting
  + Rx/Tx diversity based reporting
  + Truncated CIR reporting

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Support Carrier phase measurements and Rx/Tx diversity based reporting |
| LG | We support only Rx/Tx diversity based reporting |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Qualcomm | Low priority |
| Nokia/NSB | For a generic proposal like this at this stage we only support investigating the final two bullets. Discussion on the exact proposals for the other items would be needed in view as just saying that CSI measurements can be investigated has no meaning to us for example. E-CID already supports some CSI-RS measurements, what is meant by this? |
| Futurewei | DO not support the whole list. |
| vivo | No supported as it is unclear about the applicable scenarios of those techniques. |
| ZTE | Very low priority. |
| CEWiT | We support carrier phase measurments |
| Ericsson | Reiterating our position from revision 1. In our view, the two other proposals on carrier phase measurement and waveform reporting will require significant specification changes and thus we cannot support them. |
| SS | Low priority. Do not support the waveform reporting. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority and not supportive for several of the subbulets. I think it is more fair to discuss them on a case by case basis. |

FL Comments

It seems we may not be able to reach the consensus for any of the proposed new UE/gNB measurements. Suggest changing this to low priority, and have further discussion in this week.

## Other issues related to the UE/gNB measurements and reporting

Background

In this section, we discuss the proposed enhancements related to the UE/gNB measurements that are not covered in previous sections.

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo) Proposal 1:
  + Introduce 10 ms level granularity for the response time and reporting intervals in *CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation*
* (Apple)Proposal 1:
  + RAN1 to further study reusing/adopting other DL RS signals for DL positioning measurements.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 17:
  + For the purpose of enhanced efficiency, study further Positioning measurements derived on other reference signals and channels.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 7:
  + Send LS to RAN4, requesting RAN4 to investigate the possibility to define two (or multiple) sets of requirements (based on UE-capabilities) for RSTD accuracy, UE RX-TX time difference accuracy and UE TX timing accuracy in order to accommodate for both general purpose eMBB Ues and for Ues requiring high (sub-meter) accuracy positioning in e.g. I-IoT scenarios.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 9:
  + In order to maintain accuracy, the target latency must factor the need for tracking measurement, i.e. UE mobility

Feature lead’s view

Suggest further investigating the proposed measurement enhancements if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 4-3

* The following enhancements related to UE measurements can be investigated:
  + the use of other DL RS signals for DL positioning measurements
  + smaller granularity for the response time and reporting intervals measurement report
  + the support of tracking measurements
  + two (or multiple) sets of requirements for UE measurement accuracy

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Do we have description of ‘tracking measurements’? Multiple sets of requirements sounded like RAN4 scope. In general. We think Proposal 4-2 and 4-3 should be combined into a single proposal and kept at a very general level e.g. “New measurements at the UE/gNB would be considered and studied..” |
| CATT | The benefits from these enhancements for UE measurements need to be clarified. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We consider the proposal low priority. |
| Intel | We are on favour to support smaller granularity for timing measurements report. |
| vivo | Low priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. We prefer to discuss the xistingnts individually. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We consider this item: smaller granularity for the response time and reporting intervals measurement report |
| CMCC | Support the potential enhancement on the UE measurement if benefits to positioning accuracy are clarified. |
| Qualcomm | Small granularity of the timing report would be clearly needed, but it looks to us as a WI detail. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| LG | Each item should be discussed separately since they are not correlated xisti. |
| Fraunhofer | Don’t support. We are fine with some aspects like the granurity or investigating other RS (assuming non PRS Rel16-RSs) but the rest is not clear. |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| SS | Support the first bullet |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, similar to my comments to Proposal 4-2, it might be better to separate the proposed measurements, and collect companies views for the enhancements:

### Proposal 4-3 (Revision 1)

* The following enhancements can be investigated for the enhancements of the positioning performance:
  + the use of other DL RS signals for DL positioning measurements
    - Supported by: Ericsson (assuming ‘other’ above means ‘existing’), LG
    - Objected by:
  + smaller granularity for the response time and reporting intervals measurement report
    - Supported by:
    - Objected by:
  + two (or multiple) sets of requirements for UE measurement accuracy
    - Supported by:
    - Objected by:

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | As we mentioned in above, the benefits from these enhancements for UE measurements need to be clarified. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority for this meeting |
| Ericsson | In our understanding, in the first sub-bullet, the other DL RS refers to xisting DL RSs such as TRS, CSI-RS etc. Hopefully, this is the common understanding. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For the second and the third sub-bullet enhancement, we don’t see what to inverstigate in SI. If supported, can directly be specified in WI. For the third sub-bullet, it should be up to RAN4 decision in the work item. |
| MTK | We have interest in “smaller granularity for the response time and reporting intervals measurement report”. But we also doubt whether Rel-17 can come out any study due to limited time |
| ZTE | Low priority until more justifications are shown in next meeting. |
| SS | Support the first bullet |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar view to Huawei. We are okay to consider existing DL RS but we are not sure this will improve performance. It may address some other KPIs. |
| SONY | Support the 1st and 3rd bullet points |
| vivo | Low priority. |
| LG | Support first bullet. SSB and CSI-RS were already supported for NR ECID technique. In our view, by using the existing DL RS, the UE complexity reduction and network overhead reduction such as RS resource utilization are achievable |

FL Comments

It seems 1st sub-bullet may have some support but 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets are not. The proposal is revised based on the comments.

### Proposal 4-3 (Revision 2)

* + The use of existing DL RS signals for the enhancements of positioning performance can be investigated.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. Perhaps we can point out in the proposal what downlink reference signals should be included in the DLRS, such as CSI-RS, SSB, TRS, PT-RS, etc. |
| LG | Support. We have the same comment that SSB and CSI-RS were already supported for NR ECID technique. In our view, by using the existing DL RS, the UE complexity reduction and network overhead reduction such as RS resource utilization are achievable |
| Nokia/NSB | Low priority. |
| Futurewei | We don’t understand why this cant be RAN4 work |
| vivo | Considering our job to study is whether the enhancement of reuse existing DL signals for positioning is beneficial or not. So we suggest this wording for the proposal.   * The use of existing DL RS signals for the enhancements of positioning performance can be investigated, including the benefits on latency, accuracy, network/UE efficiency. |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| SS | Support |
| Sony | Support |

# Enhancements of positioning methods and measurement procedure

## UE positioning in idle/inactive states

Background

UE positioning in idle/inactive states was discussed in Rel-16, but not supported. For Rel-17 positioning enhancements, there are very strong interests in supporting UE positioning in idle/inactive states mainly due to the potential in improving device efficiency (e.g., UE power saving).

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 6:
  + Support measurement of DL PRS during RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, and study the mechanism regarding transmission of UL signals/channels in INACTIVE state.
* (Futurewei)Proposal 4:
  + Extend the support of Rel-16 positioning methods to Inactive and Idle Ues, at least for the DL positioning
* (vivo) Proposal 14:
  + Positioning in idle/inactive states should be supported by RAN1 in Rel-17
* (ZTE)Proposal 5:
  + Consider RS (including PRS and SRS) transmission and PRS measurement report in RRC inactive/idle state.
* (Sony)Proposal 7:
  + Support the operation of NR positioning when the UE is in RRC idle/inactive mode.
* (CATT) Proposal 1:
  + Positioning for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states should be supported in Rel-17 with the enhancements as follows:
    - Using PRACH for UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state for positioning purpose
    - Sending SRS-Pos for UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state.
* (CATT)Proposal 12:
  + Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state have three SRS configuration methods:
    - Using RRC connected state SRS-Pos configurations information.
    - Using SRS-Pos configuration information carried in the paging message.
    - Using SRS-Pos configuration information obtained by UE in a new RACH procedure.
* (TCL) Proposal 1:
  + Support positioning in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states.
* (Intel) Proposal 4:
  + RAN1 to study enhancements of a two-step RACH mechanism to facilitate accurate low-latency NR positioning
* (OPPO) Proposal 7:
  + Study to support positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE state and RRC\_IDLE state.
    - Study measurement on DL PRS resource in RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC \_IDLE state.
    - Study transmission of uplink PRS in RRC\_INACTIVE state and RRC\_IDLE state.
    - Study the mechanism of positioning measurement reporting in RRC\_INACTIVE state and RRC\_IDLE state
* (Samsung)Proposal 2:
  + IDLE/INACTIVE state positioning should be studied considering the challenges of measurement reporting, low mobility requirement, etc.
* (MTK) Proposal 8-1
  + In RRC idle state, consider downlink only measurement with UE based mode for positioning
* (MTK) Proposal 8-2
  + In RRC inactive state with UE assisted mode, the network may trigger the UE by paging the UE for a new cause of measurement for positioning, and the UE may respond with the RACH procedure
* (MTK) Proposal 8-3
  + The preamble transmission in Msg1/MsgA can also serve the purpose of requesting uplink measurement results as assistance information
* (MTK) Proposal 8-4
  + In RRC inactive state with UE based mode, the combined usage of DL-TDOA and UL-TDOA can be considered. Msg4 for 4-step RA and MsgB for 2-step RA with flexible payload size may carry the uplink measurement results to the UE for synchronization error cancellation
* (CMCC) Proposal 7:
  + Positioning for Ues in idle/inactive state should be supported.
* (Lenovo)Proposal 5:
  + Consider positioning measurement support for Ues in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state
  + Related enhancements may also require coordination with RAN2.
* (LGE) Proposal 10:
  + RAN1 needs a study for positioning support of Ues in the RRC idle and inactive modes at least for RA-dependent positioning techniques from the perspective of latency and device efficiency.
* (Nokia)Proposal 1:
  + Support RRC inactive and idle mode positioning for at least DL RAT-dependent positioning methods.
* (Nokia)Proposal 2:
  + Support of DL RAT-dependent positioning methods for idle and inactive modes should include at least measurement of DL PRS and reporting of measurements without moving to RRC connected state.
* (Nokia)Proposal 3:
  + RAN1 to study if/how UL or DL+UL RAT-dependent positioning methods could also be supported in RRC inactive and idle modes.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 6:
  + Random access procedure can be reused for UL and DL&UL positioning of Idle/Inactive UE.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 7:
  + Random access preamble can be reused as UL reference signal for Idle/Inactive UE.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 8:
  + To limit the number of SSBs refer to which preamble is sent to each TRP.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 9:
  + Consider to pre-configure the PRS for idle/inactive UE when UE is in connected mode.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 9:
  + RRC Idle and inactive mode positioning should be supported considering power saving at UE and reducing the latency of the positioning.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 16:
  + For the purpose of enhanced efficiency, study further support and enhancements for NR Positioning in the RRC Idle/Inactive state, including but not limited to
    - Transmission of UL PRS signals & Reception of DL PRS signals
    - Enablement of Rel-16 DL-only UE-assisted methods, DL/UL methods, UL-only methods

Feature lead’s view

The benefits of supporting UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state seem obvious. The support was discussed in Rel-16 but not introduced due to the very tight working schedule of Rel-16. Suggest investigating UE positioning in RRC Idle/Inactive states with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 5-1

* + NR positioning for Ues in RRC Idle/Inactive states will be investigated in Rel-17.
    - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,
      * UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
      * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT
    - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC Idle/Inactive states, e.g.,
      * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)
      * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support. As we discussed in our Tdoc, we think DL-based positioning would have the advantage to be completed sooner. We are ok with UL positioning support as well. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | Support. In the multiple proposals there is a statement “will be investigated”. We are not sure, if the agreement to this statement leads group to the noticeable progress. We prefer to change formulation from “will be investigated” to the “supported”. |
| vivo | Support in principle. In our contribution R1-2006972, it is observed that positioning measurement and report in the idle state can obtain at least 48.38% power saving gain and reduce latency of 40~200ms comparing with positioning measurement and report in the connected state.  For the second FFS, we think it is too early to study the specific RS/signaling/procedure in the SI stage, and we suggest that it be modified to:   * + - FFS: which UE behaviours to be supported corresponding to different positioning methods in idle/inactive states, e.g.,       * DL RS measurement       * UL RS transmission       * Positioning information report   One comment toward the wording of proposal 5-1 and 5-2. It seems there’re 18 companies proposed to study idle/inactive positioning and 19 companies proposed to study on-demand/apriodic PRS. We don’t understand why proposal 5-1 use “will be” while proposal 5-2 use “should be”. We suggest to align the wording in both proposals. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle but we should aim for more in our view. Almost all companies seem to be in favour of this being supported in Rel-17. We only have 1 meeting left for the SI. Suggested revision:   * + Extending positioning for Ues in RRC Idle/Inactive is beneficial from RAN1 perspective.   + NR positioning for Ues in RRC Idle/Inactive states will be investigated in Rel-17.   + At least DL based positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC idle/inactive states.     - FFS: additional positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,       * UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning       * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT     - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC Idle/Inactive states, e.g.,       * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)       * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | RRC idle and RRC inactive state should be separately discussed |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Same view with MTK. RRC Inactive and RRC Idle can be very different. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support, from a device efficiency point of view, techniques for enabling positioning in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE states should also be explored. |
| CEWiT | We support the proposal in principle. Further we prefer to have more affirmative main bullet as large number of companies have agreed to support this scheme in Rel 17. |
| LG | Support in principle. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Agree with MTK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |

FL comments

For Intel’s comment on the use of “supported” or “investigated”, my thinking is that at this stage, we are determining which methods/proposals will be investigated. Whether to support the proposals/methods, will be decided after the investigation. If the group can have consensus to support a feature or a method before the investigation completes, we may use “supported” instead of “investigated “. For the comments to separate RRC Inactive and RRC Idle, yes, the methods to support them can be quite different. For the sake of clarity, we can separate them for clarity. For vivo’s comments on the second FFS, it is unclear to me why it is too early to study the specific RS/signaling/procedure in the SI stage. Thus, I will keep the proposal as it is now. We could have further discussion on the wording. For Nokia’s proposal, I think it would be good the group can first agree the support of the UE-based positioning.

Proposal 5-1 (Revision 1)

* + Extending positioning for Ues in RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE is beneficial from RAN1 perspective
  + DL based positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC\_IDLE state and Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state
    - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,
      * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT
    - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE states
      * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)
      * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.)
  + FFS: UE-assisted positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC\_IDLE state
  + FFS: UE-assisted positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | With regards to the 1st bullet, we don’t really agree with Nokia’s suggestion to change the “will be investigated” to “is beneficial”. We understand that there is support by many companies, but such a statement is closer to what the conclusion in the end of the TR would write. For now, we are discussing what to study.  With regards to the 2nd bullet, actually, DL-based positioning is already supported in RRC Inactive and Idle. (UE-based TDOA/AoD with broadcast AD), so we think this statement is not needed.  We can accept the first bullet with “will be investigated”, together with the set of FFS that need to be considered further. |
| Ericsson | first bullet is too strong a conclusion to make in this meeting. Also, regarding the second subbullet, we cannot agree to support it in rel-17 yet as we are in study item phase. We are ok to study further. The following is our suggestion:   * + ~~Extending positioning for Ues in RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE is beneficial from RAN1 perspective~~   + NR ~~DL based~~ positioning should be ~~supported~~ studied for Ues in RRC\_IDLE state and Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state     - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,       * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT     - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE states       * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)       * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.)   + ~~FFS: UE-assisted positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC\_IDLE state~~   + ~~FFS: UE-assisted positioning should be supported for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state~~ |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We also think we need to delete “DL-based”. The last two FFS is unclear and not necessary so suggest deleing. Basically, we are ok with the revision from Ericsson. |
| MTK | We kind of agree on E/// to remove the wording of “ …. is beneficial”, because we still see restriction for RRC idle and RRC inactive.  If UE receives less or no data, the UE can still stay at RRC connected state with DRX for positoning, and the requirement for CDRX can be defined  We can study for both UE based and UE assisted.  One question to CATT: We may assume the wording of “DL based” as “DL only UE based” ? |
| ZTE | - We think the second main bullet is referring to“UE based positioning” rather than “DL based positioning”  - The second FFS should be revised as following,   * + - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE states and RRC\_INACTIVE state. |
| SS | Support in general but we propose the remove the details in the parentheses。 |
| LG | Support, but we prefer to remove the specific examples described in this proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We are okay to accept that “is beneficial” is too strong at this time. Support the update from E/// if we change “should be studied” to “will be studied”. |
| SONY | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |

FL comments

Based on the comments, the proposal is revised as follows.

Proposal 5-1 (Revision 2)

* + UE based positioning should be supported for UEs in RRC\_IDLE state and UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state
    - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,
      * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT
    - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE state and RRC\_INACTIVE state
      * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)
      * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We prefer the proposal from Ericsson. UE based positioning will be studied ~~should be supported~~ for …  We also can follow majority view on this proposal |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Why does the main bullet read UE-based positioning? Our understanding is that the existing UE-based DL-only positioning has been supported for UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, so I think the intention of this proposal is talking about the NR positioning in IDLE/INACTIVE state in general.  Suggest to adopt the following change   * + NR positioning should be supported for UEs in RRC\_IDLE state and UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state     - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,       * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT     - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE state and RRC\_INACTIVE state       * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)       * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.) |
| MTK | We are okay for Huawei. Since UE assisted mode may also be possible under RRC inactive state.  For the FFS term,   * + - * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT   We assume DL+UL are also included. Just try to align the understanding of each other |
| CMCC | We have the same question as HW’s comment on the UE-based positioning. OK with the revision of the proposal from HW. |
| ZTE | Support. Agree with OPPO and HW. |
| vivo | The revised proposal is strange to us. In Qualcomm’s comment, it says “DL-based positioning is already supported in RRC Inactive and Idle. (UE-based TDOA/AoD with broadcast AD)” If UE-based positioning for idle/inactive is already supported in Rel-16, why we study it in Rel-17 again?  On the first bullet, I think it’s our job to study whether positioning for UEs in RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE is beneficial or not. There’re several aspects where companies showed in their contributions to be beneficial. So we suggest this wording for the 1st bullet.   * Benefits of positioning for UEs in RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE on latency, network/UE efficiency and UE power consumption will be investigated in Rel-17. |
| Intel | Support. In first bullet please replace the “UE based should be supported…” with the “NR positioning should be supported …”.  We prefer to keep “should be supported” instead of “will be studied”. |
| CATT v2 | We can understand Huawei’s concern on the UE based positioning in FL proposal. Let us try to explain why UE-based positioning is prioritized in FL proposal. In our point of view, compared with UE assistant positioning, UE based positioning in NON-RRC\_ACTIVE states will simplify the positioning procedure for NON-RRC\_ACTIVE states and reduce the standardization efforts. E.g., UE can calculate the location information based on DL-PRS measurement and no need to report measurement results to LMF. Therefore, we prefer to prioritize UE-based positioning and the first step is to support UE-based positioning for UE in NON-RRC\_ACTIVE states, and then discuss whether to support UE-assistant positioning for UE in NON-RRC\_ACTIVE states. Hope the above explanation will help to understand the prioritization of UE-based positioning in above proposal. If most of companies support to add UE-assistant positioning, we can consider to add it in the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| LG | Support with minor change. We suggest change “UE based positioning” to “NR positioning” in the main bullet, since UE-assisted based positioning should be included for this enhancement |
| CEWiT | Support in principle but no need to restrict to only UE based positioning. Support Intel’s suggested modification |
| Nokia/NSB | We cannot support this with the change to UE based only. That is not what we have been discussing for most of the meeting. Change back to NR positioning as suggest by LG. |
| Ericsson | Support Huawei’s revision. We think it is too early to say ‘Should be supported’. We prefer ‘will be studied’ for this meeting. |

FL Comments

It seems most companies support changing “UE based positioning” to “NR positioning” to include “UE assisted positioning”. About whether to use “should be supported” or “will be studied”, given that we are in SI stage, it might be better to use “will be studied” for now. We may change to “should be supported” when we conclude the investigation. For vivo’s comment to add the sub-bullet “Benefits of positioning for UEs in RRC\_IDLE / RRC\_INACTIVE on latency, network/UE efficiency and UE power consumption will be investigated in Rel-17”, I assume it is common understanding that the benefits will be included in the study.

Proposal 5-1 (Revision 3)

* + - NR positioning for UEs in RRC\_IDLE state and UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state will be investigated in Rel-17, including the benefits on latency, network/UE efficiency and UE power consumption
    - FFS: which positioning methods to be supported, e.g.,
      * DL positioning, UL positioning, and/or Multi-RTT
    - FFS: the details of how to enable the UE positioning in RRC\_IDLE state and RRC\_INACTIVE state
      * Reference signals (e.g., based on DL PRS signals, UL SRS signals, both of them, etc.)
      * Signaling and procedures (e.g., based on PRACH procedure, paging triggered UL SRS transmission, etc.)

FL comments

### Issue closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## On-demand DL PRS for positioning

Background

Rel-16 only supports periodic DL PRS transmission and reception. For Rel-17 positioning enhancements, many companies are interested in extending the support to semi-periodic and a-periodic DL PRS, as well as on-demand DL PRS, due to the potential in reducing the positioning latency and improving device efficiency (e.g., reducing the resource usage and power saving).

**Note:** In theproposals from the contribution, the terms “A-periodic PRS”, “on-demand”, and “dynamic PRS” are used. For clarification, here we assume these terms have different meanings:

* **Aperiodic PRS**: a non-period DL PRS transmission, i.e., the transmission of the PRS is neither periodic nor semi-periodic.
* **On-demand PRS**: The DL PRS is transmitted with a particular request, which may demand when, where, and how the DL PRS are transmitted. On-demand PRS may often be A-PRS. It may also be periodic PRS and semi-periodic PRS.
* **Dynamic PRS**: PRS resource allocation is allocated/deallocated dynamically. Here we assume the dynamic allocation of the PRS resource is more related to the implementation, e.g., the network may use dynamic PRS resource allocation or supporting on-demand and a-periodic PRS.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 4:
  + The enhancement of UE procedure of receiving PRS should include studying
    - Aperiodic PRS only from the serving cells
* (vivo)Proposal 5:
  + The on demand PRS should be introduced in Rel-17.
* (vivo)Proposal 6:
  + The Aperiodic PRS should be studied in Rel-17.
* (vivo) Proposal 12:
  + Aperiodic positioning measurement report can be considered in Rel-17
* (vivo) Proposal 17:
  + Support to introduce on demand measurement gap for on demand PRS in Rel-17.
* (Futurewei) Proposal 1:
  + Aperiodic DL PRS requests and transmission should be supported for its benefits in reducing PRS transmissions overhead and improving latency. Details on the specifications support and impact are for further study
* (OPPO) Proposal 1:
  + Study to support UE-specific configuration and transmission of DL PRS resource
* (ZTE) Proposal 4:
  + To further reduce positioning latency, at least following enhancements should be considered,
    - Support low-layer PRS triggering.
    - Support low-layer positioning measurement report.
* (Sony)Proposal 1:
  + Support the study on dynamic PRS allocation / Aperiodic PRS transmission to improve positioning accuracy and/or reduce positioning latency.
* (CATT)Proposal 2:
  + Aperiodic and semi-persistent DL PRS should be introduced in Rel-17 in order to reduce the latency and overhead of DL PRS
* (TCL) Proposal 2:
  + Study and support aperiodic and on-demand PRS transmission.
* (Intel) Proposal 2:
  + RAN1 to study benefits from support of dynamic UE centric DL PRS resource allocation
* (CMCC) Proposal 2:
  + NW-triggered and UE-triggered on demand PRS configurations should be supported.
* (CMCC)Proposal 3:
  + NR positioning should support the physical-layer procedures to trigger the on-demand DL PRS configurations.
* (InterDigital)Proposal 3:
  + Study mechanism supporting on-demand **PRS** and SRS for positioning
* (Spreadtrum)Proposal 1:
  + Support semi-persistent and aperiodic DL PRS transmission in Rel-17.
* (LGE)Proposal 1:
  + In Rel-17, RAN1 needs a study on RS overhead reduction by introducing the SSB for timing measurement and the on-demand type PRS.
* (Nokia)Proposal 7:
  + Study mechanisms to enable optimized PRS transmission by the network
* (Nokia)Proposal 8:
  + Study mechanisms to support dynamic PRS configuration in UE dedicated manner to support UE specific positioning needs. Note: This may have RAN2 impact.
* (Lenovo) Proposal 3:
  + Explore dynamic signalling mechanisms to enable the LMF and UE to better adapt to changes in the radio environment for reduced latency, e.g. beam failure, identification of NLOS beams
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 1:
  + Consider to introduce On-demand DL PRS to reduce the latency and signaling overhead.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 8:
  + Aperiodic reporting of position and/or positioning measurements based of pre-configured trigger should be studied for IioT scenario.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 1:
  + Dynamic and on demand PRS transmission should be studied in Release-17.
* (CAICT)Proposal 1:
  + Considering Aperiodic and semi-persistent scheduling DL PRS in Rel-17 to satisfy the low latency requirement of positioning service.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 13:
  + At least for the purpose of efficiency, study further on-demand **PRS** and SRS transmissions, including, but not limited to, the following aspects:
    - Required signaling & procedures to enable a target device to request/recommend specific PRS configurations (e.g., on-demand ON/OFF switching, bandwidth, TRPs, beam directions), and/or Positioning methods.

Feature lead’s view

Suggest investigating the semi-periodic, a-periodic, and on-demand DL PRS for positioning with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 5-2

* Semi-periodic and a-periodic transmission and reception of DL PRS should be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable semi-periodic and A- periodic DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT
* On-demand transmission and reception of DL PRS should be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable on-demand DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewe | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | First we would suggest to change “semi-periodic” to “semi-persistent”.  Second when it comes to “semi-persistent” and “aperiodic”, are they configured by higher layers and triggered by MAC CE and DCI, respectively, in people’s mind?  Third we suggest to remove “and reception” in the second main bullet, as it is unclear to us what “on-demand reception” means in the context.  We suggest to limit the scope to only AP-PRS from the serving cell, as proposed in our contribution. |
| Intel | We are not clear on difference between the semi-persistent/a-periodic and on demand DL PRS transmission.  We would like to support semi-persistent/a-periodic DL PRS transmission. |
| vivo | Support in principle  One comment toward the wording of proposal 5-1 and 5-2. It seems there’re 18 companies proposed to study idle/inactive positioning and 19 companies proposed to study on-demand/apriodic PRS. We don’t understand why proposal 5-1 use “will be” while proposal 5-2 use “should be”. We suggest to align the wording in both proposals. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Can we say on-demand RS is equal to the RS with semi-persistent or aperiodic transmission? We think it is YES  Also in our view, on-demand RS is a means to facilitate certain measurement. For example to transmit 2 ports RS for LOS/NLOS detection, or transmit a sinusoidal signal for carrier phase measurement.  Then, when we say on deman RS, beside the time domain behaviour of RS, the content for transmission should also be discussed |
| CMCC | Support of on-demand DL PRS (can be P/SP/AP DL PRS). Regarding HW’s 2nd comment, we agree that it should be clarified. For us, both NW and UE triggered on-demand DL PRS should be studied. |
| Qualcomm | Support assuming the following are clarified:   * semi-periodic means semi-persistent (MAC-CE triggered) * Aperiodic would correspond to DCI-triggeed. * On-demand corresponds to the UE-initiated or network-initiated request of PRS and/or SRS. So, it is NOT the same as whether PRS is DCI-triggered or MAC-Ce triggered. It is about UE or LFM request/suggesting/recommending specific PRS pattern, ON/OFF, periodicity, BW, etc.   Why this proposal is “should be investigated” and other proposals are “will be investigated”? |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| CEWiT | Support this proposal |
| LG | Support in principle. Our understanding for semi-periodic, apeioridc, on-demand type is similar to Qualcomm, but we prefer to clarify the difference in this proposal in order to avoid different understanding between companies. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |

FL comments

For HW’s comment on the trigger of “semi-persistent” and “aperiodic”, I think it can be included in the investigaton. We could add the clarification suggested from Qualcomm. For Intel and MTK’s comments on the difference between “a-periodic and on demand DL PRS transmission”, I assume different companies may have different interpretations. That is why I have tried to clarify the differences of the definitions at the start of this section (also see Qualcomm’s comments). It would be good for this group to have the same understanding of them.

For the comment of about the use of “will be” or “should be”, it is not my intention to use two different wordings for them.

Proposal 5-2 (Revision 1)

* Semi-periodic and a-periodic transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable semi-periodic and A- periodic DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT
* On-demand transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable on-demand DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT
* Notes:
  + Semi-periodic means semi-persistent (MAC-CE triggered)
  + Aperiodic would correspond to DCI-triggeed.
  + On-demand corresponds to the UE-initiated or network-initiated request of PRS and/or SRS. So, it is NOT the same as whether PRS is DCI-triggered or MAC-Ce triggered. It is about UE or LFM request/suggesting/recommending specific PRS pattern, ON/OFF, periodicity, BW, etc.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | Support in principle. Suggest to replace ‘semi-periodic’ with ‘semi-persistent’ in the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support in principle but suggest the following change   * Semi-persistent and a-periodic transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.   + FFS: the details on when and how to enable semi-persistent and A- periodic DL PRS   + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,     - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning     - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT * On-demand transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.   + FFS: the details on when and how to enable on-demand DL PRS   + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,     - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning     - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT * Notes:   + Semi-persistent means MAC-CE triggered   + Aperiodic would correspond to DCI-triggeed.   On-demand corresponds to the UE-initiated or network-initiated request of PRS and/or SRS. So, it is NOT the same as whether PRS is DCI-triggered or MAC-CE triggered. It is about UE or LMF request/suggesting/recommending specific PRS pattern, ON/OFF, periodicity, BW, etc. |
| MTK | Okay with HW revision |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | Support but we also prefer to use “Semi-persistent” instead of “semi-periodic” |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the update from Huawei. |
| SONY | Support HW’s updated version. |

FL comments

The proposal is revised with HW’s comments.

Proposal 5-2 (Revision 2)

* Semi-persistent and a-periodic transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable semi-persistent and A- periodic DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT
* On-demand transmission and reception of DL PRS will be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable on-demand DL PRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - DL positioning and/or Multi-RTT
* Notes:
  + Semi-persistent means MAC-CE triggered
  + Aperiodic would correspond to DCI- triggered
  + On-demand corresponds to the UE-initiated or network-initiated request of PRS and/or SRS. So, it is NOT the same as whether PRS is DCI-triggered or MAC-CE triggered. It is about UE or LMF request/suggesting/recommending specific PRS pattern, ON/OFF, periodicity, BW, etc.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. The wording of Semi-persistent is fine for us. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Intel | Support. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

### Issue closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## On-demand UL SRS for positioning

Background

Rel-16 has already supported semi-periodic and a-periodic SRS for positioning. For Rel-17 positioning enhancements, there are proposals to extend the support to on-demand UL SRS for positioning, due to the potential in reducing the positioning latency and improving device efficiency (e.g., reducing the resource usage and power saving).

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo) Proposal 9:
  + Enhancements of aperiodic SRS for positioning should be studied in Rel-17.
* (Intel)Proposal 3:
  + RAN1 to study opportunistic on-demand transmission of SRS for positioning (potentially associated with UL control signaling) to facilitate low latency ranging with gNBs/TRPs (e.g. low latency multi-RTT in combination w/ AoA or other measurements)
* (InterDigital)Proposal 3:
  + Study mechanism supporting on-demand PRS and **SRS** for positioning
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 13:
  + At least for the purpose of efficiency, study further on-demand PRS and **SRS** transmissions, including, but not limited to, the following aspects:
    - Required signaling & procedures to enable a target device to request/recommend specific PRS configurations (e.g., on-demand ON/OFF switching, bandwidth, TRPs, beam directions), and/or Positioning methods.

Feature lead’s view

Suggest On-demand UL SRS for positioning be investigated with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-3

* On-demand transmission and reception of UL SRS for positioning can be investigated in Rel-17.
  + FFS: the details on when and how to enable on-demand UL SRS
  + FFS: to be supported for which positioning methods, e.g.,
    - UE-assisted and/or UE-based positioning
    - UL positioning and/or Multi-RTT

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Unclear what on-demand SRS transmission means. We understand the logic of on-demand PRS, but SRS allocation is more dynamic and current NRPPa has already supported transmission characteristic request. |
| Intel | We would like to understand better the term on demand in this proposal.  In our view, it is an opportunistic UE autonomous transmission of SRS for positioning. For example, UEs can autonomously select SRS for positioning resource and sequence for transmission in a predefined/pre-configured region of resources allocated for SRS for positioning. |
| vivo | Same view with Huawei, in our view, SRS was a UE-specific signal, and semi-persistent/aperodic-SRS have been appening in R16.  We suggest enhance aperiodic SRS for positioning considering the neighbouring cell is difficult to know the triggering time and triggering signal quickly. So we propose to change the proposal as below   * Enhancements of aperiodic SRS for positioning can be investigated in Rel-17. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Low priority for uplink for this on demand thing… |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Also a bit unclear, but I assume it means:   * UE can send a recommendation on what SRS may be configured. The network clearly makes the final call always.   Is that the understanding?  Assuming that we are studying UE-initiated on-demand DL PRS, it makes sense to enable UE-initiated SRS for positioning under the assumption that it just means the UE sends recommendation of what PRS/SRS to be used. |
| OPPO | Share the same view as Huawei. SP/AP SRS is supported in R16 and its transmission is totally up to gNB triggering.  Regarding QC’s description, one question from my side is why UE knows better than the NW when the measurements are carried at NW side. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Also agree that the motivation behind is unclear since SRS for Positioning configuration is handled at the gNB and is already dynamic. Could be a low priority issue. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | Support for further study with low priority. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |
| SONY | Low priority |
| Futurewei | Low priority |
| Ericsson | Low priority |
| SS | Low priority |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, it seems the group does not have the command understanding of “on-demand SRS” and multiple companies consider it a low priority. Suggest lowering the priority to medium and have further email discussion on the motivation of “on-demand SRS”.

For vivo’s proposal of “Enhancements of aperiodic SRS for positioning”, suggest listing as a separate proposal, since it seems an enhancement of Rel-16 A-SRS for positioning, and not necessarily be related to “on-demand”.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Unclear what on-demand SRS transmission means. We understand the logic of on-demand PRS, but SRS allocation is more dynamic and current NRPPa has already supported transmission characteristic request. |

### Proposal 5-3.1

* On-demand transmission and reception of UL SRS for positioning can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Low priority. Normally the demand is based on   * QoS request from UE in MO-LR or external client in MT-LR * UE SRS capability reporting.   We are open to discuss gNB SRS capability reporting, but we are not clear if it is covered by the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| Ericsson | Low priority |
| SS | Low priority |

### Proposal 5-3.2

* Enhancements of aperiodic SRS for positioning can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Lower priority.  We do not see any need to further enhance AP-SRS, besides what is being addressed in Rel-16. |
| MTK | Don't support |
| Futurewei | Low Priority |
| OPPO | Not support |
| vivo | Support  At least, how to trigger the neighboring cell to receive the aperiodic SRS timely is a critical issue and should be investigated in R17 |
| ZTE | Not support. |
| Ericsson | Low priority |
| SS | Not support |
| Sony | Low Priority |

## Methods for reducing timing measurement errors

Background

Network time synchronization errors have a direct impact on the positioning accuracy of DL-TDOA and UL-TDOA. For multi-RTT, although the precise network time synchronization is not a requirement, the group delays in the Tx and Rx RF trains of the UE and TRPs also impact directly on the positioning accuracy of multi-RTT. For supporting sub-meter positioning accuracy in Rel-17, it is a necessity to remove or compensate these timing errors.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 7:
  + Study the mechanism of location based on network calibration, including
    - Time calibration (synchronization)
* (ZTE) Proposal 2:
  + Network can deliver some prior channel information to UE, the information will assist UE to perform better positioning.
* (ZTE) Proposal 6:
  + Enable network measurement to calibrate synchronization offset, e.g. support RSTD measurement between positioning nodes
* (CATT) Proposal 16:
  + RAN1 should investigate the use of the RAT-dependent network synchronization techniques for NR positioning, where the precise network synchronization can be achieved by monitoring the reference signals transmitted from TRPs.
* (CATT) Proposal 18:
  + A receiver should eliminate the impact of the Rx group delay when providing NR positioning measurements, e.g., UE should eliminate the Rx group delay in UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements.
* (CATT) Proposal 19:
  + For network-based positioning, the information of the UE Tx group delay should be sent to LMF for eliminating the impact of the Tx group delay on NR positioning. For UE-based positioning, the information of the gNB Tx group delay should be sent to UE for eliminating the impact of the Tx group delay on NR positioning.
* (CATT) Proposal 20:
  + LMF can provide the estimated UE position and the uncertainty associated with the estimated UE position to UE/gNB for aiding the UE/gNB in the reception of the DL/UL reference signals and proving reliable NR timing and angular positioning measurements.
* (MTK)Proposal 2-2
  + For UE-based DL-TDOA, when combining with multiple-RTT or UL-TDOA, the measurement results at gNB side (gNB RX-TX time difference or UL-RTOA) can provide to the UE to reduce the impact of synchronization error between TRPs
* (CEWiT)Proposal 2:
  + Deployment of reference UE in IioT and indoor office scenario should be studied for determination of the network synchronization error.
* (CEWiT)Proposal 3:
  + Achievable clock accuracy of network synchronization techniques like syncE and PTP should be studied.
* (Nokia) Proposal 9:
  + RAN1 to study beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms in order to improve the positioning accuracy achievable with DL-AoD.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 5:
  + For the purpose of improved accuracy, study further UE and/or network assistance for UE and network calibration (group delay, NW synchronization) :
    - Methods/signaling to mitigate the group delay calibration errors in Multi-RTT (e.g., enabling differential Multi-RTT, enabling calibration gaps; other schemes are not precluded)
    - Enhancing TDOA and Multi-RTT reporting for assisting with network synchronization
    - More explicitly conveying any adjustment for group delay
* (Ericsson) Proposal 8:
  + Study and specify methods to estimate UE RX and TX timing errors per UE antenna panel (due to filter group delays etc.) in order to enhance UL TDOA, DL TDOA and RTT positioning accuracy. Potential methods may include both reporting of what antenna panel has been used by the UE for a measurement or a SRS transmission and network control of what antenna panel the UE shall use for a measurement or a SRS transmission.

Feature lead’s view

To obtain the sub-meter positioning accuracy for Rel-17, it is clear that the measurement errors, including the errors caused by the network synchronization and the Tx/Rx group delays, need to be reduced to sub-meter level. Thus, suggest investigating the methods for reducing these measurement errors with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-4

* + The methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the network synchronization, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for both UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17
  + The methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the UE and gNB Rx and Tx group delays, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | In our view, the mentioned aspects can be solved by implementation and do not require standard support.  We think that calibration aspects are in the scope of RAN4 group. |
| vivo | Support the first sub-bullet.  For the second sub-bullet, we wonder whether the UE and gNB Rx and Tx group delays are equal with RX and TX timing error or calibrate error, if yes, we suggest unifying the naming. And we prefer to discuss the enhancement after reaching consensus in the AI8.5.1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Network synchronization could be more critical than the goup delay. We support first bullet from RAN1 perspective |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| OPPO | The scope is not clear. Which of the following interprations is the right one?  1. Study some enhancement to mitigate the impact introduced by network synchronization error  2. Study some mechanism to help the better synchronization at NW side |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| CEWiT | Network synchronization is critical issue in timing based positioning as mentioned by many companies in their proposals and evaluations. Providing robust mechanism for network synchronization rather than just relying on implementation specific solutions is necessary. Therefore we support first bullet and it should prioritiesd in Rel 17. We are neutral second bullet. |
| LG | We are supportive of the first bullet, and we prefer separate discussions on the two different sub-proposals. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support in principle. We suggest to have another bullet,   * Study if network can provide some prior information to UE for latency and accuracy improvement,(e.g. coarse location, prior channel information etc.). |
| SS | Support |

FL comments

For Intel’s comments, my understanding is that we may need some procedure and/or signalling support the calibrations. For vivo’s comments, I’d agree that it would be better the group to have the same understanding on the Rx/Tx time delays. My understanding of the Tx/Rx group delays are the time delays between the baseband to the Tx/Rx antennas. Based on the comments, it might be better to separate the two bullets into two proposals.

### Proposal 5-4.1 (Revision 1)

* + The methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the network synchronization, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for both UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | Do not support. Network synchronization should be up to network implementation. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Support. We see at least 130ns sync error for DL-TDOA under LTE positioning at US network. How can we rely on network implementation to solve it? If it can be solved, the error value should be much smaller than 130ns |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SS | Agree with Ericsson |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay, we can add that implementation solutions can be considered too. |
| SONY | Support |

FL comments

For E///’s comments, I understand the network synchronization is up to network implementation. The proposal here is not about the implementation of the network synchronization, but the estimation/or calibration of the network synchronization error. Maybe we can make this clear in the proposal.

### Proposal 5-4.1 (Revision 2)

* + The methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the network synchronization errors, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for both UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | Support |
| CMCC | Support. Network synchronization error plays a key role in the positioning error of TDOA-based techniques. To achieve a sub-meter level even cm level accuracy in Rel-17, besides the implementation method, solutions with spec impact as mentioned in the proposal should be further studied. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Intel | In our view, the mentioned aspects can be solved by implementation and do not require standard support.  We think that calibration aspects are in the scope of RAN4 group. |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Ericsson | We have similar view as Intel. Network synchronization is up to implementation. So we do not support this proposal.  Regarding the FL comments below, we would like to reiterate our position that we cannot accept the proposal. The FL’s response to our earlier comment is “The proposal here is not about the implementation of the network synchronization, but the estimation/or calibration of the network synchronization error.” We are of the view that even this (i.e., estimation and/or calibration of the network synchronization error) is an implementation issue. We have a lot of potential enhancements to study for the next meeting. So, we don’t think we need to spend much time on issues that can be handled via pure implementation. |
| FL’s response | To: Intel and E///s. The proposal here is not about the implementation of the network synchronization, but about using the UE/gNB measurements to help the estimation and compensation of the network synchronization errors in the positioning calculation. Thus, it should have no impact on the implementation of the network synchronization |
|  |  |

FL comments

.

Proposal 5-4.2 (Revision 1)

* + The methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the UE Rx/Tx transmission delays, and/or and gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | Okay ! |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SS | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| SONY | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| vivo | We raised some questions regarding this Rx and Tx timing error calibration in AI 8.5.1 discussion. It is still unclear to us what is the cause of Rx and Tx timing error and how to model it.  We can accept study on scenario and performance benefits followed by methods/signaling. However, we do not support this proposal as is where only methods and signaling are proposed to be investigated. |
| Ericsson | Support |

FL comments

For vivo’s comments, it seems reasonable to include on the scenario and performance benefits into the study.

Proposal 5-4.2 (Revision 2)

* + The scenario, benefits, methods and signaling for the estimation and calibration of the UE Rx/Tx transmission delays, and/or and gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay. |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Ericsson | Ok. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Ericsson2 | After careful consideration, the current formulation is not acceptable to us.  There has been limited discussion on particular solutions for improving positioning accuracy in the presence of Rx/Tx transmission delay.  The current formulation only allows explicit estimation and calibration of the Rx/Tx transmission delays.  We think it is premature to exclude other solutions that don’t rely on explicit estimation of the Rx/Tx transmission delays.  As we commented earlier, we prefer to have more general wording for the proposal as given below.  We can downselect specific solutions in the next meeting after there are more results and discussion on the detailed.   **Proposal 5-4.2  (Revision 2)** ○     The ~~scenario, benefits,~~ methods and signaling for ~~the estimation and calibration~~ improving positioning accuracy in the presence of the UE Rx/Tx transmission delays, and/or and gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays, which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements, will be investigated for UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17. |
| Intel | We believe that this aspect should be discussed in RAN4. |
| SS | OK for Ericsson’s rewording |
| Fraunhofer | The second change in the proposal from Ericsson is better. “Scenario, benefits” shall be kept. |
|  |  |

FL Comments

It seems all companies are supportive to investigate the methods to deal with the UE/gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays. For E///’s comment is understandable that we should not preclude other solutions at this moment. In the meanwhile, we should not exclude the methods already identified either.

Proposal 5-4.2 (Revision 3)

* + The scenario, benefits, methods and signaling for improving positioning accuracy in the presence of the UE Rx/Tx transmission delays, and/or and gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays (e.g., by the estimation and calibration of the UE/gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays based on NR reference signals and measurements), will be investigated for UE-based and network-based positioning in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Ericsson | We can support the proposal if the parenthesis “(e.g., by the estimation and calibration of the UE/gNB Rx/Tx transmission delays , which may be based on NR reference signals and measurements)”. For this issue, RAN1 has not yet identified any potential solutions, so it is better to keep an open wording in the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sony | Support |

Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Methods for reducing angular measurement errors

Background

For positioning methods based on the angular measurements, the positioning accuracy depends directly on the accuracy of the angular measurements. For example, the DL AoD and UL AoA measurement accuracy are related to the orientation uncertainties of the gNB Tx/Rx beams. The positioning accuracy can be improved if the LMF (network-based) and UE(UE-based) can calibrate the orientation uncertainties of the gNB Tx and Rx beams from the angular measurements. Also, the multipath signals may cause significant errors in the UL AoA measurements since the reflected signals may reach the receiver antenna at completely different angles than the LOS angle.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 3:
  + The enhancement of measurement should include studying
    - AoA measurement enhancement targeting ULA
    - DL-AoD accuracy enhancement
* (MTK) Proposal 5-1:
  + Study RSRP measurement for first-arriving path as accuracy improvement for DL-AoD technique
* (MTK) Proposal 5-2
  + RAN1 should take the lead for defining the mapping of a number of RSRP measurements to the angle for DL-AoD enhancement in Rel-17
* (CATT) Proposal 20:
  + LMF can provide the estimated UE position and the uncertainty associated with the estimated UE position to UE/gNB for aiding the UE/gNB in the reception of the DL/UL reference signals and proving reliable NR timing and angular positioning measurements.
* (LGE) Proposal 4:
  + As a potential enhancement of Rel-17 NR positioning, timing measurement based DL-AoD technique needs to be considered.
* (Nokia) Proposal 9:
  + RAN1 to study beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms in order to improve the positioning accuracy achievable with DL-AoD.

Feature lead’s view

To obtaining the sub-meter positioning accuracy based on DL AoD and/or UL AOA, it is clear that the errors of the angular measurements need to be reduced such that the equivalent distance errors are in the same level. Thus, it is needed to investigate the methods for reducing angular measurement errors.

Proposal 5-5

* The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17,

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| Intel | The text of proposal needs to be refined to be clear on what should be investigated. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Support, and our proposal for single path RSRP measurement can also move to here.. ☺ |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear what is the scope of this proposal |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support as a general observation. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| LG | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| SS | Support |

FL comments

Most companies are supportieve to the proposal. To address Intel and Qulacomm’s comments on the clarification of the scope, the proposal is modified as follows with the consideration of the submitted proposals.

Proposal 5-5 (Revision 1)

* The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to:
  + Enhancement of the mapping of RSRP measurements to the angle for DL-AoD enhancement
  + assistance data from LMF to gNB for supporting UL AoA measurements
  + gNB antenna beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We consider this low priority in this section. |
| Ericsson | support only the main bullet. The subbulets can be discussed later. So suggest to remove the subbulets for now. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support in principle. We suggest to add another sub-bullet with the following change. As for indoor case, uniform linear array is more practical at gNB.   * The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to:   + Enhancement of the mapping of RSRP measurements to the angle for DL-AoD enhancement   + assistance data from LMF to gNB for supporting UL AoA measurements   + gNB antenna beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms   Angle measurement anhancement considering uniform linear array at gNB |
| MTK | Support , and okay with HW’s revision |
| ZTE | Support with low priority. |
| SS | Support since it may help with LOS/NLOS classification |
| LG | We support with the change of the first sub-bullet  Enhacnement of the mapping of ~~RSRP measurements~~ each PRS resource to the angle for DL-AoD enhancement |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| SONY | Support |

FL comments

For Ericsson’s comments, the sub-bullets are added due to the concern that the scope can be too broad, if we only list the main bullet. For LG’s proposal, it is unclear to me how to mapping of each PRS resource to DL-AoD angle. I assume we need to first obtain the measurements (e.g., RSRP) and then mapping the measurements to the angles. Maybe the intention is to “Enhancement of the mapping of RSRP measurements from DL PRS resources to the angle for DL-AoD?”

The proposal is revised based on the comments from Huawei.

Proposal 5-5 (Revision 2)

* The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17, which may include, but not limited to:
  + Enhancement of the mapping of RSRP measurements to DL-AoD
  + assistance data from LMF to gNB for supporting UL AoA measurements
  + gNB antenna beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms
  + Angle measurement enhancement considering uniform linear array at gNB

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MTK | We suggest some revision to the first bullet   * Enhancement of RSRP measurement, and the corresponding mapping to the angle for DL-AoD   This is because RSRP measurement can be improved, for example measuring single path to improve performance under NLOS |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | We think all sub-bullets should be FFS, we can go back in next meeting after more technical justifications are shown. |
| vivo | Low priority and only support the main bullet “The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17”  One general comment, it seems the study only focus on methods but not on why such enhancement is needed (applicable scenarios and performance benefits etc.) |
| LG | We have similar view with MTK. The intention of our original suggestion was that we do not need to restrict to the current RSRP measurement of PRS resource for DL-AoD technique. For example, RSRP of the first-arrival signal path can be considered. Support either MTK’s proposal or “enhancement of the mapping of PRS resource measurement to the angle of DL-AoD. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Ericsson | We agree with ZTE and VIVO. We can only support the main bullet. For sub-bullets, we prefer to remove them. |

FL comments

The sub-bullets were added to Proposal 5-5 due to the previous comment to the scope of the proposal is unclear. Since a number of companies propose to remove the sub-bullets, let us remove them to see if we can reach a consensus on the main bullet.

Proposal 5-5 (Revision 3)

The methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Suppport. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | Okay to remove the sub-bullets ! |
| Intel | Low priority. |
| LG | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Qualcomm | Low priority |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Same comment as before, the benefit and scenario need be considered. So, we suggest this wording for the proposal.  The scenario, benefits, methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Ericsson | Ok. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| CMCC | Ok with vivo’s revision. |
| Futurewei | Support |

Proposal 5-5 (Revision 4)

The scenario, benefits, and methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Suppport. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MTK | Okay to remove the sub-bullets ! |
| Intel | Low priority. |
| LG | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Qualcomm | Low priority. Can we clarify that this involve |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Same comment as before, the benefit and scenario need be considered. So, we suggest this wording for the proposal.  The scenario, benefits, methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements can be investigated in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Ericsson | Ok. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| CMCC | Ok with vivo’s revision. |
| Qualcomm2 | Low priority. Can we clarify that this involve both UE-A and UE-B considerations? Example of proposal:  The scenario, benefits, and methods for improving the accuracy of the UE-A UL AoA and UE-A/UE-B DL-AoD methods ~~measurements~~ can be investigated in Rel-17. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Intel | Low priority. |
| SS | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |

FL comments

16 companies support, and 4 companies think it is low priority. The proposal is revised with the consideration of Qualcomm’s comments.

Proposal 5-5 (Revision 5)

The scenario, benefits, and methods for improving the accuracy of the UL AoA and DL-AoD ~~measurements~~ methods for both UE-based and UE-assisted positioning can be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Generally supportive now, but we still think that we should change the “UL AoA and DL-AoD measurements” to “UL AoA and DL-AoD methods”. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| vivo | Support. |
| LG | OK |
| Sony | OK |

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Enhancements on E-CID positioning

Background

In Rel-16, E-CID is supported based on the Rel-15 RRM measurements. Several companies propose further enhancements of E-CID positioning based on Rel-15/Rel-16 NR reference signals for improving positioning accuracy and efficiency.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 3:
  + The enhancement of measurement should include studying
    - E-CID enhancement to incorporate RTT measurement based on the serving gNB(s)
    - Use of SRS configured by SRS-Resource for multi-RTT
* (DCM) Proposal 1:
  + TA based positioning scheme (e.g. reusing LTE Positioning scheme based on TA Type1 and TA Type2) should be consider for Rel-17 NR Positioning to reduce positioning latency.
* (CMCC) Proposal 8:
  + Enhancement on E-CID positioning should be supported:
    - Supporting E-CID based on RTT + UL-AoA measurements
    - Supporting E-CID using Rel-16 DL/UL positioning reference signals
* (Ericsson) Proposal 19:
  + Support reuse of Rel-15 SRS resource set for gNB Rx-Tx and UE Rx-Tx measurements for positioning in NR.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 20:
  + Send an LS to RAN4 regarding UE Rx-Tx requirements
  + Note: There is no impact to specifications managed by RAN1

Feature lead’s view

Suggest investigating the E-CID positioning enhancement based on Rel-15/16 NR reference signals with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-6

* Enhancements for E-CID positioning based on NR Rel-15 reference signals (e.g., Rel-15 CSI-RS and SRS) and Rel-16 reference signals (e.g., PRS and SRS for positioning) with timing related measurements (e.g., UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements) and angular measurements (e.g., DL-AoD and UL AoA) will be investigated for the potential of improving positioning accuracy and device efficiency.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
|  | In our view it is a low priority item for Rel.17 enhancements. |
| vivo | We’re open to study of enhancement for E-CID. Again, we’d like to remind that such study should be accompanied by quantitative evalautions and study if such enhancement can meet the Rel-17 requirements as in SID oejbctive 1.c.  We suggest the following wording:   * Enhancements for E-CID positioning based on NR Rel-15 reference signals (e.g., Rel-15 CSI-RS and SRS) and Rel-16 reference signals (e.g., PRS and SRS for positioning) with timing related measurements (e.g., UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements) and angular measurements (e.g., DL-AoD and UL AoA) will be investigated to meet Rel-17 requirements: * positioning accuracy and device efficiency performance |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay but in principle this proposal just says that E-CID can be investigated for enhancement which is very broad. Not sure what we gain by this proposal. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Low priority |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | If such appeningts are considered, then why is this called E-CID and not RTT or TDOA or AoD? We are not supportive of this proposal, unless it is more clear what specific item can be enhanced. |
| OPPO | Low priority due to the accuracy of E-CID |
| LG | If we consider timing measurements using Rel-15 RSs, it does not need to be limited to E-CID technique, so we are not supportive of the proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Don’t support |
| ZTE | We are not supportive this proposal. Why we need ECID to have timing and angle measurement? |
| NTT DOCOMO | According to Rel-17 Positioning SID, we can consider enhancement to reduce latency. TA based positioning may be beneficial to obtain gNB Rx-Tx measurements since NW can measure gNB Rx-Tx time difference without any dedicated signaling. Hence, we suggest to include TA based positioning in Proposal 5-6 (e.g. ”… based on NR Rel-15 reference signals (e.g., Rel-15 CSI-RS and SRS), Rel-16 reference signals (e.g., PRS and SRS for positioning) and TA Type1/2 with timing …”). |
| SS | Low priority |

FL comments

Based on the feedbacks, especially the operators, enhancements for E-CID positioning with existing NR reference signals is important fin Rel-17 especially the reduce of the positioning latency. Suggest keeping it as high priority due to the importance to the feature and relative small effort in the standardization.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support to keep it as high priority. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia’s comment above. We support the proposal in principle, but the scope is very broad. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| SS | Low priority |
| LG | Low priority |
| SONY | Support with Medium/Low Priority |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support to keep High priority. We think it’ not necessary to restrict to enhancements based on reference signal at this stage. |
| CMCC | Agree with CATT and DCM that E-CID enhancement should be kept as high priority. Not only it benefits the latency, but also have potential benefits for use cases that UE (such as AGVs) moves quite fast and the TA may change during the measurement period. |
| Futurewei |  |

FL comments

Maybe the main concern is the scope of the study for the proposal. Maybe we can further clarify the scope to address the concern, e.g., the RTT from the serving cell.

### Proposal 5-6 (Revision 1)

* Enhancements for E-CID positioning with UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements and angular measurements from the serving cell(s) will be investigated in Rel-17.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| LG | Support with low priority |
| Fraunhofer | Same view as LG |
| Qualcomm | Low priority |
| Nokia/NSB | Not sure this brings much value as written. Low priority. What would we investigate? |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| OPPO | Low priority |
| vivo | We’re open to study of enhancement for E-CID. Again, we’d like to remind that such study should be accompanied by quantitative evaluations and study if such enhancement can meet the Rel-17 requirements as in SID objectives 1.c.  We suggest the following wording:   * Enhancements for E-CID positioning with UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements and angular measurements from the serving cell(s) will be investigated in Rel-17: * positioning accuracy and device efficiency performance |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| CMCC | Support |

FL comments

For Nokia’s comments, my understanding for the investigation is that for LTE E-CID, UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements (a.k.a., TADV) ty and angular measurements from serving cell are used, but Rel-16 NR E-CID does not support it. Thus, the proponents want to consider the support using UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements (a.k.a., TADV) and angular measurements for Rel-17 E-CID. The proposal is revised with the consideration of vivo’s comments.

### Proposal 5-6 (Revision 2)

* Enhancements for E-CID positioning with UE/gNB Rx-Tx measurements and angular measurements from the serving cell(s) will be investigated in Rel-17 for improving E-CID positioning accuracy and device efficiency.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Rel-16 NR E-CID does not support gNB Rx-Tx because we have introduced something more accurate, M-RTT. E-CID gNB Rx-Tx would mean using the Timing advance, which is very low accuracy. I still don’t see what it is to study really. Is there a way to reduce the scope by making it more specific? |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support a broad proposal like this. Very unclear what this would be studying. |
| LG | Low priority |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Reply to all:  We consider E-CID a very important positioning method to provide the initial UE location with very limited latency budget. The accuracy can be further enhancement, and the requirement is not necessarily associated with TA granularity.  Further it may be accompanied with other positioning method to achieve the accuracy/latency trade-off, and we also got the feedback from operators requesting enhancing E-CID, and it has been proposed multiple times in RAN1 and RAN2 in Rel-16.  The scope is quite specific. We will investigate the positioning accuracy achievable by RTT+AoA and the respective latency. |
| ZTE | Low priority. We can use dedicated timing and angle methods specified in Rel-16. |
| CMCC | For the enhancement for E-CID, what we have in mind is that we can use RTT plus AOA to obtain the UE location, which performs better than using TA.  Regarding some companies commented that we have already introduced something more accurate, such as multi-RTT, we agree. But we think the enhanced E-CID may have a potential advantage under the cases that UE is moving fast, and TA may change during the measurement phase. |
| SS | Low priority |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with Huawei/HiSilicon and CMCC. In addition, if NW can measure the positioning metric based on both TA and PRS, the number of repetitions of PRS Tx will be decreased compared to PRS based scheme only. We think it’s beneficial to obtain gNB Rx-Tx measurements with low latency. |
|  |  |

## Methods for reducing positioning latency

Background

One of the main objectives of the SI is to investigate the solutions for reducing the latency. Different solutions are proposed by many companies, and some of them are already discussed in previous sections (e.g., on-demand DL PRS). In this section, we discuss some additional proposals for reducing positioning latency, especially the triggering, processing, and reporting of the positioning measurements.

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo)Proposal 2:
  + The enhancements are needed for **positioning latency**, network efficiency, and device efficiency
* (Sony) Proposal 6:
  + Support the operation of fast positioning measurement report once the UE has obtained positioning measurement result (e.g. using uplink configured grant for positioning, UE to directly monitor control channel for uplink grant)
* (LGE)Proposal 9:
  + In Rel-17, RAN1 needs a study on the reporting latency reduction considering the physical layer procedure for scheduling request and positioning performance impact if additional latency is required when the measurement reporting is not available at once.
* (Nokia)Proposal 1:0
  + RAN1 should only focus on physical layer aspects when discussing enhancements on latency reduction for positioning.
* (Nokia)Proposal 1:
  + Methods to reduce the delay in the positioning measurement report should be studied.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 6:
  + NR Rel-17 should target PHY-layer and High-layer enhancements to support a 10 msec End-To-End latency consider the following targets in the respective working groups:
  + PHY-layer latency of which includes the time from location request/triggering to successful decoding of the positioning measurement report from the serving gNB
  + High-layer latency of ms which includes the time to collect the measurements from the TRPs, perform the position estimation, and transmit the estimate to the external client.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 8:
  + For the purpose of reduced latency, study further Low-layer (e.g., DCI, MAC-CE) triggering of DL/UL PRS transmission and muting.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 9:
  + For the purpose of reduced latency, study further Enhanced PRS processing capabilities and PRS instances with reduced time-domain foot-print.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 10:
  + For the purpose of reduced latency, study further Low-layer (e.g., DCI, MAC-CE) triggering of DL/UL Location Information Reporting.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 11:
  + For the purpose of reduced latency, study further reporting of Positioning information directly to the serving gNB either by RRC, MAC-CE or UCI.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 16:
  + Assume Rel-16 single-DCI based Multi-TRP architecture for IioT scenario in order to reduce latency associated with positioning.
* (Ericsson) Proposal 17:
  + In Rel-17 positioning, consider configuration of positioning measurement reports via RRC to reduce latency.

Feature lead’s view

The methods for reducing positioning latency, especially the triggering, processing, and reporting of the positioning measurements. Should be investigated with high priority in this meeting.

Proposal 5-7

* For reducing NR positioning, more efficient signaling & procedures will be investigated to enable a device to request and report positioning information, which may include, but not limited to, the following aspects:
  + DL PRS/UL SRS configuration via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The request for positioning information (the assistance data, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The report of positioning information (the measurement report, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are generally fine with such WF. However, such a positioning architecture change should involve RAN2 for feasibility check. Also we should not change the LCS architecture specified in TS 23.273, i.e. the location request is managed by 5GC, and positioning calculation should only be UE/SET, LMF, or SLP. |
| Intel | Support. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the main bullet and not listing details. The sub-bullets are not clear to us at all. Some of these proposals would also change the signalling which needs to be discussed in detail. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | OKAY ! |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Generally support the above proposal.  However, such proposals would only try to tackle the reporting to be appening towards the serving cell (in a non-transparent manner to the RAN). What is needed is RAN2 to work on analysing the positioning architecture that may be needed to ensure that any such PHY-layer enhancements could be useful to reduce the latency.  Add the following note:   * It is within RAN2 scope to analyze positioning architecture enhancements to enable such more efficient signaling & procedures. |
| OPPO | Support. We share the same view as Huawei and QC. Thus we support QC’s note as well. Moreover, we also support Nokia’s proposal to remove sub-bullets. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Share the same view as Huawei, QC and Oppo. For such enhancements, any phy layer signalling impacts affecting the existing LPP structure would need to be investigated, which is also part of the scope of RAN2. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | Support the main bullet with minor change. It seems that “latency” is omitted. We suggest that “For reducing NR positioning latency” in front of the sentence. Regarding sub-bullets, we also think that there is RAN2 impact. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support. Only keep the main bullet. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |

FL comments

Most companies are supportive to the effort. The proposal is modified based on the comments.

Proposal 5-7 (Revision 1)

* For reducing NR positioning, more efficient signaling & procedures will be investigated to enable a device to request and report positioning information, which may include, but not limited to, the following aspects:
  + DL PRS/UL SRS configuration via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The request for positioning information (the assistance data, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The report of positioning information (the measurement report, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
* Note: It is within RAN2 scope to analyze positioning architecture enhancements to enable such more efficient signaling & procedures.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Ericsson | Support. In the main bullet, the work ‘latency’ is missing. i.e., ‘For reducing NR positioning latency’ |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We suggest to add another Note:  Note: The LCS architecture specified in TS 23.273 is not expected to be affected. |
| MTK | Okay |
| ZTE | Support |
| SS | Support the main bullet but the sub-bullets should be FFS only. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Lg | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the main bullet only as above. |
| SONY | Only support the main bullet (same view as QC). |

FL comments

The proposal is modified based on the comments from Ericsson and Huawei.

Proposal 5-7 (Revision 2)

* For reducing NR positioning latency, more efficient signaling & procedures will be investigated to enable a device to request and report positioning information, which may include, but not limited to, the following aspects:
  + DL PRS/UL SRS configuration via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The request for positioning information (the assistance data, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
  + The report of positioning information (the measurement report, etc.) via RRC, MAC-CE, or UCI.
* Note: It is within RAN2 scope to analyze positioning architecture enhancements to enable such more efficient signaling & procedures.
* Note: The LCS architecture specified in TS 23.273 is not expected to be affected.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| MTK | ok |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | OK |
| vivo | Support. |
| Intel | Support. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| LG | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Qualcomm | Object with the new note that was added. How can RAN1 make such decision?   * Note: The LCS architecture specified in TS 23.273 is not expected to be affected. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the main bullet only. The subbullets have not been discussed and are quite broad in our view. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal. But some questions regarding the notes:  -> Why do we (RAN1) have to agree what is in RAN2 scope? RAN2 can decide their scope and we don’t need to tell them what is in their scope. So we should remove this note. These potential positioning architecture enhancements can be discussed directly in RAN2.  -> the last note is also not in RAN1 scope.  So, we suggest to remove both notes. |

FL comments

### Closed. See Chairman’s notes for the agreement.

## Measurement gap

Background

In Rel-16, UE is not expected to process DL PRS if the measurement gap is not configured. UE measurement gap is configured through RRC signaling. For Rel-17 the following enhancements related to measurement gap for positioning are proposed (Note: In Rel-16, RAN4 decided not to provide the definitions of intra-/inter-frequency measurements for DL PRS due to the measurements from DL PRS are obtained under the assumption that the measurement gap is configured).

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo) Proposal 13:
  + Measurement gap related indication should be included in positioning measurement report.
* (vivo) Proposal 15:

Positioning BWP switching can be considered in Rel-17 as an alternative to using measurement gap

* (vivo) Proposal 17:
  + Support to introduce on demand measurement gap for on demand PRS in Rel-17.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 2:
  + It is necessary to study the method on PRS reception without measurement gap.
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 7:
  + For the purpose of reduced latency, study further enhancements in MG configuration & triggering (e.g., DCI/MAC-CE triggered MG, Positioning-specific MG, band-specific/layer-specific MG)

Feature lead’s view

It is clearly undesirable that a measurement gap has to be configured whenever a UE needs to measure DL PRS. Thus, this issue needs to be resolved in Rel-17. Suggest investigating this issue with high priority in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-8

* The enhancements related to UE measurement gap will be investigated, which may include
  + Measurement gap indication in positioning measurement report.
  + BWP switching for positioning measurement
  + on-demand measurement gap request
  + DL PRS reception without measurement gap
  + Enhancements in MG configuration & triggering (e.g., DCI/MAC-CE triggered MG, Positioning-specific MG, band-specific/layer-specific MG)

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSlicon | Not sure what to study. Those issues seems to be not appropriate to be handled in SI. |
| Intel | Support. We think that some of the items are out of RAN1 scope. |
| vivo | Support. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Support. We think measurement gap can be further enhanced for RRC connected state when UE has less data transmission and there is no need to move to RRC idle/inactive state. The positioning under RRC idle/inactive state may be restricted |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are supportive of this proposal. Indeed some of these are within Ran4 scope, and can be clarified further. For the purpose of RAN1 study, we can try to analyse these aspects and conclude what aspects can be beneficial to be specified (part or all of the specification work may be within RAN4). |
| OPPO | Support |
| LG | Support |
| ZTE | It’s beyond RAN1’s scope. |
| SS | Low priority |
| Nokia/NSB | Scope seems very broad but in principle we are okay. |
| Ericsson | We don’t see the need to enhance measurement gaps in Rel-17. Measurement Gap indication/triggering/request will not help in reducing positioning latency. So do not support. |

FL Comments

It seems further discussion is needed on whether the issue should be handled in RAN1. In my view, at least some issues need to be discussed in RAN1, or RAN1 can lead the discussion and then provide the inputs to other WGs. Suggest keeping this issue with high priority in this meeting, and further discuss the proposal.

### Proposal 5-8 (Revision 1)

* The enhancements related to UE measurement gap will be investigated, which may include
  + Measurement gap indication in positioning measurement report.
  + BWP switching for positioning measurement
  + on-demand measurement gap request
  + DL PRS reception without measurement gap
  + Enhancements in MG configuration & triggering (e.g., DCI/MAC-CE triggered MG, Positioning-specific MG, band-specific/layer-specific MG)
* Note: The investigation will identify and focus on the RAN1’s aspects.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| MTK | Ok |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | We don’t think it’s a high priority issue. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Futurewei | Low Priority |
| LG | Support |
| Ericsson | Do not support, we don’t see what could be in the scope of the SI for this. |
| Qualcomm | Support.  To E//, e.g.: DCI-triggered or MAC-CE activated PRS, would need also MG (at least UEs that always require MG will always be there, even if PRS-processing without MG is introduced). So having DCI-triggered PRS without considering how to quickly trigger MG would not be useful. |
| FL’s comments | In Rel-16 DL PRS is measured under the assumption that a measurement gap is always configured. At least this needs to be fixed in Rel-17 wither start the investigation in SI with possibly better solution or wait for WI to handle it. |
| SS | OK |
| CATT | Support. |

FL Comments

11 companies provide feedback. 8 companies support it, 2 companies consider it a low priority, and 1 company is not supportive. Suggest further discussion in this meeting.

## UE-based positioning

Background

UE-based DL positioning is supported in Rel-16 with the broadcast of location assistance data. Enhancements for UE-based positioning are proposed to further reduce the positioning latency and accuracy.

Submitted Proposals

* (Lenovo)Proposal 1:
  + UE-based positioning latency enhancements should be studied, which are especially applicable for IIoT scenarios
* (Qualcomm) Proposal 1:
  + At least for the purpose of improved accuracy, additional support and enhancements for UE-based positioning should be supported, including, but not limited to:
    - Enhancements of the assistance data (e.g. RTD enhancements, beam-shape assistance data)
    - UE-based UL and DL & UL methods (e.g., UE-Based Multi-RTT)

Feature lead’s view

UE-based positioning may offer the advantage of reducing the positioning latency, especially when it only uses DL positioning measurements, which is supported in Rel-16. Suggest further investigating the benefits of other UE-based positioning methods, such as UE-based Multi-RTT~~, if we have the time to do so in this meeting~~.

### Proposal 5-9

* Enhancements for UE-based positioning may be investigated for the potential of improving positioning performance.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We consider it low priority. |
| Intel | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We suggest low priority. What benefits would be achieved by UE based in multi-RTT for example? There is still need for LMF to signal a measurement to the UE. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We support UE based. Not just for UE based multiple-RTT, we can further consider to enhance UE based DL-TDOA as we mention during on-line |
| CMCC | We are fine with the idea of using UE-based positioning to reduce the latency; however, it seems in the RAN2 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Support. We consider it high priority. This discussion is not only about UE-B MRTT, but also enhanements overall on UE-B support. To Nokia: For reasoning of UE-B MRTT please read our paper and send me any email with questions .  We porpose the following wording update as follows:   * Enhancements for UE-based positioning may be investigated for the potential of improving positioning performance, reduced latency and efficiency. |
| OPPO | Low priority |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support enahancements for UE-based positioning since it is clear that such mechanisms offer latency reduction benefits when compared to UE-assisted approaches at least in terms of measurement reporting. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal |
| LG | We consider it with low priority |
| Fraunhofer | Low priority |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SS | Low priority |
| Ericsson | This should be low priority. |
| SONY | Low priority |

FL comments

It seems there are different views on whether to consider UE-based positioning as high-priority in the SI. My understanding is that the support of UE-based positioning has its advantage for the potential of improving positioning performance, reduced latency and efficiency, especially the hybrid positioning as pointed out by supporting companies. The workload of supporting UE-based positioning may be in other WGs, but not in RAN1.

The proposal is revised with the comments from Qualcomm. Based on the feedback from multiple companies, suggest lowering the proposed enhancement to medium priority and further discussion of the proposal in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-9 (Revision 1)

* Enhancements for UE-based positioning may be investigated for the potential of improving positioning performance, reduced latency and efficiency.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support. For example, the existing DL-TDOA UE based can be further improved |
| ZTE | OK |
| vivo | Support in principle  And we suggest this wording for the proposal.   * Enhancements for UE-based positioning may be investigated for the potential of improving positioning performance, reduced latency ~~and efficiency~~, network/UE efficiency and UE power consumption. |
| LG | OK |
| Ericsson | Low prioirty |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support with high priority. Especially for some low-latency applications, UE-based might turn out to be the only feasible solution. Enhancements should continue in both fronts of UE-A and UE-B positioning. |
| OPPO | Low priority |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK2 | Respond to CMCC for earlier comment: “We are fine with the idea of using UE-based positioning to reduce the latency; however, it seems in the RAN2 scope”  In our view, not just for latency reduction, also for accuracy improvement. There could be signalling work which belongs to RAN2 territory. We think RAN1 can indicate RAN2 on how UE based positioning can improve accuracy, and then it is all about signalling work for RAN2 to fulfil |
| CEWiT | Support |

FL comments

Most companies are supportive to the proposal. Two companies think this is a low priority issue, while one company consider it as high-priority. So, suggest keeping it as medium priority. The proposal is revised with the consideration of vivo’s comments.

### Proposal 5-9 (Revision 2)

* Enhancements for UE-based positioning may be investigated for the potential of increasing positioning performance, reducing positioning latency, and improving network/UE efficiency and reducing UE power consumption.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Support. High priority, especially for latency, efficiency and power consumption.  Isn’t obvious the latency gain for scenarios of client being at the UE? Examples: Enhancements only on PHY-layer latency would directly result to enhancements in latency. No need of input and debates from RAN2/3/SA2 about what are the network latencies/signaling. There are several low-hanging fruit of enhancements, like RTD enhancements for TDOA, and assistance data enhancements for AoD that would enhance UE-based further during this release. Furthermore, there can be extension of UE-based for additional techniques. Eventually many of these would be within scope of Ran2, but still the discussion needs to happen in RAN1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Low priority for this meeting. |
| CATT | Support. |
| LG | In our view, Rel-17 NR positioning enhancements includes both UE-assisted positioning and UE-based positioning. We are not sure if we need to make an agreement especially for UE-based positioning. |
| ZTE | OK. |
| Ericsson | Low prioirty |
|  |  |

## UE positioning in DRX state

Background

In Rel-16, UE positioning is not supported for UE in DRX state. For reducing the UE power consumption, it is important to consider the support of positioning for a UE in DRX state.

Submitted Proposals

* (CATT) Proposal 8:
  + For the purpose of device efficiency, it should be considered to send SRS-Pos signal at DRX active time for UL positioning.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 14:
  + For the purpose of enhanced efficiency, study further relation of DRX to DL/UL positioning reference signals, signaling, procedures and measurement accuracy including, but not limited to:
    - DL PRS reception and UL SRS for positioning transmission outside DRX active time
    - Measurement Accuracy requirements outside DRX active time
    - Any required signaling from the UE to LMF or serving gNB, or serving gNB to the LMF

Feature lead’s view

Supporting UE positioning in DRX state may potentially offer significant advantages for reducing UE power consumption, if we have the time to do so in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-10

* UE positioning in DRX state can be investigated.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | From our understanding, PRS reception in CDRX inactive time is supported, which should not be studied in Rel-17.  Transmitting SRS in CDRX inactive time seems not appropriate to be discussed in the SI. |
| Intel | Support. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar understanding as Huawei. We suggest low priority for this topic. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | We think the requirement should be relaxed under DRX state. We feel that this maybe RAN4 work to define a relaxed performance requirement when UE performs positioning under DRX |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support.  To Huawei/HiSilicon: PRS reception within CDRX inactive is supported, but with the same requirements as the case of no DRX. This means that the UE is actually remaining awake, and there are no power savings gains. |
| OPPO | Share the same view as Huawei and Nokia. If the intention of this study is to relaxe the requirements with DRX inactive state, it seems RAN4 work |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support and could have potential imapcts on UE power consumption. |
| LG | We suggest it with low priority |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Agree with MTK. |
| SS | Low priority |
| Futurewei | Low Priority |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Huawei and Nokia. |

FL comments

Among the 16 feedbacks, 7 of them are supportive. Others either think it should be discussed in RAN4 or low priority. It seems difficult to reach a consensus for this proposal in this meeting. Suggest further discussion in next meeting.

## Beam-management of positioning

Background

The use of the beam related information for supporting NR positioning is carefully considered in Rel-16 NR positioning, Further enhancements of beam-management of the positioning reference signals may further reducing the overhead, latency, and power consumption.

Submitted Proposals

* (OPPO) Proposal 8:
  + Study to enhance the multi-beam operation on DL PRS resource and support UE-specific beam configuration
* (LGE)Proposal 1:
  + Rel-17 NR positioning needs a study on TX/RX beam optimization for the timing measurements for the improvement of positioning accuracy.
* (LGE)Proposal 5:
  + Rel-17 NR positioning SI needs to study how to use the UE's RX beam index reporting for positioning.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 3:
  + Both UE based and gNB based beam managements of neighboring cell should be supported. Cell specific reference signal is preferred for UE based beam measurement of neighboring cell. Reuse beam management reference signal of serving cell for gNB based beam measurement of neighboring cell is preferred.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 4:
  + Multi-reference signal transmitted at the same time with different beam should be configured for UE with multi-panel to reduce beam management latency.
* (Xiaomi)Proposal 5:
  + We suggest to find the LOS path during beam management procedure.

Feature lead’s view

Enhancements of the beam-management for the transmission and reception of the DL PRS and UL SRS may offer the benefits of improving UE positioning accuracy, reducing the measurement delay, and reducing UE power consumption.

### Proposal 5-11

* Enhancements of the beam managements for the transmission and reception of the DL PRS and UL SRS can be investigated for improving UE positioning accuracy, reducing the measurement delay, and reducing the UE power consumption.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support. We consider enhancements that related to more complete multipath measurements and the beam aspects of it as the same category of enhancements. For example, knowing the beam index or direction would greatly provide a more accurate UE measurements of the channel sinve the UE would be able to align towards that direction when the channel profile measurements are made. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We understand that this feature is already supported in Rel-16, e.g. PRS-QCL-typeD indication and SRS spatial relation configuration. The proposal itself is too vague and too broad. Suggest to have it low priority. |
| Intel | The statement is too general, it is not clear what is the scope to be considered. |
| vivo | Same views with Huawei and Intel. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Same view as HW, intel and vivo |
| CMCC | Not clear what should be enhanced unless more enhancement details are further clarified in FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Too general statement, and many of the things that may be considered here can potentially be part of the other proposals. All enhancements should consider both FR1 & FR2. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| LG | Support. For the beam related issue to improve accuracy, we understand how to utilize the RX beam information needs to be discussed together. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Low priority. |
| SS | Low priority. |
| SONY | Support. We agree with Futurewei’s statement. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Ericsson | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Futurewei | Many of these aspects are part of other proposals. We would like a FL Conclusion:   * *Enhancements of the beam managements for the transmission and reception of the DL PRS and UL SRS should be studied when proposed as part of other proposals.* |

FL comments

18 companies provide the feedback. 8 companies are supportive, while others consider the proposal is too general or low priority or can be covered by other enhancements. The proposal is revised with the consideration of FW’s suggestion.

### Proposal 5-11 (Revision 1)

* Conclusion:
  + Enhancements of the beam managements for the transmission and reception of the DL PRS and UL SRS can be studied when proposed as part of other proposals.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with this approach |
| Ericsson | OK |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | We wonder how to evaluate the enhancement is due to beam management or other proposals. |
| LG | Support. |

## Additional methods for increasing the network and UE efficiency

Background

Several proposals are presented related to the enhancements of network efficiency and device efficiency.

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo)Proposal 2:
  + The enhancements are needed for positioning latency, network efficiency, and device efficiency
* (vivo) Proposal 16:
  + Support to introduce positioning measurement window in Rel-17.
* (Lenovo) Proposal 4:
  + Study DL-PRS overhead reduction techniques from the network and UE perspective.
* (Nokia)Proposal 6:
  + RAN1 to study complexity reductions for RAT-dependent positioning techniques with a focus on FR2 operations.

Feature lead’s view

One of the main objectives of the SI is the improvement of the network and UE efficiency. Sggest further investigating the proposed enhancements in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-12

* The methods for the enhancement of the network and device efficiency and reduce the network and device complexity can be investigated, e.g.,
  + positioning measurement window
  + DL-PRS overhead reduction techniques

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think positioning window is a good idea. However it is more suitable to be directly discussed in a WI without need of further study in SI.  For overhead reduction, we think it is already covered by on-demand PRS. |
| Intel | The statement is too general, it is not clear what is the scope to be considered. |
| vivo | Support and we have investigated power saving gain for introducing the positioning measurement window. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. But we need to clarify the scope of work first. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Too vague |
| CMCC | Support |
| Qualcomm | The statement is too general, it is not clear what is the scope to be considered. PRS overhead reduction technique is for example the on-demand PRS, the PRS reception without MG, the shorter PRS length, etc. All these are added in other proposals above already. |
| OPPO | If some enhancements in other parts are introduced (e.g., on-demand PRS), do we really need positioning measurement window? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support but may overlap with previously discussed proposals. |
| LG | Support, but the first sub-bullet is too specific but the second is more general. We need to clarify the scope of discussion first. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Too general. |
| SS | Support |
| SONY | Support but we also observe it is too general (agree with QC observation above). |
| Futurewei | Low Priority. The listed e.g. can easily be studied as part of other proposals. |
| Ericsson | Low priority. |

FL comments

Based on the feedbacks, the main concern is that the proposal is too general. The proposal is revised to address the concern.

### Proposal 5-12 (Revision 1)

* The method for defining positioning measurement window can be investigated in Rel-17 for reducing the measurement delay and reducing the UE power consumption.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Nokia/NSB | We are still a bit unclear what the scope of this is. What is a method for defining positioning measurement window? |
| Futurewei | Low Priority |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Low priority. It can be done by network scheduling. |
| Ericsson | Low prioirty |
| SS | Support |
| Qualcom | We need better underastnding how that related to MG and PRS processing without MG. |
| vivo | Support |
| LG | We first would like to clarify the positioning measurement window. If it is the cross-correlation window for timing measurement, we already have in mind its importance for UE complexity reduction. |

FL comments

Only 6 companies provide feedback. 2 are supportive, while 4 consider it low priority. Need the feedback from more companies.

## Additional positioning methods

Background

Several companies proposed some additional methods. For example, the differential positioning technique, which is commonly used on GNSS positioning for improving the positioning accuracy by eliminating the measurement errors, is proposed for NR positioning.

Submitted Proposals

* (vivo) Proposal 19:
  + The differential positioning can be studied as potential positioning techniques for the NLOS scenario.
    - Considering combining differential positioning with Rel-16 positioning techniques to improve the positioning accuracy
* (vivo) Proposal 20:
  + Machine learning techniques can be studied as potential positioning techniques for the NLOS scenario in Rel-17.
* (CATT) Proposal 17:
  + Consider supporting the differential operations for eliminating TRP synchronization errors for high-accuracy NR positioning in Rel-17.
* (Sony)Proposal 8:
  + Support positioning procedure for the operation of two steps positioning (i.e. coarse and fine positioning)
* (Samsung)Proposal 4:
  + Uplink transmission-based relative positioning should be studied
* (CEWiT)Proposal 10:
  + Release 17 should support reporting of measurements by a UE performed on the SRS transmitted by other UEs. Release-16 CLI measurement mechanism can be baseline.

Feature lead’s view

The benefits of the proposed positioning methods may be investigated in this meeting.

### Proposal 5-13

* Additional positioning methods (differential positioning, two steps positioning, relative positioning, etc.) can be studied.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Low priority. |
| Intel | The statement is too general, it is not clear what is the scope to be considered. |
| vivo | Support. Differential positioning technique and machine learning positioning technique can improve the accuracy of the NLOS scenario. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Differential positioning seems interesting. But we doubt whether Rel-17 have time for it. Probably for Rel-18? |
| CMCC | Regarding the differential positioning and machine learning positioning techniques, they are more of implementation enhcanement and advanced algorithms to us, no objections but not clear if there are spec impact or not; for the two-step positioning, may be it can be co-studied with RACH-based pos; and for relative positioning, it seems belongs to sidelink-based pos, which is not included in the Rel-17 positioining scope. |
| Qualcomm | The statement is too general, it is not clear what is the scope to be considered. |
| CEWiT | We support the modivation behind the proposal. Additional positioning methods like differential positioning and relative positioning should be studied in Rel 17. This is important for positioning always shadowed areas in IIoT and other commercial usecases where even though we know NLOS/LOS component we can not improve positioning accuracy to desired level. |
| LG | We consider it with low priority |
| Fraunhofer | Ok to study.  It is benfical to study Fingerprinting methods for NLOS dominant enviorements (assuming ML is an implementation option for fingerprinting). We don not think the current agreed simulation parameters allows such an investigation. |
| ZTE | Agree with CMCC. |

FL Comments

It seems we may need to narrow done the scope of the proposal. It seems more companies are supportive to differential positioning technique than other proposed positioning techniques.

### Proposal 5-13 (Revision)

* Differential positioning can be studied.
* FFS: machine learning positioning technique
* FFS: relative positioning

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. We prefer differential positioning enhancement. In our point of view, for machine learning positioning technique, it is a general concept and it can be used in combination with other positioning schemes. And for relative positioning, it looks like to be related to sidelink positioning and not within the scope of R17 positioning . |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see the need to study them; It is not clear which of the directions (accuracy, latency, efficiency) these would help at this point and given all the set of proposals that are being looked at. |
| Ericsson | Low priority |
| ZTE | We are not supportive of the proposal, the listed two FFS belong to implementation issue and sidelink respectively. |
| SS | Do not support |
| LG | Not support |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. |
| SONY | Do not support, no need to narrow down at this stage. |
| vivo | Support  Reply to Qualcomm, the performance will be improved in our Tdoc(2005381), and we believe that it also contributes to eliminating synchronization error. |
| Futurewei | Do not support. Lowest Priority at best. |
| CEWiT | Support. We would like to reiterate that .additional positioning methods like differential positioning and relative positioning should be studied in Rel 17 to achieve desired accuracy for advance commercial use cases like IIoT. |
| SS | Do not support |
| Ericsson | Do not Support |

FL comments

It seems the supporting companies are fewer than the companies that are not supportive. Suggest changing the priority of the proposal to low. Further discussion is needed if we have time to do so in this meeting.

## SRS transmission time

Background

In Rel-16 the timing advance of SRS transmission is based on the serving cell, which may cause an interference problem at a neighbor cell due to the different distances from UE to the serving and the neighbor cell. In addition, the timing measurement accuracy may be degraded if the UE changes the SRS transmission time between SRS transmission occasions.

Submitted Proposals

* (LGE)Proposal 2:
  + Rel-17 NR positioning needs to study on cell/TRP-specific TA considering interference problem at a neighbour cell.
* (LGE)Proposal 6:
  + Need a study to find solution(s) to minimize accuracy degradation according to the transmission timing change between SRS transmission occasions especially for UL-TDOA technique.

Feature lead’s view

The TA issue was discussed in Rel-16 without a conclusion. If UE changes the UL Tx time during a positioning measurement duration, it may result in a significant error to UL RTOA measurement.

### Proposal 5-14

* The UL interference at a non-serving cell, which is caused by the transmission of the SRS for positioning from the UEs of other cells, can be studied in this SI.
* The solution(s) to minimize accuracy degradation according to the transmission timing change between SRS transmission occasions can be studied in this SI.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | In our point of view, this issue had been discussed in Rel-16 and it had been decied that the TA of SRS transmission is based on the serving cell. Therefore, we don’t prefer to re-open the discussion. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK to discuss. |
| Intel | It was discussed in Rel.16. No further discussion is needed. |
| vivo | Low priority. |
| CMCC | Cell/TRP-specific TA adjustment may cause more problems than benefits, low priority to us. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t consider that it needs to be discussed again in Rel-17. |
| OPPO | Low priority |
| CEWiT | It is important to discuss as Rel 16 limitation may cause additional inaccuracy in timing based measurements. So we support it. |
| LG | Support for study |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fraunhofer | We support a modified proposal with first bullet only and including the interference casued on the positioning SRS as well. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Not to discuss again in Rel-17. |
| SS | Low priority |
| SONY | No further discussion or at least low priority |
| Ericsson | Low prioirty |

FL comments

It seems the supporting companies are fewer than the companies that are not supportive. Suggest changing the priority of the proposal to low. Further discussion is needed if we have time to do so in this meeting.

## Others

Background

It could happen that the enhancements discussed during the SI do not fully cover the potential enhancements for Rel-17.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) in email discussion:
* Enhancements that are not investigated in the SI, are not necessarily precluded for work item.

### Proposal 5-15

* Enhancements that are not investigated in the SI, are not necessarily precluded for work item.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We consider some items are obviously needed to be specified in the WI if any, but not much study is needed, e.g. fine granularity of measurement report for UE/NG-RAN assisted positioning, gap configuration enhancement, etc. |
| LG | OK |
| vivo | Supported  We hope it’s a common understanding that techniques identified as high priority and beneficial for NR positioning (such as accuracy, low latency, network efficiency and device efficiency) or reached the conclusion or agreement in SI will discussed in WI as high priority as well. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay if we can get quick agreement but this should be obvious and not need long discussion in our view. RAN plenary will decide the WI scope. |
| ZTE | Support in principle. But this only happens in the case that agreed enhancements have directly impact on those untouched issues, otherwise why do we need SI. |
| Ericsson | No agreement needed. The scope of the work item can be discussed later at RAN. |
| Qualcomm | No agreement needed. |
|  |  |

# Architecture and signalling enhancements

## Architecture and signalling enhancements

Background

Rel-16 NR positioning adopts the LMF-centred architecture, including capability transfer, assistance data transfer, location information transfer, and measurement exchange. To improve the positioning enhancements, especially reducing the positioning delay and increase the network efficiency, the existing architecture and signally can be further enhanced. Also, hybrid positioning may significantly increase positioning accuracy and reliability. Hybrid positioning is supported in Rel-16 positioning architecture and signalling.

Submitted Proposals

* (Huawei) Proposal 8:
  + Study the following architecture enhancement
    - NG-RAN assisted PRS scheduling
    - NG-RAN assisted NR-RAT dependent positioning measurement procedure
* (CEWiT)Proposal 7:
  + Positioning architecture for NG-RAN should be optimised to reduce the latency incurred in TTFF of position of the UE.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 4:
  + For the purpose of improved accuracy, study further the reporting of additional motion state / kinematics constraints information for both UE-based and UE-assisted including but not limited to:
    - Signaling of side information / constraints on potential trajectory, path, velocity, direction of the target device.
* (Qualcomm)Proposal 12:
  + To support ultra-low latency, study further enhancements to positioning architecture and signaling.
* (MTK)Proposal 2-1:
  + The combined technique usage of DL-TDOA and multiple-RTT, or of DL-TDOA and UL-TDOA, can be considered as DL-TDOA enhancement to improve accuracy for both UE-assisted and UE-based mode
* (Lenovo)Proposal 6:
  + Study efficient DL-PRS configuration, measurement and reporting mechanisms to support configurable Hybrid positioning techniques.

Feature lead’s view

Efficient architecture and higher-layer signalling are important for supporting very-low latency positioning. Although the architecture and higher-layer signalling are defined by other WGs, RAN1 may offer valuable inputs for the enhancements.

### Proposal 6-1

* Enhancements of the architecture, the signalling, and the assistance data can be investigated for reducing latency and increasing accuracy for both UE-based, UE-assisted and hybrid positioning, e.g.,
  + NG-RAN assisted PRS scheduling
  + NG-RAN assisted NR-RAT dependent positioning measurement procedure
  + reporting of additional motion state/kinematics constraints information

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think the first two bullets are somehow covered by on-demand PRS in 5.2 and reducing latency 5.7. It should be low priority then. |
| Intel | We think that it should be discussed in RAN2 first. |
| vivo | This issue should be RAN2 work. |
| Nokia/NSB | Is this for RAN1 to discuss? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | To increase accuracy, we can consider to provide uplink measurement result as assistance info to the UE for UE based mode. As long as RAN1 agrees, RAN2 can design the signalling. |
| Qualcomm | Support. This should be high priority. We are also OK to move the main sentence in “reducing positioning latency” scope. When we are talking about latency, we cannot have only the UE->gNB link optimized, and not consider enhnacmeents for the gNB->client link. In other words, if Proposal 5-7, 5-1, 5-2 are high priority, the enhancements on architecture and signaling need to be high priority also.  **To Intel, vivo, Nokia**: Yes it is within RAN1 scope to guide RAN2 and tell them: RAN1 is doing this, this, and this enhanmenet to reduce latency, and for these to really decrease latency, RAN2 need to do their part. |
| OPPO | Share the same view as Intel, vivo and Nokia. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support, perhaps RAN1 can identify the need of such enhancements and trigger RAN2 to validate RAN1’s concern and work on the corresponding details. |
| CEWiT | RAN 1 should finalise potential changes for NG-RAN architecture considering the latency and accuracy requirements. Procedure for modification of architecture is upto RAN2 discretion. Therefore we support this proposal. |
| LG | We also consider this is RAN2 issue. |
| ZTE | First two bullets can be discussed along with on-demand RS and latency reduction. Regarding the architecture, we suggest not to discuss in RAN1. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL |
| SS | Is this in RAN1 scope? |
| Futurewei | Out of RAN1 scope, should be discussed in RAN2. |
| Ericsson | This is out of RAN1 scope. |

FL comments

It seems there are different views on how RAN1 to play the role in supporting the enhancements of the architecture, the signalling, etc. Suggest having further discussion of this issue in this meeting if we have time to do so.

# Additional proposals

## Performance evaluation

Background

There are proposals related to the evaluation of the proposed positioning enhancements.

Submitted Proposals

* (CATT) Proposal 6:
  + For assessing the scalability of positioning solutions, the latency of a positioning procedure should be studied as a function of the number of devices to be positioned.
* (CATT) Proposal 7:
  + The average power consumption of devices should be studied as a function of configured time and frequency resources for positioning.
* (Samsung) Proposal 6:
  + Evaluation of IIoT OTDoA positioning performance should include a consideration of a sub-set of PRS and SRS possible parameter values for periodicity, slot offset and repetition rate, which conform to a dynamic TDD setting in the IIoT network.
* (Intel) Proposal 1:
  + RAN1 to study performance benefits of super-resolution processing techniques for precise UE positioning
* (LGE)Proposal 3:
  + For DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT, the performance impact according to the height difference between a UE and a TRP needs to be studied at least for InF scenarios.

Feature lead’s view

These proposals may be further discussed in AI 8.5.1/2 for performance evaluation.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Agree to FL’s view. |
| SS | OK |

## Positioning algorithms

Background

Using advanced signal processing and positioning algorithms is critical for a high-performance positioning system. There is a proposal related to the use of the positioning algorithms.

Submitted Proposals

* (CEWiT)Proposal 4:
  + Support for enabling advanced positioning algorithms should be studied in Release-17.

Feature lead’s view

The proposal seems closely related to the UE/gNB implementation. 3GPP normally does not define which algorithms are used by UE/gNB.

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Agree to FL’s view that it should be an implementation issue. |
| CEWiT | Agree with FL’s view but the purpose of this proposal is to identify the signalling and measurement parameters for effective enabling the advanced positioning algorithms. This proposal can go with proposals on multipath rated parameter measurement and signally (proposals in section 4). |
| SS | Implementation |

# Summary

TBD
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