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# Introduction

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

1. R1-2106452 Positioning latency enhancements Huawei, HiSilicon
2. R1-2106552 Discussion on latency reduction for NR positioning ZTE
3. R1-2106598 Discussion on latency enhancement for NR positioning vivo
4. R1-2106812 Considerations on latency improvements for positioning Sony
5. R1-2106891 Discussion on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods Samsung
6. R1-2106974 Discussion on latency reduction for NR positioning CATT
7. R1-2107060 Views on PHY Latency Reductions Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
8. R1-2107134 Discussion on latency improvements for positioning methods China Telecom
9. R1-2107216 Enhancements on Latency Reduction in NR Positioning OPPO
10. R1-2107348 Enhancements for Latency Improvements for Positioning Qualcomm Incorporated
11. R1-2107406 Discussion on latency improvement for positioning CMCC
12. R1-2107545 Discussion on latency improvements for NR positioning LG Electronics
13. R1-2107593 Latency Reduction Solutions for NR Positioning Intel Corporation
14. R1-2107647 Discussion on latency improvements for DL and DL+UL positioning methods InterDigital, Inc.
15. R1-2107743 Views on Rel-17 positioning latency reduction Apple
16. R1-2107828 Aspects of physical latency improvement MediaTek Inc.
17. R1-2107861 Discussion on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods NTT DOCOMO, INC.
18. R1-2107923 Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning method Xiaomi
19. R1-2108144 Positioning Latency Reduction Enhancements Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
20. R1-2108167 Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods Ericsson

This paper provides the summary of solutions to improve positioning latency for DL and DL+UL methods.

[106-e-NR-ePos-04] Email discussion/approval on latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning methods with checkpoints for agreements on August 19, 24 and 27 – Su (Huawei)

# M-sample PRS processing

## General information

Agreements made in RAN1#105-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:M-sample (1<=M<4) PRS processing corresponding to measurements performed within M instances of the DL PRS resource set on a PRS resource, subject to UE capability, is beneficial from a RAN1 perspective for latency reduction.* One sample corresponds to one instance
* Send an LS to RAN4 informing that
	+ M-sample (1<=M<4) measurements corresponding to measurements performed within M (1<=M<4) instances of the DL PRS resource set on a PRS resource are beneficial for reduction of measurement latency from RAN1 point of view.
	+ RAN4 is requested to check the feasibility of measurements performed within M (1<=M<4) instances of the DL PRS resource set and identify the impact on requirements/side condition.
* RAN1 to further study at least the following aspects for allowing M-sample (1<=M<4) PRS processing
	+ Details of UE capability
	+ Signaling details, e.g., to indicate whether measurement is based on one or more samples
	+ Whether the PRS sample processing time is defined and the relation with (N, T).
		- Note: This may have RAN4 dependency
 |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei [1] | **Proposal 1:** The existing NR-DL-PRS-ProcessingCapability and NR-DL-PRS-ResourceCapability should be also applied to M-sample PRS measurement.**Proposal 2:**  Support LMF to explicitly request either M-sample or both M-sample and 4-sample PRS measurement, and if both are requested, UE include the M-sample in the early fix report and 4-sample in the normal location fix. |
| Samsung [5] | **Proposal 3:**FFS on how to determine the number of samples to be used for RSTD, UE Rx-Tx time difference and PRS-RSRP measurement: by LMF indication and/or UE implementation. |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 10**: RAN1 to discuss and gain common understanding on if PRS repetitions correspond to one sample or multiple samples. RAN4 involvement may also be necessary. **Proposal 11**: Wait for RAN4 input before further agreements on M-sample PRS processing. |
| China Telecom [8] | **Proposal 1:** Rel-17 should support to report an extra signal indicating the sample number of PRS measurement to LMF. |
| Qualcomm [10] | **Proposal 3:** Support only M=1 for low-latency enhancements and de-prioritize specification support for M=2 and M=3. * Introduce a UE capability whether a UE supports single-sample PRS processing

**Proposal 4:** Introduce signaling from the LMF in the Location Request message which signals to the UE that single-sample measurements are expected to be performed.* FFS: Signaling details

**Proposal 5:** A UE should be able to report separate PRS processing capabilities for the case the UE performs single-sample (M=1) PRS measurements.* FFS: Signaling details

**Proposal 7:** For single-sample processing, the measurement period for measuring a single sample can be equal to T according to the reported (N,T) PRS processing capabilities under the following conditions: * During a first window with duration of at least N msec, referred to as “Measurement Window”, up to N msec of PRS symbols are expected to be measured by the UE.
* During a second window of at least T-N msec, which starts after the end of the Masurement Window, referred to as “Processing window”,
	+ a UE is expected to process the measured PRS symbols and be capable of reporting the measurements after the end of the processing window
	+ a UE is not expected to receive any other DL signals or perform any other DL procedures
* Minimum length of the Processing window shall be [4] msec
 |
| LGE [12] | **Proposal 1:** * For request location information, introduce a parameter for distinguishing between a specific case (e.g. 1<=M<4 sample(s)) and the normal case (e.g. 4 samples) which is accompanied in request location information. The parameter can be included in the following IEs:
	+ Common IEs for request location information (e.g. CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation)
	+ Positioning method specific IEs (e.g. NR-DL-TDOA-ProvideLocationInformation, NR-DL-AoD-ProvideLocationInformation, NR-Multi-RTT-ProvideLocationInformation, etc.)
 |
| Intel [13] | **Proposal 2:** * Support configurability of parameter M for UE DL PRS processing
	+ Further analyze signaling details to support configurability of parameter M
 |
| Lenovo [19] | **Proposal 3:** Support a new UE capability for at least N=1 sample measurement. |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 3** Support measurement reports for RSRP and RSTD based on a single PRS measurement, i.e. Nsample= 1. |

**Signalling of number of samples**

* Supported by: Huawei [1], Samsung [5], China Telecom [8], Qualcomm [10], LGE [12], Intel [13]

**M=1**

* Supported by: Qualcomm [10], Lenovo [19], Ericsson [20]

**On the UE processing capability for M-samples**

* Huawei [1] think that the UE PRS processing capabilities should be reused
* Qualcomm [10] think that a separate PRS processing capabilities should be defined.

In addition

* Huawei [1] proposed to allow both M-sample and 4-sample measurement being requested at the same time, and in case of such a request, M-sample is reported via early fix report.
* Nokia [7] request to have a common understanding on the relation between samples and PRS repetitions.
* Nokia [7] also suggest to wait for RAN4 input before making any progress in RAN1.
* Qualcomm [10] propose to define measurement window and processing window inside the MG duration for 1-sample PRS processing.

## Round 1

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

**Proposal 2.1-1**

* Support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with either M-sample or 4-sample.
* FFS signalling details, e.g. common IE or positioning method specific IE.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We are supportive of the proposal. But we are confused about the content of e.g, and considers the ongoing RAN 4 meeting, we suggest modifying as followsProposal 2.1-1* Support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with either M-sample or 4-sample if RAN4 has supported M-sample measurement.
* FFS signalling details~~, e.g. common IE or positioning method specific IE.~~
 |
| CATT |  | Our understanding is that UE to report the measurement with 4-sample in Rel-16. If so, there is no need to add new support for a request for UE to report the measurement with 4-samples or we can say * Support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with ~~either~~ M-sample, where M={1,4} ~~or 4-sample~~.
	+ FFS: M={2,3}
 |
| Nokia/NSB |  | In general we are okay with the update from vivo. We also feel it is important to highlight that RAN4 has not yet had time to check the feasibility of such an enhancement.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | OK with the change from vivo.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | OK with the change from vivo. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | OK with the change from vivo. |
| ZTE | Yes | OK with updates from vivo. We would like to support M={2,3}, which may have balance between accuracy and latency. |
| OPPO |  | We ok with the update from vivo which includes the “if RAN4 has supported…” because as in our previous agreement, RAN4 shall check the feasibility to decide if it can be supported. |
| China Telecom | Yes | OK with the change from vivo. |
| LG | Yes | We are generally fine with vivo’s revision. But, In terms of signaling, since there are only two types of IEs in LPP message (in measurement request), we prefer to leave “e.g. common IE or positioning method specific IE.” in the second bullet. We don’t think that introducing additional IEs to support it is not necessary.Proposal 2.1-1* Support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with either M-sample or 4-sample if RAN4 has supported M-sample measurement.
* FFS signalling details, e.g. common IE or positioning method specific IE.
 |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | OK with the change from vivo. We also think it is necessary to check the feasibility by RAN4 before we make this decision. |
| SONY | Yes | We think the UE needs to be informed (by LMF) to perform measurement with M-sample (for latency reduction purpose).Fine with the proposed changes by Vivo. |
| Intel  | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Supportive of FL’s proposal. No strong view on RAN4’s inclusion text, however if the RAN4 text is included would an LS need to be sent after this meeting or at a later stage? |
| InterDigital | Yes | Ok with modification from vivo. |
| Ericsson | Yes | ok in principle with the intention from vivo's wording. However, an agreement conditioned to action from ran4 is not standard procedure. Perhaps better to send an LS on the issue.  |
| Apple | Comments | In our view, this is not a pure RAN1 issue, but RAN4 input is needed. So we share same view as Ericsson to send LS to RAN4. Is the proposal applied to UE-assisted only (I assume the answer is yes)? Please add subject to UE capability.  |

FL comment: based on the input, it looks like most companies are OK with vivo’s version. As for the IE, I think LGE raised an issue that anyhow will be discussed, either by RAN1 or RAN2. From the FL perspective, I think it does not harm to add it for now.

### Proposal 2.1-1 (Closed)

* Subject to UE capability, support LMF to explicitly request UE to report the measurement with either M-sample or 4-sample, if RAN4 has supported M-sample measurement.
* FFS signalling details, e.g. common IE or positioning method specific IE.

### After GTW

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

### Proposal 2.1-2 (Closed)

* Support 1-sample (M=1) for PRS measurement subject to UE capabilities.
* FFS other sample numbers.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | wait for RAN4 input |
| CATT |  | Fine with the proposal, since we already have the agreement to support 1-sample measurement.  |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Not clear what the benefit of such an agreement is. We can take it up under UE capability discussions later.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | In our understanding, there could be follow-up issues pertaining to M=1 sample processing. Agreeing to this (subject to RAN4 confirmation) would lay the foundation for follow-up discussion. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | We are supportive of the proposal. However, it may be better to wait for RAN4 reply since RAN1 sent an LS to RAN4 regarding the feasibility of measurement with M(<4)-sample. |
| ZTE |  | Wait for progress of Proposal 2.1-1. |
| OPPO |  | Prefer to wait for RAN4’s conclusion. RAN4 shall be the one to decide whether to support it. |
| China Telecom |  | Support in principle, but need to wait the input from RAN4. |
| LG |  | we need to wait for response from RAN4. |
| Xiaomi |  | Support this UE capability if RAN4 support 1 sample measurement. |
| SONY |  | NO need to decide now, we can wait the response from RAN4. |
| Intel  | Comments  | Decide based on the RAN4 response. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Support. RAN4 can decide how to impact their specification for M=1 |
| Apple | comments | Again we should see RAN4’s input. |

FL comment: It seems most companies suggest to wait for RAN4 progress. This proposal is closed.

### Proposal 2.1-3 (Closed)

* Further study the following aspects
	+ Whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined for M-sample PRS.
	+ The relationship between measurement sample and PRS repetition, e.g. whether one measurement sample corresponds to processing a single repetition within multiple repetitions of a PRS transmission occasion.
	+ If 1-sample PRS measurement is supported, whether a MG length can be split into PRS measurement window and PRS processing window.
	+ Whether both M-sample and 4-sample PRS measurement report can be requested at the same time.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Further study is okay for us, and we would like to express some views on some aspectsFor sub-bullet 2, in the RAN1 #105 e meeting agreement, it is clear that M sample corresponding to M instance of the DL PRS resource set on a PRS resource. Based on the current description in the TS 38.214. M instance of the DL PRS resource set is used to describe the periodicity other than repetition. In addition, we believe using 4 samples is for channel selection, if the time gap of different samples is too close and the channel does not change, then the multi-sample measurement will be meaningless. Therefore, we can found the measurement period in TS 38.133 is the Multiples of $T\_{effect,i}$($T\_{effect,i}$ is the periodicity of the PRS)as follows.$T\_{RSTD,i}=\left(CSSF\_{PRS,i}\*N\_{RxBeam,i}\*\left⌈\frac{N\_{PRS,i}^{slot}}{N^{'}}\right⌉\left⌈\frac{L\_{available\\_PRS,i}}{N}\right⌉\*N\_{sample}-1\right)\*T\_{effect,i}+T\_{last}$ FL: I think it is clear that one sample covers any potential repetitions.For sub-bullet 3, we doubt there is any difference for one sample measurement and 4-sample measurement to lead an MG length is split into two windows for one sample measurement.For sub-bullet 4, we would like to confirm whether it means {M-sample and 4-sample} reporting is requested in *RequestLocationInformation*Agreement:* M-sample (1<=M<4) PRS processing corresponding to measurements performed within M instances of the DL PRS resource set on a PRS resource, subject to UE capability, is beneficial from a RAN1 perspective for latency reduction.
* One sample corresponds to one instance
* Send an LS to RAN4 informing that
	+ M-sample (1<=M<4) measurements corresponding to measurements performed within M (1<=M<4) instances of the DL PRS resource set on a PRS resource are beneficial for reduction of measurement latency from RAN1 point of view.
	+ RAN4 is requested to check the feasibility of measurements performed within M (1<=M<4) instances of the DL PRS resource set and identify the impact on requirements/side condition.

|  |
| --- |
| *TS 38.214*If dl-PRS-MutingOption2 is configured each bit in the bitmap of dl-PRS-MutingOption2 corresponds to a single repetition index for each of the DL PRS resources within each instance of a nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSet and the length of the bitmap is equal to the values of dl-PRS-ResourceRepetitionFactor. Both dl-PRS-MutingOption1 and dl-PRS-MutingOption2 may be configured at the same time in which case the logical AND operation is applied to the bit maps as described in Clause 7.4.1.7.4 of [4, TS 38.211] |

 |
| CATT |  | For the 1st sub-bullet, I am wondering what is the difference of the “UE capabilities” in Proposal 2.1-2 and the “a **new** UE PRS processing capability” in here. If Proposal 2.1-2 is agreed, do we still need to discuss “a **new** UE PRS processing capability” for M=1?FL: I think in proposal 2.1-2 it refers to whether UE supports 1-sample, while in proposal 2.1-3, it refers to a different (N, T) for 1-sample at least.For the 2nd sub-bullet, our understand is that one instance of the DL PRS resource set may has multiple repetitions of PRS resources of the DL PRS resource set. For the 3rd sub-bullet, we don’t see the split a MG length into PRS measurement window and PRS processing window. The unit of the MG is subframes, and the lengths of the MG are designed to including the transition for UE to enter and leave the MG. Thus, we don’t see the need for UE to have separate PRS processing window.For the 4th sub-bullet, we dones see the need to have separate measurement report. We assume RAN4 may define the corresponding requirement to address the situation that the measurement from 1 M-sample is not good enough and thus, the UE may use more samples to provide the PRS measurement. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | For the 2nd sub-bullet, is the common understanding that 4 sample is 4 instances? We at least would like to get confirmation that if the PRS is repeated (remember that in beam sweeping it can have a gap between repetitions) and the {N,T} value is sufficient that the RAN4 spec implies that the UE can’t use two repetitions as different samples. FL: Agree with the understanding. One note is that RAN4 did not count the potential latency reduction using Rx beam sweeping for different repetition.For the 4th sub-bullet, we don’t understand why M-sample and 4-sample would be reported at the same time. If that happens there is no latency benefit.  |
| Qualcomm |  | To CATT: the split is needed because otherwise it is not clear how much time does the UE have to perform the processing. After the last PRS symbol of an instance, the UE needs some time to finish the processing. This is called processing time, and it exists for CSIRS, PDSCH decoding, etc, etc. Network would need to know how much time the UE needs. If the UE reports (N,T) with the current measurement period definition, as we show in our paper, the measurement period is unccessarily large (T\_last). To vivo: We don’t say that we are going to split the MG. We are saying that the PRS resources should be front-loaded, so that the UE can do the processing uniterapted (basic principle for front-load DMRS, CSIRS processing, etc, etc). If there is a PRS arriving late inside a MG, the time to finish will be longer. We propose to effectively use the (N,T) parameters to say: after the end of the last PRS symbol, the UE has T-N time to finish the processing; aka, the T-N correspodsn to a processing window, since there is no PRS to be measured inside that time. Can CATT or vivo provide an alternate definition of how the network will know when the UE is ready to report in the single-sample measurement?  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | For both requesting 1-sample and 4-sample, we think that 1-sample can offer an early fix so as to achieve the low latency, while the following 4-sample report can offer a more reliable and richer measurement information.For example, UE may measure more TRPs using 4 samples since the side conditions could be lower than 1 sample. More TRP measurements would result in a better/smaller GDOP for location fix. |
| ZTE |  | We can only live with first sub-bullet.For second sub-bullet, share the same view with vivo. Multiple repetitions of single resource should be regarded as a single instance. The repetitions is related to Rx beam sweeping, which may impact the positioning latency on NRxbeam defined in 38.133.FL: Yes.For third sub-bullet,it’s better to decide by RAN4 whether new formula should be introduced for M-sample case or reuse existing formula.For fourth sub-bullet, we prefer that M-sample report should have a flexibility to be treated as a normal report. |
| OPPO |  | For 2nd sub-bullet: The reason for discussing M-sample measurement is because the measurement as defined in RAN4 is 4-sample measurement. So, how to define the relationship between PRS repetitions/instance and measurement sample shall be up to RAN4.For 3rd sub-bullet: do not see the motivation for explicit split. If the system wants the UE to finish the PRS receiption and processing within one MG, the system shall configure a MG with sufficient length to cover all the PRS resources and also the UE processing time.For 4th sub-bullet: the UE can not conduct both M-sample measurement and 4 sample measurement on the same PRS resource.  |
| LG |  | For the 1st, 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet, we think all of the points are up to RAN4, 2nd is already informed to RAN4 through LS in the last meeting. Regarding 4th sub-bullet, we also have similar view with Nokia. we see that natural behavior is reporting either of them since the positioning measurement is triggered depending on the use case (normal, latency). why do we consider reporting all together at the same time?. |
| Xiaomi |  | For 2nd sub-bullet, we also think 1-sample refers to 1 instance, and different repetitions within a period can’t be taken as 2-samples.For 3rd sub-bullet, we think there is no relationship between the number of sample and MG length. In each MG, UE is expected to measure a number of PRS resources from each TRP. So even with 1-sample measurement, the MG length can’t be reduced.For 4th sub-bullet, we can accept both M-sample and 4-sample PRS measurement report requested at the same time, it does not mean M-sample and 4-sample PRS measurement report will be triggered at the same time. |
| SONY |  | Further study is fine and it should not preclude other aspects (if any). The motivation of 4th sub-bullet is unclear. |
| Intel  | Comments  | Low priority for this meeting.  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility |  | Since it’s a study in the context of latency reduction and optimized PRS processing, support FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson |  | Ok to study |
| Apple |  | Ok to keep it further study at this stage |

FL comment: This is anyway a list of study items, and some companies consider it low priority for this meeting. It is encouraged for interested companies to bring the issue in the next meeting.

## Round 2

We do not have round 2 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Wait for RAN4 on the (feasibility of) M-sample processing and the value of M
* Consider whether following aspects are essential to latency improvement
	+ Whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined for M-sample PRS.
	+ If 1-sample PRS measurement is supported, whether a MG length can be split into PRS measurement window and PRS processing window.
	+ Whether both M-sample and 4-sample PRS measurement report can be requested at the same time.

# PRS measurement within MG

## General information

Agreements made in RAN1#105-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:RAN1 to further study at least the following aspects for MG enhancement with regards to MG requesting and configuration/activation/triggering for the purpose of latency reduction for positioning:* Preconfiguration of multiple MGs
* Triggering/activation of MG(s) with lower layer signalings (DCI or DL MAC CE)
* Request of MG(s) with lower layer signaling by the UE to the gNB
* Request/determination of MG(s) by LMF indication to the gNB/UE
* Note: The combination of the above items is possible.
 |

The following sources mentioned enhancements on PRS measurement within a MG.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei [1] | **Proposal 9:** For the MG request, only support LMF based request.**Proposal 10:** Support activation and deactivation of MG(s) from the preconfigured MGs via a MAC CE. |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 5:** For the sake of latency reduction related to the measurement gap, Rel-17 should allow LMF to request measurement gap.**Proposal 6:** Enhance the measurement gap sharing scheme to prioritize the NR PRS measurement inside a measurement gap. RAN1 should send an LS to RAN4 on the benefits identified by RAN1. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 9:** * + Pre-configured MG for positioning should be supported for NR positioning.
		- Send an LS to RAN4 for informing this information

**Proposal 10:** * + The common parameter of pre-configured MG for positioning is configured and transmitted to LMF/UE in advance, based on the Frequency layer information included in the MG request from LMF/UE, such as:
		- Frequency domain information: PointA, StartPRB, Bandwidth and SubcarrierSpacing of frequency layer;
		- Time domain information: gap offset, gap length and gap periodicity for the Frequency layer.
	+ FFS: Include MG type in MG request, MG type: regular MG, pre-configured MG

**Proposal 11:** * + Further study the specific parameter of pre-configured MG for positioning, such as:
		- Initial status of pre-configured MG: activated, deactivated.
		- Whether the MG or activated status of MG is associated with the serving cell index and/or BWP index.

**Proposal 12:** * + Pre-configuration MG activation/deactivation for positioning needs to be considered in Rel-17.

**Proposal 13:** * + To consider the following options for pre-configured MG activation/deactivation
		- Option1: LMF transmits a pre-configured MG activation/deactivation request to gNB by NRPPa information, and then gNB activates/deactivates pre-configured MG by lower layer signaling to UE;
		- Option 2: LMF transmits a pre-configured MG activation/deactivation request to gNB by NRPPa information, and LMF activates/deactivates activate/deactivate pre-configured MG by LPP to UE;
		- Option 3: UE expects the MG is activated when PRS measurement within pre-configured MG is needed, e.g. when active DL BWP doesn’t satisfy the PRS measurement (bandwidth and/or SCS), and/or LPP Request Location Information is applied;
			* FFS: Autonomously/implicitly triggering via event at gNB and UE, e.g. ignaling by reception of LPP Request Location Information, triggered by relationship between active BWP and PRS
		- Option 4: UE requests the MG activation to gNB when PRS measurement within pre-configured MG is needed, e.g. when active DL BWP doesn’t satisfy the PRS measurement (bandwidth and/or SCS), and/or LPP Request Location Information is applied. And then gNB activates/deactivates pre-configured MG by lower layer signaling to UE.

**Proposal 14:** * + Pre-configuration and/or activation/deactivation of an MG associated with on-demand PRS needs to be considered in Rel-17.

**Proposal 16:** * + Priority rules should be supported for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels or sharing MG.

**Proposal 17:** * + Priority rules for positioning measurement and report should be supported in Rel-17 positioning.
 |
| SONY [4] | **Proposal 1:** gNB provides the supported MG configuration(s) to UE / LMF.**Proposal 2:** Support triggering/activation of MG(s) with layer-1 signalling (e.g., via DCI).**Proposal 3:** Measurement gap request/indication for low latency positioning measurement purpose can be provided to gNB either from LMF (via NRPPa) or UE (via UCI). |
| CATT [6] | **Proposal 7:** To reduce latency, the aperiodic measurement gap for NR positioning should be introduced in Rel-17. **Proposal 8:** For on-demand DL PRS, support the following methods related to the measurement gap configuration for reducing the positioning latency: 1. Either a UE or serving gNB may inform LMF about the existing measurement gap configuration for the UE.
2. LMF may determine and send the recommended transmission time of on-demand DL PRS for a UE to the gNBs based on the UE’s capability of whether to support positioning measurement without a measurement gap.
3. LMF informs UE of the expected measurement gap before on-demand PRS is configured to UE by LMF.

**Proposal 9:** Support LMF to send the recommended measurement gap configuration for a UE to the serving gNB for reducing the positioning latency. |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 2**: Determination of MG(s) by LMF is not supported. **Proposal 3**: Request of MG(s) by the LMF to the UE is not supported. **Proposal 4**: RAN1 to focus the study of the prior agreement to requesting MG(s) with lower layer signaling by the UE to the gNB. |
| China Telecom [8] | **Proposal 2:** Rel-17 should support a periodical PRS measurement with MG for reducing the latency caused by RRC signal. |
| OPPO [9] | **Proposal 5:** Support using lower-layer signaling (DCI-based or MAC CE-based) to trigger or activate measurement gap configuration.**Proposal 6:** Support lower-layer signaling based (PUCCH-based or MAC-CE based) measurement gap request.**Proposal 7:** One triggered measurement gap can happen multiple repetitions and then stop. |
| Qualcomm [10] | **Proposal 1:** For Measurement gaps shared between Positioning and mobility measurements, support increased priority of processing of Positioning resources when low-latency Positioning Measurements are expected by the UE. **Proposal 2:** Support configuring a separate Measurement Gap for the purpose of Positioning only. **Proposal 8:** For low latency MG request, support request of MG(s) with an UL MAC-CE from the UE.**Proposal 9:** For low latency MG configuration, support configuration and/or activation of MG(s) with DL MAC-CE from the UE.* FFS: Whether multiple MGs are needed to be previously configured and relation to the MAC-CE signaling.

**Proposal 10:** For low latency Positioning, consider the option of autonomous MG for Positioning, wherein the UE, after it receives a low-latency location request, it is allowed to drop other DL signal processing/traffic during one or more window(s) of time without an explicit request/configuration from the serving gNB.* Note: Coordination between UE-serving gNB-LMF may be specified to ensure seamless operation of the autonomous MG for Positioning.
* FFS: Signaling details between the LMF and the serving gNB
* FFS: UE capabilities, duration of time of the autonomous gaps

**Proposal 11:** In NR Rel-17, for low latency positioning, support only a MG-based PRS processing (The option of autonomous MG-based Processing is not precluded, and we consider it as an enhancement of the legacy MG-based PRS processing feature). |
| CMCC [11] | **Proposal 4:** With regards to MG requesting and configuration/activation/triggering for the purpose of latency reduction for positioning, at least support:* Pre-configuration of multiple MGs, details can be up to RAN4;
* Semi-persistent, aperiodic, on-demand MGs, details can be up to RAN4;
* Triggering/activation of MG(s) with lower layer ignaling (DCI or DL MAC-CE)
* Request of MG(s) with lower layer signaling by the UE to the gNB (UCI or UL MAC-CE)
 |
| LGE [12] | **Proposal 3:** * If CG-based PUSCH is applied for positioning measurement report, ‘the lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of measurement gap(s) (MG(s)) (which is discussed as a method for MG enhancement in the previous meeting [2]) can be reused for activation of CG-based PUSCH resources for positioning measurement reporting.

**Proposal 4:** * The information for indicating which CG-based PUSCH is used for is necessary to be included in lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of MG(s) when CG-based PUSCH is supported for the MG without case.
 |
| Intel [13] | **Proposal 1:** * To reduce latency of NR positioning with MGs for DL PRS processing define the following enhancements
	+ Support pre-configuration of multiple MG patterns for DL PRS processing by UE
	+ Support DCI signaling to activate pre-configured MG for DL PRS processing by UE
	+ Optimize Rel.16 measurement gap patterns (e.g., period, length) for NR DL PRS processing by UE
		- Send LS to RAN4 with a recommendation to optimize MG patterns for positioning
	+ Consider physical layer signaling (e.g., SR) for MG request, if DCI based MG activation is agreed
* Send LS to RAN2/RAN4 capturing outcome of the RAN1 discussion on MG enhancements for NR positioning latency reduction and ask for feedback
 |
| IDC [14] | **Proposal 4:** Support fast activation of preconfigured measurement gap via MAC-CE**Proposal 5 :** Preconfigured measurement gap patterns are characterized by repetition period, length and offset**Proposal 6:** Support priority indication for the measurement gap associated with PRS. |
| Apple [15] | **Proposal 5**: NW provides assistance data to UE based on which UE is configured with one or more MG configurations and A-PRSs associated with each MG. * A MG and PRS resources associated with that MG may be triggered/activated by UE specific DCI, or GC-DCI or MAC-CE signaling
 |
| MTK [16] | **Proposal 2-1**: RAN1 may reach agreement that the main bottleneck is that UE needs to indicate the location measurement to the gNB when UE senses that the MG is not sufficient for DL-PRS measurement. This is because the gNB doesn’t know which UE of camping on is going to perform DL-PRS measurement**Proposal 2-2**: When the agreement is reached, send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for the signalling between LMF and gNB for the notification of which UE under location request |
| Xiaomi [18] | **Proposal 4:** Support triggering of on-demand measurement gap by MAC CE or DCI.**Proposal 5:** Suggest to associate a state ID with a PRS configuration, a measurement gap configuration and a PRS measurement report configuration, and MAC CE or DCI can activate/deactivate or trigger the PRS measurement report by indicating a state ID.**Proposal 7:** Consider of simultaneous reception of PRS and data by different panel for MPUE by panel specific measurement gap. |
| Lenovo [19] | **Proposal 2:** RAN1 to consider the latency reduction benefits of lower MGRPs. Send LS to RAN4 to determine feasibility of such an MG enhancement. |

**FL comments:**

It is the FL understanding that the MG activation request/MG activation may not necessarily reply on preconfiguration, which motivates decoupling of the following three aspects.

**Preconfiguration of multiple MGs**

* Supported by vivo [3], SONY [4], CMCC [11], Intel [13], IDC [14], Xiaomi [18]

**MG activation request**

* By LMF
	+ Supported by Huawei [1], ZTE[2], vivo [3], SONY [4], MTK [16]
* By UE, e.g. UL MAC CE, UCI
	+ Supported by vivo [3], SONY [4], CATT? [6], Nokia [7], OPPO [9], Qualcomm [10], CMCC [11], Intel [13]
* In addition
	+ Nokia [4] do not support request of MG by the LMF to the UE.
	+ MTK [16] claim that the bottleneck is that the gNB doesn’t know which UE camping on it is going to perform DL-PRS measurement.

**MG activation by**

* DL MAC CE
	+ Supported by: Huawei [1], OPPO [9], Qualcomm [10], CMCC [11], IDC [14], Xiaomi [18]
* DCI
	+ Supported by: SONY [4], CATT? [6], OPPO [9], CMCC [11], Intel [13], Apple [15], Xiaomi [18]
* Lower layer signalling
	+ Supported by: vivo [3], Nokia [7], OPPO [9], CMCC [11], LGE [12]
* LMF
	+ Supported by: vivo [3], CATT [6]
	+ Not supported by: Nokia [4]

**On autonomous gap activation**

* vivo [3] support autonomous/implicit triggering under some event
* Qualcomm [10] support autonomous MG similar to system information acquisition of a neighbouring cell in LTE or ANR in NR.

**For measurement gap sharing**

* ZTE [2] proposed to enhance the gap sharing mechanism to prioritize PRS measurement within the MG
* vivo [3] proposed to define priority rules for PRS in case of MG sharing.
* Qualcomm [10] proposed to support increased priority of positioning resources in the MG when lower latency positioning measurements are expected, and in addition also support positioning only MG.
* IDC [14] proposed to support priority indication for the PRS associated MG.

**For MG pattern enhancements**

* Intel [13] proposed to support optimization of Rel-16 MG patterns (e.g. period, length).
* Lenovo [19] proposed to lower MGRPs.

In addition

* vivo [3] proposed MG activation associated with on-demand PRS.
* CATT [6] proposed UE or gNB reporting to LMF on the existing MG
* China Telecom [8] proposed to support periodical PRS measurement with MG.
* OPPO [9] proposed triggering MG can repeat multiple times and then stop.
* Xiaomi [18] proposed associating PRS configuration, MG configuration, and measurement report configuration with a state ID, and activation/deactivation or triggering can be based on the ID.
* Xiaomi [18] also proposed panel-specific MG.

## Round 1

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

**Proposal 3.1-1**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support pre-configuration of multiple MGs by the gNB.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | Since the MG is configured for PRS measurement, and the PRS as a cell-specific signal can be known in advance (e.g: based on NRPPa PRS information exchange), pre-configuration is helpful for triggering(especially triggered by low layer). |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Thanks for the proposal and the discussion. Needs further discussion, and depending on the progress. To be more specific: If we go to a direction of having Low-layer-UE-request and Low-layer-gNB-activation, then indeed, having a pre-configuraiton of multiple MGs, might be something useful (otherwise, too much overhead will be added in the low-layer request/activation messages). So, we suggest to discuss these other proposals first, and then, if these are agreed, we can discuss how to reduce the overhead/implement them. Having pre-configuration of multiple MGs, is just a way to reduce signaling overhead.  |
| CMCC | Yes | Before directly digging into the discussion on PRS measurements within or without MG, we would like to clarify that whether both these two enhancements can be supported (e.g., when conditions discussed in Proposal 4.1-1 are not met, then the MG can be requested for PRS measurements), or only one of them should be considered? FL: I think it is subject to progress to decide either, neither, or both are supportedBasically, we think that both two enhancements can be considered, and for the MG-based enhancement, we generally support this proposal. |
| MTK | Yes with condition | We don’t think the pre-configuration is critical. The bottleneck of the latency, as we mentioned in our contribution, is that gNB is not aware of which UE will perform DL-PRS measurement so that the MG is not properly allocated. And the existing spec relies on UE to tell gNB that I will perform DL-PRS measurement, and please give me the appropriate MG configuration and then gNB will configure/re-configure MGIf the serving gnb doesn’t know the PRS setting of surrounding neighboring gNBs, then the pre-configuration of multiple MGs would be meaningless, unless gNB knows the PRS configuration of neighboring gNBs. So we further propose that, in addition to this proposal, we also send LS to RAN2/RAN3 saying that,1, RAN1 to consider it feasible for LMF to indicate PRS configuration of neighboring gNBs to the gNB to support pre-configuration of MGs, 2, RAN1 to consider it feasible for LMF to indicate to the gNB which UE under location request  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We tent to agree with the concern raised by MTK.Preconfiguration of MGs would imply that the serving gNB has the priori information that a UE will measure PRS in the future, and serving gNB knows in advance the time domain characteristics of PRS (periodicity/offset) to measure so that the MG preconfiguration can cover this.All of this needs careful investigation. |
| ZTE |  | We should consult RAN4 for the feasibility since this have much impact on measurement requirement. As I know, RAN4 has an on-going WI to discuss this issue. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| China Telecom |  | Pre-configuration may help reduce the latency caused by the configuration via RRC signal. However, since the gNB may can’t aware of when the UE can perform DL-PRS measurement, the pre-configuration MG may cause problems in realization.  |
| LG | No | We are also the same view as MTK and Huawei. Since the configuration of PRS is provided through LPP, gNB doesn’t know the exact measurement time when UE performs PRS measurement. In this respect, we need to discuss it carefully and we prefer to treat the issue as a low priority. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | Preconfiguration of MGs can reduce the latency. |
| SONY | Yes | We consider the gNB needs to tells its supported MGs (by providing per-configured multiple MGs that the gNB can support). |
| Intel  | Yes  | Open to further discussion, if there are other solutions applicable to reduce latency  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support the principle of the proposal. FFS details on how the serving and neighbouring gNBs are aligned with the UE’s PRS measurement time.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are also ok to add the FFS proposed by Lenovo. |
| Ericsson | no | Since the potential gain is latency improvement, careful evaluation of the latency of the whole mechanism (including LMF-gnb messages and MG requests procedure) should be evaluated.  |
| vivo2 | Yes | We acknowledge the message between LMF and gNB in advance is required if pre-configuration is supported. Otherwise, why do we discuss this? if pre-configuration is supported, we can discuss reusing the procedure NRPPa Positioning information Request/response (which is used for recommending SRS) to transmit the message. But whether it is the time-domain characteristics of PRS (periodicity/offset) of neighbor cells, or the similar message of MG request in the UE side(such as gap offset, gap length and gap periodicity) depends on the further discussion. |
| Apple | No | We share similar view as QC |

**Proposal 3.1-2**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support a new mechanism of MG request.
	+ Further study the following options.
		- Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message)
		- Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | Option 2 is preferred |
| CATT | Yes | We are supportive to both options. For example, Option 1 may be used for LMF-initiated on-demand PRS, while Option 2 can be used for UE-initiated on-demand PRS when multiple MGs are preconfigured. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | If we clarify that Option 1 is a MG request by the LMF to the gNB we are oaky with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | The UE should be able to request (or be free to choose/recommend) a MG. This principle goes back to early LTE days, and we think it is fundamental to an optimized PRS processing.  |
| CMCC | Yes (for Option 2) | Based on our comments above, for Option 1, we think that since the LMF has no idea of the active DL BWP of the UE, it cannot decide whether the MG is required or not at the UE side. In this sense, Option 2 is more reasonable. |
| Mtk | Option 1 for some condition | Our comments for this proposal would be similar to that for proposal 3.1-1. We think, LMF is not to request MG. LMF simply provides some information to a gNB, such as, 1, which UE will be under PRS measurement2, the neighboring gnbs’ PRS configurationThen it is gNB’s call to arrange the MG for the UE. This should be the fundamental solution  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | In general, we are OK for a new mechanism.In terms of options, we prefer Option 1. In our understanding, the MG request can be implicit, e.g. providing the PRS configuration to the serving gNB for the purpose of determination of which MG to activate. The existing NRPPa POSITIONING ACTIVATION REQUEST can serve such a functionality, and LMF is not required to be aware of the MG configuration at all. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | We are fine with the proposal at this stage. |
| ZTE | Option 1  | Please note that UE MG request can only be sent to serving gNB after UE receives assistance data or location request. However, LMF is aware of which DL PRS that UE is required to measure. So the MG request from LMF can be sent to serving gNB before or in parallel with assistance data or location request. This enhancement reduces the overall positioning latency obviously. |
| OPPO | Yes for Option 2 | Re Option 1: do not think option 1 can offer benefit of latency reduction. |
| China Telecom | Yes | We prefer the option 2 since in more situration is the UE side to decide whether to request a MG. But we are also fine with the Option 1. |
| LG | Yes | We are fine with both options and agree with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | We support Option 2 at least, since it is UE who knows that a MG is needed or a reconfiguration of MG patteren is needed. While for Option 1, MG request by LMF is also fine to us. For example, LMF provides the PRS resource of other gNBs to serving gNB or LMF recommend a MG pattern to serving gNB directly considering PRS resource of all gNBs. |
| SONY | Yes | Keep both options for now. |
| Intel  | Yes  |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Ok to study the options at this stage. |
| InterDigital | Yes and Option 2 | The request should come from the UE for latency reduction. |
| Ericsson | no | We should first evaluate the latency gain of the procedure. Also, “support a new mechanism of MG request” is too broad. We should first discuss the specific details including the benefits before making any agreement. |
| ZTE2 |  | To CMCC:LMF doesn’t need to know UE’s active BWP. LMF just give some suggestion to serving gNB on what MG is required when UE conducts DL PRS measurements requested by LMF. Serving gNB will take this into consideration when configuring MG to UE.To OPPO/Erisson,Please refer to contributions from ZTE and Huawei, we already mentioned that MG request from LMF can be sent to serving gNB before or in parallel with assistance data or location request, which reduces the overall positioning latency obviously. |
| Apple | Yes | We prefer Option 1, but open to discuss Option 2 |

FL comment: Only one company (18/19) expressed concern, worrying that the scope is too broad. Also based on input, companies seems to be OK with the existing options, without proposing one options. The proposal is thus updated below.

### Proposal 3.1-2 (Closed)

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support a new mechanism of MG request.
	+ Downselect from the following options in RAN1#106b.
		- Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message)
		- Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support of a new mechanism of MG request, consider the following options with a decision to be made in RAN1#106b.* Option. 1: by LMF (via a NRPPa message)
* Option. 2: by UE (via UCI or UL MAC CE)
 |

**Proposal 3.1-3**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support a new mechanism of MG activation and deactivation.
	+ Further study the following options.
		- Option. 1: DCI
		- Option. 2: DL MAC CE
		- Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG
	+ FFS whether deactivation can be implicit via configurable number of the MG occasions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Okay to study but we should not say we will definitely support one of the options at this point. So suggest to remove the main bullet. Additional question for clarification is this new MG activation method only applicable to positioning or also to other features? Suggested updated: * + Further study the following options for MG activation and deactiviation.
		- Option. 1: DCI
		- Option. 2: DL MAC CE
		- Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG
	+ FFS whether deactivation can be implicit via configurable number of the MG occasions
 |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes (for Option 1 and 2) | Regarding Option 3, we would like to understand more on autonomously applied MG. Does it mean that when the DL PRS measurements have higher priority than other DL signal/channel processing, then UE decides to apply a MG to ensure the reception of DL PRS? If Option 3 is considered, are we going to further discuss the rules, or it can be totally up to UE implementation? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes. |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | We should consult RAN4 for the feasibility since this have much impact on measurement requirement. As I know, RAN4 has an on-going WI to discuss this issue. |
| OPPO | Yes | Support to further study option 1 and Option 2.But for Option 3: we have a question. How can UE autonomously apply a MG with gNB not being aware about that? |
| China Telecom | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes (only for Option 1 and 2) | Regarding option #3, we didn’t have enough time to discuss it in detail. We think that more information about option #3 is needed and more time to discuss it also be needed. For clear understanding, could someone give us the original intention of option #3?  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | Prefer Option 1 and Option 2. |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| Intel  | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support and Option 1 or 2. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Support Option 2. |
| Ericsson | no | We should first evaluate the latency gain of the procedure. “support a new mechanism of MG activation and deactivation” is too broad and this is too early to agree. We can discuss the details and benefits of the options first. |

FL comment: there are three companies (15/18) expressed concern. From FL perspective, I think the general framework is quite clear. For the sake of progress, I think what Nokia proposed is a good compromise, and thus the proposal is updated below.

### Proposal 3.1-3 (Closed)

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, further study the following options for MG activation and deactivation.
	+ Option. 1: DCI
	+ Option. 2: DL MAC CE
	+ Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG
* FFS whether deactivation can be implicit via configurable number of the MG occasions

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, with potential support a new MG activation and deactivation procedure, consider the following options with a decision to be made in RAN1#106b (and RAN4 to be informed about any decision made)* Option. 1: DCI
* Option. 2: DL MAC CE
* Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG

FFS whether deactivation can be implicit via configurable number of the MG occasions |

**Proposal 3.1-4**

* Further study mechanisms to prioritize positioning measurement inside the MG
	+ Option 1: Positioning measurement is prioritized over other RRM
	+ Option 2: Define positioning-only MG
	+ Other options are not precluded.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT |  | Not sure if RAN1 is in the best position to do so. For example, it is not a trivia task to evaluate the impact on RRM performance if the positioning measurement is prioritized over RRM measurements. |
| Nokia/NSB | No | Not a RAN1 issue. This is for RAN4 to decide.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To Nokia: We can say: RAN1 considers beneficial to have a positioning-only MG and have an option to prioritize PRS over other RRM in common MG is used. As RAN1 is the leading group, and we can read the 38.133 spec, and how the measurement period is defined, it is easy for RAN1 to provide guidance on what we consider beneficial to be enhanced. To CATT: If MG is shared, or there is prioritization of RRM, the latency will increase by definition. Low-latency positioning cannot happen without sacrifizing something else; UEs will not suddenly get more powerful or add more buffering/measurement/RF chains just to support a Positioning feature. Also, since this is for low-latency, e..g, single-saample processing, the effect on RRM will be negligible (RRM measurements are L3, with averaging, etc).  |
| CMCC |  | Share similar views as CATT and Nokia. |
| MTK | Yes  | To have separate gap for PRS is like the placement of SSB and PRS are quite apart. How to arrange the position of PRS and SSB is actually the gnb implementation.If SSB and PRS are placed quite closely, then both could be within a same gap. In this case, the super UE may process SSB and PRS simultaneously within a gap. But we can’t expect all the UE to be so super.We don’t think to prioritize PRS measurement over mobility measurement is the best solution. However, considering the case the SSB and PRS within a same gap, prioritization of PRS over SSB seems feasible, but not best solution |
| ZTE | Yes | With changes on Option1:* + Option 1: Enhance measurement gap sharing mechanism to prioritize positioning measurement over other RRM

In addition, we may need to send LS to RAN4 on the benefits identified by RAN1. |
| OPPO |  | Share same understanding as CATT/Nokia/CMCC, this shall be dicussed by RAN4. |
| China Telecom |  | Similar view as CATT/Nokia/CMCC/OPPO. |
| LG |  | We are on the same page with CATT, Nokia and CMCC and we also think it is up to RAN4. In view of the lack of time, we think we need to focus on issues that have more related to RAN1. |
| Xiaomi |  | We need to confirm with RAN 4 that if Measurement gap patterns #24 and #25 can only be used for PRS measurement.  |
| SONY | Yes | We can still provide our view/input to RAN4 |
| Intel  |  | RAN1 can discuss these options and send an LS to RAN4 for feedback |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes  | Support and we can convey our view to RAN4 to determine the final feasibility. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are ok to further study this aspect. |
| Ericsson |  | Isn’t this a RAN4 issue? We can leave this to RAN4.  |

### Proposal 3.1-5 (Closed)

* Further study the following aspects
	+ MG pattern enhancements, e.g. lower MGRP, other MGL
	+ Reporting of existing MG to the LMF
	+ Joint configuration/activation of MG, (on-demand) PRS, and/or location measurement
	+ UE panel specific MG

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | Some comments are as followsFor the first sub-bullet, RAN4 is involved and should be determined by RAN4.For the last-sub-bullet, we would like to ask about the use case and condition for UE panel-specific MG. |
| CATT |  | We are fine to study them. But, we share the similar view with vivo about the 1st and the last sub-bullets. |
| Nokia/NSB | No | Similar concerns as vivo and CATT. The 3rd sub-bullet also seems to be more of a signaling optimization so would be a RAN2 decision.  |
| CMCC |  | From RAN1 perspective, we are OK to further study the 2nd and 3rd bullet. Regarding the last bullet, it seems confused. It seems that the NW has no knowledge of UE panel-wise information, then what does panel-specific here mean, how does this MG be configured/requested/triggered? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We are OK for the study, but currently do not think any of those aspects is feasible from RAN1 perspective. Perhaps first sub-bullet can be left up to RAN4. |
| ZTE |  | De-prioritize the discussion. |
| LG |  | We are generally supportive of the proposal. But, we have the same concerns about the first and last sub-bulets as vivio’s comment. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | For the last sub bullet, at least for 2-step beam sweeping, with information of adjacent beams or with expected DL AoD/ZoD discussed in 8.5.3, UE has the information that which Rx beams will be used for PRS measurement, if only 1 panel is needed to perform PRS measurement at a certain time, the other panel can be used for DL reception of other RSs/channels for MPUE. That is the motivation of panel-sepcific MG. We can further discuss how to support it.  |
| SONY |  | We think those aspects are non-essential, we can deprioritize it. |
| Intel  |  | Currently, we do not think that this is a priority for the group discussion.We are supportive, but prefer to leave it up to RAN4 to decide.  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility |  | Ok to leave first-sub bullet up to RAN4 |
| InterDigital | Yes | We can further study these aspects. |
| Ericsson | no | The first sub bullet could be treated by ran4, the three other topics seem non-critical.  |

FL comment: This is anyway a list of study items, and some companies consider it low priority for this meeting. It is encouraged for interested companies to bring the issue in the next meeting.

## Round 2

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3.1-1*** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, support pre-configuration of multiple MGs by the gNB.
 |

FL comment: It looks as if there is still some uncertainty on the feasibility of preconfiguration of multiple MGs. We can have a second round discussion mainly to address the concern.

### Follow-up discussion for Proposal 3.1-1 (Closed)

Please proponents of the proposal try to address the concern received so far including

* MTK/HW/CTC: gNB awareness in advance of the UE in a (future) LPP session, and of the PRS to measure
* ZTE: Impact on measurement requirement by RAN4
* E///: careful evaluation of the latency of the whole mechanism (including LMF-gnb messages and MG requests procedure)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | No | We have agreed that MG request may be sent from LMF, so gNB will know what is required MG for UE to conduct DL PRS measurement. gNB can configure the MG to UE (via DCI, MAC CE etc) from MG patterns that are supported by UE capability. There is nothing to with pre-configured MGs. |
| vivo | Yes | For Q1:We acknowledge the message between LMF and gNB in advance is required if pre-configuration is supported. Otherwise, why do we discuss this? if pre-configuration is supported, we can discuss reusing the procedure NRPPa Positioning information Request/response (which is used for recommending SRS) to transmit the message. But whether it is the time-domain characteristics of PRS (periodicity/offset) of neighbor cells, or the similar message of MG request in the UE side(such as gap offset, gap length and gap periodicity) depends on the further discussion.FL: Just to clarify if the pre-configuration is before or after the reception of LCS request.For Q2:It is obviously feasible since RAN4 has supported activating pre-configurated MG based on the recent agreement in RAN4, And we wonder why preconfiguration has an impact on requirement? * Agreements:
	+ The pre-configured MG activation/deactivation is triggered by the DCI/Timer based BWP switch
		- FFS if additional conditions for pre-configured MG activation/deactivation shall be considered
	+ NW can control activation/deactivation of pre-configured MG for the specific BWP
		- Option 1: via its RRC configuration message
		- Option 2: via DCI or MAC configurations
	+ Additional explicit rules for pre-configured MG autonomous activation/deactivation shall be defined for the case when signalling is not provided
	+ UE capability on the support of NW-controlled and autonomous pre-configured MG activation/deactivation mechanisms can be further discussed

FL: I think RAN4 discussion is based on the fact that gNB is in charge of all the RRM procedures, which may be different for positioning.For Q3:We believe having a pre-configuration of multiple MGs is helpful for triggering(especially triggered by low layer). Since the MG request and MG activation is optionally supported, reaching an agreement for pre-configuration is beneficial for further discussion in the future meeting |
| MTK |  | For item 1, to agree pre-configured MG should be **after** achieving agreement that the gNB knows about the PRS configuration of neighboring gNBs and also that a UE may be under positioning measurement. Otherwise it is meaningless for pre-configured MG because gNB doesn't know the proper setting of MG, and there is no need to provide pre-configured MG to a UE not for positioningFor item 2, it seems to us that the pre-configured MG in RAN4 is to handle the following case, whether SSB is within UE BWP or not. When SSB is not completely within UE BWP, gap is needed, when SSB is within UE BWP then gap could be de-activatedThe concept of pre-configured MG could be extended for positioning. And we think this is RAN1’s job |
| CMCC | Yes | Regarding Q1: In R16 meachnism, one reason of MG causing long latency is that the mismatch between the MG pattern and the DL PRS. To support pre-configuration of MGs, we think that as the DL PRS (R16 or on-demand) are configured by the LMF, it is possible for the LMF to recommend multiple MG configurations to the gNB (final decisions can be up to gNB similar as the configuraoitn of Ul SRS), and the pre-configured MG patterns will then be delivered to the UE. FL: Just to clarify if the pre-configuration is before the reception of any LCS request.Regarding Q3: Followed by our comments to Q1, the pre-confgured MGs can be sent to the UE beforehead, when a location service is requested, the UE can pick a proper pattern and request to the gNB using lower layer signaling, which is faster when compared to the RRC signaling in R16.FL: Is it implying that LMF will provide the configuration when the UE is registered to the network?In addition, during the last GTW session, we had agreements regarding the MG request and MG activation/deactivation to further study who and/or how the MG will be requested, activated/deactived. In out view, whether to support the pre-configuration of MGs could be related to the further progress made on these issues, and we are also OK to postpone the discussion when we make decisions on MG request/activation/deacticatoin in the future. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3.1-4*** Further study mechanisms to prioritize positioning measurement inside the MG
	+ Option 1: Positioning measurement is prioritized over other RRM
	+ Option 2: Define positioning-only MG
	+ Other options are not precluded.
 |

FL comment: most concerning companies think that it should be up to RAN4 to decide. So we may have a second round discussion mainly on the necessity of an LS to RAN4.

**Proposal 3.2-1 (Medium priority)**

* Send an LS to RAN4, with the following information
	+ RAN1 considers beneficial to have a positioning-only MG and have an option to prioritize PRS over other RRM in common MG is used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | No | We don’t think RAN1 needs to take action on this item. RAN4 is already on the objective in the WID and could directly discuss these issues in our view.  |
| ZTE | Yes | RAN1 was responsible for latency evaluation during study phase. So, RAN1 is aware of which component contributes a lot for physical layer latency. RAN4 should be informed of the possible enhancements that identified by RAN1, which can be further decided by RAN4. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | We need to confirm with RAN 4 that if Measurement gap patterns #24 and #25 can only be used for PRS measurement. If not, we support to define positioning-only MG. |
| MTK | Yes | We have quite same view as ZTE… |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LG | No | We have a same view as Nokia. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To LG/Nokia: As we said to RAN4 that M-sample processing is beneficial, RAN1 should say what else it considers beneficial that is within RAN4 domain. What about the following:* + *RAN1 considers beneficial for the purpose of latency reduction to have one or both of the following MG-related positioning enhancements:*
		- *Introduce a positioning-only MG*
		- *Introduce an option to prioritize PRS over other RRM when a common MG is used.*
	+ *Note: It is up to RAN4 to decide whether any of the above will be supported.*
 |
| CATT |  | We share the similar view as Nokia and LG that there is no need for RAN1 to send the LS to RAN4 on this. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support QC’s revised proposal. |
| Sony | Yes | This is an overlap area where RAN1 and RAN4 are involved. RAN1 can express their for RAN4 consideration. |
| ZTE2 |  | Support QC’s revision. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We think RAN4 can discuss this directly. No strong need to send the LS. |
| LG2 | No | Even though we agree that RAN1 can express our views, we think it is directly related to RAN4 and additional LS seems so unnecessary. |
| Apple | Yes | Support QC’s version |
| Ericsson | No | We share similar view as Nokia, LG, CATT, and Huawei. RAN4 can discuss this without any such LS from RAN1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We have similar view as Nokia, LG, CATT, Huawei and Ericsson. |
| ZTE2 |  | We should treat Proposal 5.2-1 in the same way. |

**LS to RAN4**

* Supported by (8): ZTE, Xiaomi, MTK, CMCC, QC, Lenovo, SONY, Apple
* Not supported by (6): Nokia, LGE, CATT, Huawei, Ericsson, DCM

There is no clear majority view to support the LS, and thus from the feature lead perspective, I suggest to have the following conclusion.

### Proposal 3.2-2 (for conclusion)

* No concensus in RAN1 on the LS to RAN4 indicating the benefit from RAN1 perspective on using positioning-only MG or prioritizing PRS over other RRM within a common MG
* Companies are encouraged to discuss the potential enhancements directly in RAN4.

## Round 3

We do not have round 3 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Discuss positioning-only MG and prioritizing PRS over other RRM within a common MG directly in RAN4.
* Consider whether following aspects are essential to latency improvement
	+ Preconfiguration of multiple MGs in advance
	+ Reporting of existing MG to the LMF
	+ Joint configuration/activation of MG, (on-demand) PRS, and/or location measurement

# PRS measurement without MG

## General information

Agreements made in RAN1#105-e.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* Further study the following options (with the same numerology) to support PRS measurement without MGs for latency reduction in Rel-17
	+ Option 1: The PRS is from the serving cell and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
	+ Option 2: The PRS can be from the serving cell and non-serving cell, and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
	+ Option 3: The PRS (from the serving cell or non-serving cell) used for UE measurement may extend outside or be completely outside the active DL BWP (including with potentially a different numerology)
	+ Note: RAN1 strives not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
* The following aspects are FFS
	+ PRS processing prioritization window
	+ Mechanism to trigger UE DL PRS measurements and report
	+ UE/gNB assumptions on processing of DL PRS and other DL physical channels / signals
	+ UE DL PRS processing capabilities
* Note: Companies are encouraged to compare the latency benefits of introducing MG-less PRS measurements over MG-based PRS measurements
* Note: Depending on the comparison of latency benefits (and other considerations such as complexity) between introducing MG-less PRS measurements and MG-based PRS measurements, none/one/multiple of the above options should be adopted in Rel-17.
 |

The following sources mentioned enhancements on PRS measurement without a MG.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei [1] | **Proposal 4:** Support Option 2 with the modification for PRS measurement without MG.* Option 2: The PRS can be from the serving cell and non-serving cell, and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
	+ Note: The timing of the serving cell and the non-serving cell should be aligned.
	+ Note: The PRS configuration bandwidth may extend outside the active DL BWP.

**Proposal 5:** Support PMTC for PRS measurement without MG, where UE is only required to measure the PRS inside the PMTC.* FFS explicit configuration by LMF or gNB or implicit derivation by the UE

**Proposal 6:** Support communication in the PMTC at least for the case when the communication symbols is not overlapped with PRS symbols.* Note: This applied for the case when PRS symbol timing from the non-serving cell is aligned with that from the serving cell.
* FFS: Scheduling availability on additional symbols preceding and succeeding the PRS symbols.

**Proposal 7:** Support under UE capability the simultaneous processing of PRS only from the serving cell and data in FR1.**Proposal 8:** Support scheduling restriction on PRS symbols in the PMTC if the PRS to measure concerns any non-serving cell or any cell in FR2 or if UE does not support simultaneous processing of PRS only from the serving cell and data in FR1. |
| Vivo [3] | **Proposal 2:** * + PRS measurement without MG and PRS measurement with MG enhancement can be supported together in Rel-17 for maximizing the advantages of the two methods.

**Proposal 3:** * + PRS measurement without Mgwhen PRS is within active DL BWP should be specified.

**Proposal 4:** * + To support the case (case 2) of option 1 and option 2 where PRS partially within active BWP, consider enhancing the reporting information, for example,
		- UE capability reporting, including without MG capability.
		- Active BWP information reporting.

**Proposal 5:** * + To support the case (case 2) of option 1 and option 2 that UE PRS partially within active BWP, consider enhancing the UE measurement procedure or signaling, for example,
		- if the overlapping bandwidth of active BWP and PRS can satisfy the performance requirement, UE measurement can be inside the active BWP. Otherwise, the UE can request MG(s) or BWP switching.

**Proposal 6:** * + Support option 1 and option 2 for latency and complexity reduction.
		- Option 1: The PRS is from the serving cell and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
		- Option 2: The PRS can be from the serving cell and non-serving cell, and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP

**Proposal 7:** * + Further study the signaling and procedure for supporting option 3 as an alternative to using MG.
		- Option 3: The PRS (from the serving cell or non-serving cell) used for UE measurement may extend outside or be completely outside the active DL BWP (including with potentially a different numerology)

**Proposal 8:** * + Supporting PRS measurement or processing prioritization window for centralized on-demand PRS
		- centralized on-demand PRS: on-demand PRS is configured/requested within the PRS measurement or processing prioritization window

**Proposal 16:** * + Priority rules should be supported for the processing/reception of DL PRS and other signals/channels or sharing MG.
 |
| SONY [4] | **Proposal 4:** Positioning measurement without measurement gap is supported and subject to certain conditions to enable such operation.**Proposal 5:** UE intend to perform positioning without measurement grant can indicate to the serving gNB and serving gNB can provide the response whether the UE is allowed to perform positioning measurement (e.g., when it is needed) within certain duration of time. |
| Samsung [5] |  |
| CATT [6] | **Proposal 5:** At least Option 3 should be supported in Rel-17. Option 1 and option 2 can also be supported for Ues with different capabilities.**Proposal 6:** When a UE has the capability to support PRS measurement without MGs, the UE is expected to perform DL PRS measurement and reporting simultaneously with other DL channels transmission/reception without the interruption of the DL data communication. Thus, there is no need to define PRS processing prioritization window, and the gNB assumes on the processing of DL PRS and other DL physical channels/signals.**Proposal 6:** When a UE has the capability to support PRS measurement without MGs, the UE is expected to perform DL PRS measurement and reporting simultaneously with other DL channels transmission/reception without the interruption of the DL data communication. Thus, there is no need to define PRS processing prioritization window, and the gNB assumes on the processing of DL PRS and other DL physical channels/signals. |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 5**: Support option 2 from the prior agreement: the PRS can be received from the serving cell and non-serving cell, and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP.  |
| China Telecom [8] | **Proposal 3:** Rel-17 should support the DL PRS frequency domain multiplexed with other DL signals and channels in PRB-level. |
| OPPO [9] | **Proposal 1:** Support measuring DL PRS resource without measurement gap when DL PRS resource is within the active DL BWP and with the same numerology of the active DL BWP and from the serving cell.* This is subject to UE capability.

**Proposal 2:** Define new DL PRS processing capability for the case when measurement gap is not configured.**Proposal 3:** On the symbols where the UE measures DL PRS resource, the UE is not expected to receive DL channel or reference signal.**Proposal 4:** The DL PRS resource and SSB can be mapped onto the same symbol and the UE is indicated with if the UE shall receive DL PRS resource or SSB. |
| Qualcomm [10] | **Proposal 11:** In NR Rel-17, for low latency positioning, support only a MG-based PRS processing (The option of autonomous MG-based Processing is not precluded, and we consider it as an enhancement of the legacy MG-based PRS processing feature). |
| CMCC [11] | **Proposal 1:** Support the UE to measure the DL PRS without measurement gap, when the PRS from the serving cell and non-serving cell is inside the active DL BWP and with the same numerology as the active DL BWP.**Proposal 2:** Support the UE to process DL PRS and other DL signals/channels that are multiplexed in an FDM manner in the same OFDM symbol.**Proposal 3:** Support introducing physical layer priority for DL PRS and DL signals/channels carrying LPP signaling. |
| IDC [14] | **Proposal 1:** Measurements and processing of PRS without measurement gap should be supported with at least Option 1 (The PRS is from the serving cell and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP)**Proposal 2:** In the presence of no measurement gap, the UE is expected to receive PRS with higher priority, associated with on-demand PRS, over other channels if the PRS overlaps with other channels in the time domain.**Proposal 3:** Support priorities related to measurement reports and priority depends on types of PRS (e.g., on-demand PRS) that is associated with the report.  |
| Apple [15] | **Proposal 1**: For PRS measurement without/outside MGs, support subject to UE capability, the PRS from the serving cell and non-serving cell can be received and measured within UE’s active DL BWP.**Proposal 2**: support under UE capability an indication to switch to a BWP associated with positioning measurements, by* Alt1: UE-specific DCI
* Alt2: GC-DCI
* Alt3: In a periodic higher layer configured by LMF

**Proposal 3**: M-BWP configuration may include the time duration which M-BWP will last * In this case, once the time is expired, UE would switch to a default BWP or back to the active BWP before switching to M-BWP
* Alternatively, UE would stay in M-BWP until further indication to switch to another (regular) BWP is received

**Proposal 4**: For PRS measurement outside/without MG, e.g. once UE receives the indication to switch to Measurement BWP (M-BWP), UE is not expected to receive or transmit data within the M-BWP |
| DCM [17] | **Observation 1:** * Regarding MG-less based positioning, priority rule between DL-PRS and other channels/signals should be specified

**Observation 2:** * If priority rule between DL-PRS and other channels/signals is introduced, whether the margin period around DL-PRS symbols is necessary or not can be considered
 |
| Xiaomi [18] | **Proposal 6:** to discuss the UE behavior when PRS resource on symbols are indicated as UL or used by other DL signals or channels transmission with gap-less measurement for positioning.**Proposal 8:** The priority of PRS should be differentiated for different latency requirement. |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 1** In NR Rel-17, support DL measurements based on DL PRS without the UE having to request measurement gaps.**Proposal 2** Introduce an indicator in the assistance data signaling that the PRSs present in the measurement request can be measured without measurement gaps.**Proposal 5** For priority of the PRS against other downlink reference signals and channels, support the following* + The PRS from a serving cell is subject to dropping rules/priority indications.
	+ The PRS transmitted from non-serving cell is expected to be measured in a measurement gap if the eighbor cell PRS symbols do not coincide with the serving cell PRS symbols.
	+ For PRS transmissions from TRPs in a serving cell, the PRS collisions with PDSCH/CSI-RS can be handled via priority indicators
	+ For PRS transmissions from TRPs in a serving cell, whether PRS is dropped or not depends on the priority indicator

**Proposal 6** In NR Rel-17, support reserved resources for PRS where PDSCH data are resource mapped around the reserved resources for PRS. |

**For MG-less PRS measurement conditions**

* Option 1: The PRS is from the serving cell and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
	+ Supported by: vivo [3], CATT [6], OPPO [9], IDC [14]
* Option 2: The PRS can be from the serving cell and non-serving cell, and UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP
	+ Supported by: Huawei [1], vivo [3], CATT [6], Nokia [7], CMCC [11], Apple [15]
	+ Huawei [1] proposed that in this case, the timing of the serving and the non-serving cell should be aligned.
* Option 3: The PRS (from the serving cell or non-serving cell) used for UE measurement may extend outside or be completely outside the active DL BWP (including with potentially a different numerology)
	+ Supported by: CATT [6]
	+ vivo [3] proposed for further study.
* MG-less PRS measurement (without mentioning preference of Options)
	+ Supported by: SONY [4], Ericsson [20]
	+ Not supported: Qualcomm [10]

**For the UE PRS measurement capability without MG**

* vivo [3], OPPO [9] proposed to define a new UE PRS processing capability without MG.

**For the handling of frequency domain aspects of PRS measurement without MG**

* vivo [3] proposed that UE can measure the overlapping BW of PRS with the active DL BWP if the overlapping BW satisfies the performance requirement, and UE can request MG or BWP switching otherwise.
* Apple [15] proposed to introduce M-BWP, which can be switched via UE-specific DCI, GC-DCI, or in a periodic manner configured by LMF, and discussed potential ways of switching back to a “regular” BWP.

**For the handling of time domain aspects of PRS measurement without MG**

* Huawei [1] proposed to introduce PMTC, only inside which UE is required to measure the PRS.
* vivo [3] proposed to introduce PRS measurement/processing prioritization window for centralized on-demand PRS.
* CATT [6] proposed not to define PRS processing prioritization window.

**For priority rules**

* Huawei [1] proposed scheduling restrictions in PMTC, as well as simultaneous PRS and data processing in FR1 subject to UE capability.
* vivo [3] proposed a prioritized on-demand PRS processing in a window, and also proposed to define priority rules with other signals/channels.
* CATT [6] proposed that UE should be able to perform PRS measurement simultaneously with other DL channels/transmission/reception, if UE supports PRS measurement without MG.
* China Telecom [8] proposed to support DL PRS FDM with other DL signals and channels in PRB-level.
* OPPO [9] proposed to prioritized PRS over DL channel/reference signals on a symbol-level.
* CMCC [11] proposed to support processing DL PRS and other FDMed DL signals/channels, and also proposed to indicate physical layer priority for DL-PRS and DL signals/channels carrying LPP signaling (if simultaneous processing is not supported by the UE).
* IDC [14] proposed to higher priority for (on-demand) PRS over other channels overlapping in time domain.
* Apple [15] proposed no data transmission or reception in M-BWP.
* DCM [17] observed the need to define priority rule between PRS and other channel/signals, and consider the margin period around DL PRS symbols.
* Xiaomi [18] proposed to discuss UE behaviour on PRS symbol indicated as UL or used by other DL signals or channels, and also proposed differentiated PRS priority subject to different latency requirement.
* Ericsson [20] proposed to support priority rule/indicator for handling PRS from serving cell and PDSCH/CSI-RS reception, and we think that PRS from neighbouring cells that is not overlapped with PRS from the serving cell should always be measured in a MG.

In addition

* vivo [3] proposed to introduce UE active BWP information reporting (to LMF)
* SONY [4] proposed that UE can indicated to the serving gNB (on PRS measurement) and the serving gNB can indicate whether UE is allowed to perform PRS measurement without “measurement grant” within a certain duration of time.
* Ericsson [9] proposed to introduce the indicator in the AD whether the PRSs present in the measurement request can be measured without MGs.

## Round 1

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

**Proposal 4.1-1**

* Support PRS measurement without MG at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP.
	+ Note PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.
	+ FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g. synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
	+ FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.
	+ FFS whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | We are supportive of the feature. But we would like to add an example in the second FFS* + FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy (E.g: overlapping BW of PRS with the active DL BWP does not satisfy the performance requirement)
 |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Thanks for the proposal and the discussion. From our side, any UE that will be doing PRS processing without MG, it can do it faster, with MG. So the MG-based PRS, at least from processing standpoint, is a low-latency feature, and not the MG-less. Removing the MG, will only increase the latency, unless the UE can drop any other traffic/procedures for a period of time, which then will mean that we are talking about UE-autonomous dropping of other traffic, aka, autonomous MGs. The argument of removing MG to improve latency is only related to the configuration aspects of the MG. Then, we suggest to focus the work on that instead of removing an already low-latency feature, or try to redesign another feature (that may eventually turn out to not be low-latency).  |
| CMCC | Yes  |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Reply QC, we think MG-based measurement is too restrictive to the IIoT communication. When positioning is requiring low latency, also is communication.Even for the PRS processing could be prioritized over communication without MG, we still see difference between positioning measurement prioritization window and MG:* Symbol level scheduling restriction is possible within the window.
* Scheduling restriction could be carrier/cell specific for the CA case.

For the first one, it allows to UE to report HARQ-ACK between PRS reception symbols. For the second one, it allows UE to measure PRS on an Scell frequency (lisenced or unlicensed) while communication is uninterrupted on the Pcell. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | Before we further discuss this issue, we would like to check our views in this group.The proposal is trying to discuss the following case 1 or case 2?Case 1(Without MGs): UE should always conduct DL PRS measurement inside active DL BWP and witout MGs required for a location information report.Case 2 (MG-less): If DL PRS happens to be configured within a active BWP and shares the same carrier spacing as the active BWP, UE can conduct DL PRS measurement without/outside MGs. Otherwise, UE still has to conduct DL PRS measurement within MGs.* If it’s Case 1, the serving gNB is not aware of the DL PRS that configured by LMF for a UE to measure. As a result, if UE wants to conduct DL PRS measurement inside the active DL BWP without MGs, the UE has to request serving gNB to tune its active DL BWP to cover the frequency range that the UE expects to measure the DL PRS. The request and configuration of DL BWP is quite similar to measurement gap request and configuration, which can’t reduce latency. Meanwhile, the frequency boundary of DL PRS is not limited by a serving cell, which means DL PRS can be configured with a bandwidth larger than the serving cell if high positioning accuracy is required. In this case, how to meet the accuracy requirement and latency requirement at the same time if the DL PRS is only measured inside active BWP.

FL: not sure I fully understand the difference in terms of without MG and MG-less. For Case 1, I think even requesting MG and activating MG using lower layer signaling is claimed to have latency benefits by some companies.* If it’s Case 2, mechanisms defined for intra-frequency measurements (RRM measurements) without measurement gaps can be reused. However, the transition from measurements performed outside measurement gaps to measurements performed inside measurement gaps may happen when network indicates UE to switch its active BWP. RAN4 may need to evaluate whether new measurement requirement should be defined for this case.

FL: I think some information may be needed at the gNB to reduce the BWP change during PRS measurement, which is subject to further discussion. |
| OPPO | Yes | Suggest to move the note into the main bullet:* Support PRS measurement without MG at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and with same the same numerology as the current DL BWP.
	+ ~~Note PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.~~
 |
| China Telecom | Yes.  |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | We think it is necessary to define a UE behavior to support this proposal, i.e., UE still perform PRS measurement if there are other RSs/channels overlapped with PRS resource or it is indicated as UL symbols.  |
| SONY | Yes | There should also be condition when it can be supported. For example, if the active DL BWP is too narrow. The number of PRS may not be sufficient for accurate positioning measurement/estimation. Suggest to add the following note:* + Note: The PRS in the current active DL BWP should be sufficient for the UE to perform positioning measurement.
 |
| Intel  | comments | Further discussion and analysis are needed |
| Qualcomm2 |  | Beyond the issues that we raised above, we still have additional (secondary at this stage), but important to understand how all the companies “saying yes” think about it?What is the meaning of “at least serving cell”? For PRS, we don’t need a serving cell. Positioning is happening in RRC Inactive also, or in connected state, the AD do not need a concept of a serving cell. Are the proponents mean that all PRS resources the UE is configured in AD, are transmitted well-synchronized in a small uncertainty window so the UE can just do a single IFFT per symbol (without having to do hypothesis testing of which symbol carries the PRS)? OR are the proponents think that the UE will only measure a few PRS (e.g. up to 8 PRS resources) since each TRP has up to 8 resources per set? The 2nd interpretation is clearly wrong, because, a “serving cell”, e.g. a specific PCI, can be associated with many TRPs in the AD; even up to 64 TRPs per PFL. In other words, there is no really a restriction how many PRS-IDs/sets/resources can exist in a “serving cell” so the worst-case processing requirements are still the same as legacy.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | Our view is that PRS transmitted in ontroversy gap-less period may collide with other DL channels. Thus, priorities between PRS and other channels need to be ontrover and ontrove the ontrove to the case when PRS is transmitted from the serving cell seems reasonable in terms of scope for this release. |
| Ericsson | yes | Our view is that at least for indoor deployment with one serving cell (which is clearly in scope for rel17 use cases), gap-free measurement should be possible.  |
| Vivo2 | Yes | Actually，we think this is a compromise for “at least serving cell”，and we are supportive of the serving cell and non-serving cell（neighboring cell）. We would like to confirm why we can measure non-synchronized signals in MG, but it does not work under BWP. |

FL comment: two companies (13/15) expressed concern on supporting this proposal. Based on the comments received so far, the proposal is updated below. For the Note suggested by SONY, I guess the QC already raised some issue and “whether it should be sufficient” may require further discussion, e.g. unsynchronized case.

**Proposal 4.1-1 (High priority, update)**

* Support PRS measurement without MG at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.
	+ FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g. synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
	+ FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.
	+ FFS whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined.

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:Support PRS measurement without MG, subject to UE capability, at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.* FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g., synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
* FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.
* FFS whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined.
* FFS treatment of other signals and channels during measurement
 |

**Proposal 4.1-2**

* At least support prioritized PRS measurement over other DL signals and channels within a PRS processing prioritization window for PRS measurement without MG.
	+ FFS signalling details.
	+ FFS whether UE can support simultaneous PRS and data processing subject to UE capability.
	+ FFS whether the PRS is restricted to on-demand PRS.
	+ FFS whether PRS and SSB can be mapped to the same symbol.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | We would like to further study the window as following FFS: The definition of PRS processing prioritization window. And other relationships of the window and PRS configuration/measurement.  |
| CATT | No | Our concern is that introducing the prioritization of PRS measurement over other DL signals and channels could have significant impact on the reception and performance of other DL signals and channels that we may have the time to fully evaluate in this WI. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Unclear what we are agreeing. Are we saying that the LMF can configure a prioritization window in which the UE should drop other DL signals and channels over the PRS? Is it the highest priority or somewhere in the middle? We have some concerns about giving the LMF control over the UE behavior. How does gNB know that the UE will drop some DL signals or channels? FL: The proposal does not imply whether it is provided by LMF or gNB. In case gNB is provided, some assistance information may be needed from UE/LMF on the measurement of PRS, which is subject to further discussion. |
| Qualcomm |  | Thanks for the proposal and the discussion. Even though we do not support 4.1-1, and therefore, by extension this proposal, I think it will be useful to provide some comments about our reasoning and where we are coming from. To CATT: We don’t think that there is free lunch here – A UE cannot do low-latency PRS processing unless this process is prioritized over other channels/signals. Furthermore, don’t we already have “blanking of other signals/channels” due to MG-based in rel-16? Not sure what else we would need to evaluate. Also, since we are talking about low-latency measurements (e.g. single-sample measurements), the dropping will just be for a small period of time (e.g. a few msec). Even though, this proposal is going into a right direction of acknowledging basic truths/constraints about how low-latency can be achieved, we still don’t see the need/effort over just having an autonomous-like MGs feature (i.e. remove delays introduced by signaling & keep the PRS prioritization over any DL signal), because it doesn’t address the “retuning” aspect : This proposal makes the assumption that low-latency Positioning will be needed only when the BWP matches the PRS BW. In many cases, BWP is just 20 MHz, since it is enough bandwith already for communication purposes. For Positioning, that is not true. So, in many scenarios of interest, retuning will be needed. In this case, we are effectively talking about a UE which would need to autonomously retune to a different BW, drop all other channels, to quickly process the PRS, and then retune back. If companies do not want to use a name (like autonomous MGs), and just say that “MG-less PRS” correspond to the case of having a Measurement/Processing window & potential retunings before/after, such that, during the measurement/processing/retuning time all other DL channels/procedures are expected to be deprioritized over PRS; it might work for us.  |
| CMCC |  | We think that it would be more reasonable to first discuss whether to introduce a PRS processing window or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think positioning measurement window configuration is crucial to MG-less measurement, but would interpret different functionalities from autonomous MG.To Nokia, we think this window should be provided by the serving gNB, but UE behaviour is different from the MG. |
| ZTE |  | Prefer to treat proposal 4.1-1 first. |
| OPPO | No | We have concern on introducing PRS processing window. What is the difference between a MG for PRS and processing window? |
| China Telecom |  | We think this proposal can be seen as a complement to proposal 4.1-1, which can prevent the conflict and interpret with other signals. |
| LG |  | We think that the issue needs to be discussed after the discussion on the proposal 4.1-1. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | This can be discussed as a sub-bullet of Proposal 4.1-1. |
| SONY | Yes | Prioritization of PRS measurement is needed for latency reduction. We are fine with the additional FFS added by VIVO. |
| Qualcomm |  | To OPPO: MG requires to be requested and be configured, whereas a Processing window will be implicit/automatic without a signaling that will increase the latency. MG includes retuning (0.5 msec RF In/Out in FR1). If MG-less PRS happening within active BWP, processing window will not need retune.In either case, having a measurement/processing window is a must for any reasonable low-latency discussions. It is clear that if the same UE is doing multiple stuff together, then it will do them with higher latency compared to have dedicated time to finish the processing. To HW: I think, based on your paper, you are going for some symbol-level measurement window, but still this is not enough. A UE needs to perform uninterrupted the processing in order to feedback quickly the measurements. That is the basic functionality, which can be achieved by autonomous MGs, or autonomous Processing window. If the window is provided by the gNB, what is the difference from MG processing with respect to latency? Are we re-inventing features that exist already?  |
| Ericsson | No | We share the concerns expressed by CATT. If we introduce prioritized PRS processing window, then data cannot be transmitted in this window which will hurt communications overall. |

### Proposal 4.1-3 (Closed)

* Further study assistance information transfer to enable/instruct UE to perform PRS measurement without MG, including but not limited to
	+ UE active DL BWP report to LMF by the UE.
	+ Measurement grant by the gNB.
	+ Indication of MG-less PRS measurement from LMF.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| CATT |  | For the 1st sub-bullet, it is unclear to us what is the purpose for UE to send the active DL BWP report to LMF. For the 2nd sub-bullet, we would like to know that the definition of “Measurement grant”. Does the “Measurement grant” grant the UL resource for reporting the measurement, or something else?FL: Based on contribution, my understanding is that the proponent company prefers to have gNB to send the measurement grant for the UE to start the measurement. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | For 1st sub-bullet, will UE report this to LMF or gNB reports it to LMF? FL: Based on the contribution, I think it is UE reporting.For 2nd sub-bullet, same question as CATT.FL: Based on contribution, my understanding is that the proponent company prefers to have gNB to send the measurement grant for the UE to start the measurement. |
| ZTE |  | Prefer to treat proposal 4.1-1 first. |
| OPPO |  | We has similar questions on those sub-bullets as CATT. |
| LG |  | We think that the issue needs to be discussed after the discussion on the proposal 4.1-1. |
| Xiaomi |  | For the 1st sub-bullet, what does it mean?FL: I believe the intention is to let LMF have a better knowledge of the UE active DL BWP, so that LMF knows whether the measurement can be/is performed without MG.For the 2nd sub-bullet, does it mean that gNB need to grant the MG-less PRS measurement of UE? Is the purpose that gNB will not schedule other RSs/channels in the symbols with PRS resource?FL: I believe the intention is to align the period that gNB will send data and UE is not required to process data.For the 3rd sub-bullet, does it mean that some PRS resources can be measured without MG, but others need to be measured with MGFL: I believe the intention from the proponent company is LMF to indicate to the UE that the measurement can be performed without MG. |
| Sony |  | For 2nd bullet-point, it is a grant that the UE can perform positioning measurement. The UE is not required to process any other downlink transmission during that grant period (as the UE peforms positioning measurement) |
| InterDigital |  | We prefer to discuss 4-1-1 first. |
| Ericsson |  | This proposal can be discussion after concluding on 4.1-1 |

FL comment: This is anyway a list of study items, and some companies consider it low priority for this meeting. It is encouraged for interested companies to bring the issue in the next meeting.

## Round 2

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:Support PRS measurement without MG, subject to UE capability, at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.* FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g., synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
* FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.
* FFS whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined.
* FFS treatment of other signals and channels during measurement
 |

FL comment: During the GTW session, I think objecting companies seem to be willing to compromise on the condition that PRS measurement is within a window, so that PRS measurement period is not impacted. The comments from MTK suggest that PRS measurement outside MG would be more general include the case that MG is configured (e.g. for RRM), but not overlapped with PRS measurement.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4.1-2*** At least support prioritized PRS measurement over other DL signals and channels within a PRS processing prioritization window for PRS measurement without MG.
	+ FFS signalling details.
	+ FFS whether UE can support simultaneous PRS and data processing subject to UE capability.
	+ FFS whether the PRS is restricted to on-demand PRS.
	+ FFS whether PRS and SSB can be mapped to the same symbol.
 |

FL comment: I think there is concern on data interruption if prioritization rule is defined. However, also as QC explained, there is **no free lunch**. More discussion and harmonization are required.

The proposal is modified below to reflect the common ground (at least based on my understanding), and has merged Proposal 4.1-2. Companies are invited to check whether they would be fine with this.

**Proposal 4.2-1**

* Support PRS measurement outside the MG, subject to UE capability, at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell, and is within a PRS processing prioritization window, and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and PRS has the same numerology as the current DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing prioritization window, consider either one or both options, subject to UE capability
		- Option 1: PRS processing is prioritization over other signals and channels on the same symbol from the same cell
		- Option 2: PRS processing does not impact processing other signals and channels on the same symbol from the same cell
	+ FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g., synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
	+ FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.
	+ FFS whether a new UE PRS processing capability is defined.
	+ FFS whether the PRS processing prioritization window is defined per UE or per carrier/cell.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| OPPO | No | We do not support to define a new gap: PRS processing prioritization window. It would introduce latency by requesting and configuration, similar to the MG. It does not solve the problem of latency. FL: I do not think window is necessarily requested/activation based on the wording. Even if it can be requested/activation, we also have MG-based measurement benefit from a new request and triggering method (potentially).The UE can expect there is no overlap between PRS and other DL signals, which can be supported by gNB scheduling implementation.FL: To my understanding, there is request from companies to also investigate whether UE can support processing PRS and data on the same symbol. Of course, my understanding that symbol level scheduling restriction should be the baseline.Added “on the same symbol”. |
| Qualcomm | No | Thanks for the updated proposal and the constructive discussion in the previous GTW. Please find a few comments:* To OPPO: The fact that there is a processing prioritization window does **NOT** mean that there is going to be a request. We are totally 100% with you there, and that is why we proposed to reuse the “autonomous MG” approach in the MG-based processing.
	+ So in this case, it will just mean that the spec will write something like: If MG is not configured, subject to UE capability, *UE is expected to prioritize the PRS measurement and processing over other DL signals and channels for a period of time depending on UE capability.*
* FL: To my understanding, autonomous gap may have impact on IioT data traffic, which I believe needs further investigation. The point is that gap is per UE/FR, and it may be too restrictive.
* To FL/All: What do we mean “FFS: new UE capability defined”? Clearly there will be new processing capabilities if the UE has to do PRS processing together with other channel since in NR Rel-16 we only had MG-based PRS and we have a new feature in a new release -> New capability. A UE might say: I can do 2 resources per slot if it is MG-less PRS, but 10 resources per slot if I have a per-UE MG configured. Having MG-based PRS is the baseline capability, and anything above that will be a new capability, for backward compatibility reasons, we cannot just assume that a UE supporting rel-16 MG-based PRS with X PRS/slot, will be doing rel-17 MG-less PRS with X PRS/slot also.

FL: I am assuming we are talking about UE PRS processing capability, instead of a generalized PRS capability. Of course, if the feature is supported, UE will indicate whether it support gap-less measurement. However to my understanding, whether or not a new (N,T) or a new number of resources in a slot that UE can process is supposedly discussed, and due to lack of input, I would rather consider the direction as contribution driven in the next meeting.* To FL/All: We still have concerns about the “PRS from serving cell”. What does that really mean in positioning terminology? PRS can happen without any serving cell; or it doesn’t matter what/which is the serving cell. Can companies describe technically in positioning terminology what “PRS from serving cell“ mean, or how they envision to be specified? I assume we don’t mean, single PRS resource from one TRP since we cannot do positioning with just a single PRS resource; or at least, the single-TRP Positioning is really a an extreme corner case scenario. Our assumption was that “serving cell PRS”, in positioning terminology, would correspond to a scenario that all the PRS resources are well synchronized and they have very small time-domain ambiguity. E.g. UE gets AD with a lot of TRPs, each TRP having multiple PRS resources as usual, (in UE-B, these TRPs may have different locations), all of which are associated with a same PCI or different PCIs. Are companies saying that this feature will be like: UE gets AD with a lot of TRPs, all associated with the same PCI, which happens to be the same as the serving PCI?

FL: My understanding of the term “serving cell” would have the meaning in two foldsOne: The timing of PRS are synchronized to the UE communication, e.g. small delay difference than CP, which I believe some companies proposed that it should be typical for indoor IioT case.Two: gNB is aware of the PRS symbols that UE is processing, and scheduling can manage the collision between PRS and data.It is possible that for indoor deployment, a cell is having distributed TRPs.The serving cell terminology is even used for RRC\_INACTIVE state.If we agree MG-less measurement applicable only to the serving cell, then one possible UE behaviour may be that UE receives the PRS, checks whether the serving cell condition is satisfied, and if so, UE can perform MG-less measurement, and otherwise, UE can switch to MG-based measurements. I think some companies are also proposing selection/switching between two measurements.* To FL/All: Our bottom line is that at a minimum, the PRS processing prioritization window is defined at a per-UE basis. That would be the most low-latency feature: UE dedicates all its processing power to finish PRS asap. Whether we are going to introduce an additional a per carrier /band UE capability can be discussed later, but it would be, not for the purpose of latency reduction over the baseline per-UE feature, but rather for alleged increased flexibility.

FL: I am fine with firstly agreed on per UE if that helps progress.* To FL/All: “PRS processing not impact other DL channels”: I guess it doesn’t mean that PRS and other channels can be FDMed, it just means, that the symbols that do not have PRS, can be used for other channels even in the same slot? During the PRS symbols though, I assume UE is expected to process PRS and drop other traffic.
	+ In either case, this is not a low-latency enhancement. The UE doing this, will take longer time to finish processing than the rel-16 counterpart. We said previous meeting, and the whole subagenda, that we are doing low-latency enhancements here.
	+ The argument that was heard online was that there may be communications in licensed band and PRS in unlicensed band. In that case, having the PRS processing window in a per band basis, will address that scenario. How did we go from that scenario, to one where we have, in the same CC and slot, PRS processing simultaneously with other DL channels/signals/procedures, all for the purpose/sake of positioning latency reduction?

FL: I am assuming symbol level scheduling restriction should be the baseline. However, there is also request from companies to consider simultaneous processing on the same symbol, but I think some trade-off with PRS processing capability is expected, which I believe can be discussed further.Another understanding from my side, is that low latency feature is discussed under IioT case, where the PRS symbols is not likely be long due to indoor coverage characteristics. Restrict gNB from scheduling in the remaining symbols (for MG-case) would not be beneficial for the overall IioT case.Added “on the same symbol”. |
| CATT |  | We would like to understand a little more on the motivation of introducing “the PRS processing prioritization window.” In our understanding, if a UE claims it has the capability to measure DL PRS without the need of the configuration of the MG, it means the UE is able to measure DL PRS in parallel with other DL signals in the same slots (not the same DL symbols) without the interruption (no MG is needed). If we introduce the PRS processing prioritization window, it seems the UE is only able to measure DL PRS in the window when there is no other DL signals. Thus, I am curious why there is need to have such UE capability. Obviously, any UE should be able to process DL PRS if there is no other DL signals. During the PRS symbols though, we are fine that UE only process PRS, since there is unlikely for gNB to schedule other DL data and DL PRS in the same OFDM symbols due to the interference issue.FL: I think we all agree that the baseline should be symbol level scheduling restriction, which means that gNB will not schedule data on the same symbol as PRS, and likewise UE is not expected to receive both. The opportunity a PRS prioritization window can offer is communication on other symbols within the window that are not occupied by communication. Similar to UE behaviour in SMTC.Added “on the same symbol”. |
| ZTE | No | We don’t see any latency reduction for supporting this proposal since gnB and LMF have to coordinate the active BWP information.FL: My understanding is that it may not be the case. From ZTE perspective, I believe for MG-based measurement, ZTE supports LMF initiated request, in which PRS configuration that the UE is to measure is exchanged with the serving gNB. How couldn’t that be serving as the indication to the gNB on the BWP adaptation? In order to reduce latency, we should try to reduce the measurement period defined by RAN4. Currently, RAN4 defines the measurement period for positioning assuming that DL PRS measurements are conducted within MGs. If network wants a low latency report, network can configure more compacted DL PRS (e.g. through on-demand PRS) so that the location measurement can be done in a few MGs (or one MG in a extreme case).In addition, it hasn’t been evaluated by RAN4 that whether the measurement period defined for without MGs will be smaller than within MGs.Furthermore, we think following FFS is too restricted. UE may also conduct DL PRS measurement inside MGs if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.* + FFS whether and how UE may suggest BWP changes to the serving gNB to fit the PRS measurement if the MG-less measurement condition does not satisfy.

FL: I think the intention is to discuss MG-less measurement. For MG-based measurement, it really depends on gNB action. For example, if UE indicates PRS measurement to the gNB using RRC/MAC CE/UCI or LMF indidcates such, and gNB configures the MG, of course UE will do MG-based measurement. However, before that, what message UE could send to the gNB is a separate issue. |
| Vivo |  | We think we are at a deadlock, some people only agree with PRS only can be measured in a window for low latency, some worry about the introduction of another window.For us, we prefer to discuss separately in the main bullet even we are supportive of the window. And add an FFS for PRS process priority or PRS processing prioritization windowFL: I think during GTW session, the only way to convince the objecting companies on latency benefit of MG-less measurement is to have a window in which PRS processing can be prioritized. |
| Xiaomi |  | We suggest to discuss the definition of “PRS processing prioritization window” first, including the configuration procedure, the UE behavior during the window. Option 1 and Option 2 may try to define the UE behavior inside the window, but for Option 1, it means UE drops other signals and channels on the same symbol from the same cell, and gNB may not have the information which signals and channels are dropped. FL: With regard to how gNB knows that which signals and channels are dropped by the UE, I think further discussion would be needed. |
| CMCC |  | Based on the discussion online and concerns on companies of MG-less measurement, we are supportive of introducing a PRS processing prioritization window.Regarding the two options inside the window, we would like to make sure whether our understanding is correct?Option 1: When the DL PRS overlapps with other DL signals/channels on a same symbol, always drop other signals/channels;Option 2: The gNB will by implementation schedule other DL signals/channels to avoid overlapping with DL PRS on a same symbol;FL: Option 2 means that a high capability UE that can process PRS and DL signals/channels on the same symbol (RB-FDMed). I believe there is some request on support of this kind, given that the PRS and data (under the current condition) are both from the same serving cell. Yet I think Option 1 should be priorized over Option 2 considering realistic UE processing capability. So good to know that CMCC are open to prioritize PRS over data.i.e., the DL PRS processing will always be prioritized inside this window, and no further priority indication / dropping rule will be discussed. Correct? |
| LG |  | We have a one concern that UE only can measurement PRS where overlapped BW between active DL and PRS BW and the performance of accuracy tends to be low in that case. Eventhough allow UE to measure PRS outside of MG for latency reduction,we have a question why do we support it under the condition that too low performance of accuracy is expected.  |
|  |  |  |

## Round 3

FL comment: based on the comments receive so far, the updated proposal is not stable. It is also suggested by companies to separate positioning measurement prioritization window from the MG-less PRS measurement. Thus the proposal 4.2-1 is updated below.

I also removed ontroversy FFSs.

**Proposal 4.3-1 (High priority)**

* Support PRS measurement outside the MG, subject to UE capability, at least for the case when PRS is from the serving cell and the UE measurement is inside the active DL BWP and PRS should have the same numerology as the current DL BWP.
	+ FFS conditions to apply to PRS from the non-serving cell (e.g., synchronization, time domain overlapping with the serving cell).
	+ FFS treatment of other signals and channels during measurement
	+ FFS definining a PRS processing prioritization window, in which UE PRS measurement may be prioritized over other DL signals and channels on the same symbol

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Thanks for the efforts by the FL, but no concern from our side was addressed. In short:* Without PRS processing window, there is **no** latency reduction, only alleged increased flexibility. To CATT: They assume there is a “free lunch”; i.e., a UE will be doing all PRS and data processing as fast as it would be doing it if it had to do only PRS processing. How is that possible? Take any UE, it will be doing faster processing if only PRS is the task that it has to do. This is the baseline behavior to reduce latency, and NOT to start multiplexing channels & procedures.
* As explained above, a baseline capability for low-latency positioning shall make optimal choices for reducing latency. This means:
	+ No request of MG or PRS-window
	+ No configuration of MG or PRS-window
	+ No simultaneous reception of PRS with any other DL channels
	+ No reception of DL channels in a small window after PRS to ensure the fastest response possible (i.e. no sharing of CPU cycles with other DL channels), in a per-UE basis (ie.e UE prioritizes this low latency PRS across all NR/LTE bands).
* If someone can propose more enhancements to ensure smallest latency possible, this is great; lets discuss those. But, all the arguments heard above are all about “flexibility”, “communication/PRS interaction”, etc, etc. These are NOT low latency Positioning arguments.
* Having this feature only to serving cell, makes the feauture applicable **to corner cases only**. We prefer to keep it open and write down positioning-specific conditions across TRPs that need to be satisfied for this feature to make sense. The FL provided some conditions above (e..g all PRS within a CP, which might increase the applicability). We are OK to generalize these conditions as much as it is physically & technically possible, but currently, we just say “serving cell only”.
 |
| Apple |  | We are open to discuss 4.2-1 (the latest version seems even broader) with some changes: 1) at least is removed and put FFS for PRS resources from non-serving gNB. 2) it is clarified that a new processing window is not defined, but based on UE capability, once UE is indicated to receive PRS within active BWP, UE is implicitly (or explicitly, which is not desired) indicated about window starting symbol, duration, etc 3) UE is not expected to receive/transmit and other channels otherwise it is added that new UE capabilities is needed to be defined  |
| CATT | Yes |  We support the main bullet. We are fine to list the “FFS” for further discussion, although we don’t see the need to definine a PRS processing prioritization window. |
| Vivo | Yes | We support the proposal. |
| Sony |  | UE active bandwidth part is a UE-specific parameter. In case there are only a few PRS in the UE active bandwidth part then the UE would not be able to provide a good positioning measurement. In general, we need to have a generic condition when this operation can be performed (that applies to both serving and neighbor cells). |
| ZTE | No | Thanks for the update. We still have some concerns,* Agree with QC. We also think the simultaneous processing communication&positioning would not be an argument for low positioning latency. Why UE cannot resume communication immediately after using whole CPU to conduct DL PRS measurement inside MG? The MG may ensure that the DL PRS measurement is the only task.
* We’re not sure all the proponents have considered following cases,
* When LMF wants to receive a measurement report in a short time (i.e. after response time), how LMF can know UE’s current BWP status dynamically so that LMF can carefully configure the response time? Since BWP can be dynamically switched, how RAN4 can design the measurement requirement for this case with expected low latency? Does UE have to conduct DL PRS inside MG after BWP switching? From our point of view, the PRS measurement with MG is not a low latency feature for LMF-centered architecture since serving gNB and LMF are independent for active BWP and positioning frequency layer configuration respectively.
* When UE is configured with multiple positioning frequency layers, do we expect that UE only receive the positioning frequency layer that is inside active BWP? However, RAN4 has designed measurement period across positioning frequency layers in Rel-16. How to design the measurement requirement for the case when only only some of positioning frequency layers can be measured inside active BWP? This will largely impact on how LMF can configure small value of response time to expect low latency report.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | To QCWe believe there can be “free lunch” if the PRS to measure is synchronized, via using single FFT. We are open to discuss how many TRPs from the serving cell can be measured, but overall it should have limited impact on latency, and most importantly, this can be under LMF knowledge. Note the serving cell should have its meaning given that low latency positioning usually mean UE in RRC\_CONNECTED, and AMF would report UE’s serving cell to the LMF in the LCS request.We are fine to extend the case for non-serving cells, if the non-serving cell is synchronized, and PRS from non-serving is overlapped with PRS from the serving cell (prior to any muting operation), so that UE would be able to use single FFT window.To ZTEWe think LMF could inform the gNB about the PRS that UE is expected to measure (similar to MG request), and it then can be up to gNB implementation to decide whether to provide the MG or switch UE BWP or do nothing. For the latter two cases, MG-less PRS measurement would be triggered.For multiple positioning frequency layers, if any of the frequency layer can have a specific PCell/activated SCell to associate, we think it should be OK for UE to process. Otherwsie, if there is no MG, UE is only required to perform the PRS measurement overlapped with its currently active DL BWP (of a cell), i.e. for the positioning frequency layers that are not overlapped with any PCell/SCell, UE is not required to measure the positioning frequency layer.One question for ZTE is that do you think it is possible for low latency PRS measurement in MG (with potential Rel-17 enhancements) if there are more than one PRS positioning frequency layers? |
| Qualcomm2 | Comments | To: With regards to the “single IFFT” and synchronized TRPs. Then, the proposal should try to focus on that aspect, instead saying “serving cell”. We regards to the “free lunch”, the problem is not only that the PRS resources are synchronized and all can be measured with a single IFFT (no symbol-hypothesis tests). The problem is that the UE will still have to do all the PRS processing in 10-fold faster timeline than in NR rel-16. So, we need to give up something here;A Baseline UE that is doing such low-latency (order of 10 msec) shall be a specification solution that enables/facilitates as much as possible the “existence” of such UEs (otherwise, it will just be another paper product, and no one will pick it up to build it). To make a progress on something more specific that writes down a proposal from our side, we suggest the following, where we are trying to address the comment from OPPO (i.e., there is no intention to increase the latency by having a new request/configuration signaling). * *Subject to UE capability,* ***for the purpose of low-latency positioning****, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing prioritization window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.*
	+ *Inside the PRS processing prioritization window, support at least the following:*
		- *PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis*
			* + *Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.*
		- *Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels* ***only*** *in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.*
	+ *Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.*
	+ *For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:*
		- * *Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only*
			* *Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).*
 |
| vivo 2 | Yes | We are okay with the main bullet from Qc, and for the first sub-bullet, we suggest changing “ support *at least the following*” to “consider *at least the following*", and remove some repetition about per UE capability * *Subject to UE capability,* ***for the purpose of low-latency positioning****, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing prioritization window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.*
	+ *Inside the PRS processing prioritization window, ~~support~~consider at least the following:*
		- *PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. ~~For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis~~*
			* + *Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.*
		- *Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels* ***only*** *in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.*
	+ *Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.*
	+ *For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:*
		- * *Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only*
			* *Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).*

To ZTE1) Why the LMF must confirm everything, Qos information also transfer to UE. We think UE can decide whether the requirement can be satisfied.2) First, there seems no impact on performance requirement since CA is not supported. Besides, considering the information exchange between UE and gNB, we believe scell activation/BWP switching( even MG request ) is faster than waiting the coming of the next MG periodicity since multiple frequency layer measurement needs more measurement gap periods. Therefore, the latency of multiple frequency layer measurement is a general issue not just MG-less specific. |
| FL |  | Companies are invited to check whether QC’s proposal or vivo’s modification is acceptable. |
| CATT |  | It seems to us the QC’s proposal is to define the requirements of “a PRS processing prioritization window” instead of measurement without MG. Also, from “*Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency*”, we assume it means where the PRS processing prioritization window is located is up to UE implementation, and the network has no idea where they are. In this case, the serving cell, may not have the information of when the *DL signals/channels* may be interrupted for the DL PRS slots from the neighboring cells.In our view, supporting measurement without MG is more than “for the purpose of low-latency positioning”, although this AI is mainly for latency improvement.Our suggestion would be:* *Subject to UE capability,* ***~~for the purpose of low-latency positioning~~****~~,~~ support PRS measurement outside the MG, ~~within a PRS processing prioritization window,~~ and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.*
	+ *FFS: Supprt defining a PRS processing prioritization window, Inside the PRS processing prioritization window, ~~support~~consider at least the following:*
		- *PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. ~~For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis~~*
			* + *Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.*
		- *Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels* ***only*** *in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.*
			* *Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.*
	+ *For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:*
		- * *Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only*
			* *Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).*
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We are okay in principle with the new proposal from QC. From our side the note on striving to avoid signalling is not needed though. It should be clear in the latency reduction AI that we are aiming to reduce the latency as much as possible 😊 We would also prefer that the third level of sub-bullets under the first sub-bullet were FFS as we have not had much time to discuss these details but we are okay with supporting the window in the agreement.  |
| Apple | Comments | OK in principle, and we think “Note” should be there. On the last bullet and the subsequent alternatives, not sure if it is needed at this stage.  |
| Ericsson |  | We share the concerns expressed by CATT. In particular, the introduction of such a prioritization window means that UE will drop other DL signals/channels inside this window which will hurt communications. In IIoT scenarios, URLLC data is cricitcal and it could be more of a priority than doing positioning measurements on PRS.So, we suggest to make the ‘PRS processing prioritization window’ FFS for now. We are fine with CATT’s suggested revision.  |
| Xiaomi |  | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE |  | From the main bullet, we say “ outside the measurement gap”, do we expect:* UE still can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
* UE has to do the measurement inside the MG if the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
* Will RAN4 define the requirement for above cases with expecting small measurement period than Rel-16?

At least we should further study,* Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
* How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
 |
| vivo |  | To ZTEA1: Based on the following agreement in Rel 16, we think it is more clear to change 'outside the measurement gap' to ‘when not configured with a measurement gap’ or ‘when not requesting a measurement gap’.A2: We think FL has responded to your related questions. In addition to FL's reply, we want to say the information communication is needed between gNB and LMF even for the MG method. So, why the information communication can not be used in the MG-less method. For us, it is a general issue for MG-based or MG-less methods to aware of some PRS information on the gNB sideAgreement:For intra-frequency measurements:* The UE is expected to measure the DL PRS resource outside the active DL BWP or with a numerology different from the numerology of the active DL BWP if the measurement is made during a configured measurement gap.
	+ Select from one of the following options for the measurement bandwidth
		- Option 1: The UE measurement is within the DL BWP configuration
		- Option 2: The UE can measure outside the DL BWP configuration
	+ FFS: Scenarios when measurements gaps would need to be configured.
* When not configured with a measurement gap, the UE is only required to measure DL PRS within the active DL BWP and with the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
 |

FL comments:

Based on the comments received so far

* IDC, CATT, vivo, Huawei, and Xiaomi are OK with the original FL proposal.
* ZTE and QC had concern over the original FL proposal.
* Apple offered some suggestions to proposal 4.2-1, but from FL point of view, proposal 4.2-1 is proven to be unstable.
* SONY proposed that we need a generic condition to apply.

Then

* QC offered a proposal on how PRS measurement without MG can be supported, stressing that
	+ A UE-specific PRS prioritization window should be supported jointly to ensure that UE has the full capabilities dedicated for PRS processing
* vivo, CATT, and Ericsson think it is too early to support the PRS prioritization window, and put the window in FFS.
* Nokia are generally fine with the proposal from QC, but they also think that prioritization of PRS over data inside the window should be FFS.
* Apple think that the Note *Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency* should be kept and they wonder whether it is needed to keep the applicability alternatives with respect to serving cell only or serving+neighbouring cell.
* ZTE had concern on supporting MG-less PRS measurement and think that some co-existence criteria between MG-less and MG-based measurement should be studied.

I think the showstopper is whether the PRS processing prioritization window is supported. And from the FL perspective, I think perhaps we can at least confirm that there should be a PRS processing window, but priorization behaviour inside the window somehow cannot reach consensus. It seems also useful to add that Note in the agreement in the previous meeting, reminding us of the target of reducing latency. It should be OK to add two FFS bullets as per the comments from ZTE.

Judging from the current status, the FL is offering the following proposal for the GTW.

**Proposal 4.3-2 (High priority)**

* Subject to UE capability, **for the purpose of low-latency positioning**, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, consider at least the following:
		- PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis
			* Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.
		- Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels **only** in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:* Subject to UE capability, **for the purpose of low-latency positioning**, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, consider at least the following:
		- PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis
			* Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.
		- Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels **only** in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
 |

## Round 4

It seem like that we are in a deadlock.

Some companies supports MG-less PRS measurement only if the PRS processing prioritization window is supported, while some companies supports MG-less PRS measurement only if the PRS processing prioritization window is FFS.

Some clarification on difference between PRS processing prioritization window and measurement gap offered by Alex (Qualcomm) is that

* There is no RF retuning for the window, while MG should consider the RF retuning time.
* In the window, UE should be allowed to transmit, while it is not possible for the MG.
* The window may not be configured by explicit signalling, while MG would require configuration.

The additional understanding from the FL on the difference is that

* The window can be per CC/band, but the MG can only be per UE/FR.

In addition, some companies believed that the prioritization should be determined by RAN4 (e.g. using scheduling restriction for the intra-frequency measurement within SMTC). The comment from the FL on this is that in Rel-16, RAN4 initially made the agreement on FR1 with regard to PRS and data simultaneous reception that UE will drop data, but later attempted to revert it to align with RAN1 agreement for FR2 (see below).

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement in RAN1#99:In case DL PRS Resources are processed in the active BWP and there is no measurement gap configured to the UE, at least in FR2, the UE is not expected to process DL PRS in the same OFDM symbol where other DL signals and channels are transmitted to the UE. Behaviour in FR1 is up to RAN4 to decide.* Include this agreement in an LS to RAN4.
 |

Based on the information, I would like to check either side on the willingness to compromise.

**Question 4.4-1**

* For the companies who support PRS measurement withoug MG and think PRS processing prioritization window should be supported at the same time, under which condition can you accept the window being further studied?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| CMCC | We have no strong objections for the concept to introduce a window in order to reduce positioning latency. However, the current version is quite confused to us, and hence, before we say support or object the PRS processing window, some clarifications are needed. Please refer to Quesiton 4.4-4 for further details. |
| OPPO | We sympathize the intention of PRS processing window. To process PRS outside MG, we think the PRS should have prioritization over other DL signals/channels. Some mechanism to support the PRS prioritiation is needed. That is why we are open to FFS on PRS processing window or other schemes for PRS prioritization. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the discussion. The condition to try to break the deadlock from our side is to introduce separate capabilities for the different UE features. In short:* Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
	+ 1A -> per UE. 1B -> per Band/CC
* Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.

Explanation: * Cap. 1: Lowest Positioning latency / or best PRS processing capabilities, but might affect, for a small period of time (a few msec) the communication procedures for the UE (or for the affected band/CC in Cap. 1B)
* Cap. 1B: Potentially useful to the case of licensed-band communication with unlicensed-band PRS as the FL pointed out.
* Cap. 2: Highest positioning latency / or lowest PRS processing capabilities, but DL channels are not affected if they are not colliding with PRS symbols.

Please note that the topic of dropping PRS over other channels is completely different**. The technical concerns from our side is the “simultaneous processing” and not what takes priority over what.** We can obviously have priority rules defined where PRS is dropped over other channels. To write the above compromised proposal:Proposal:* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability associated to this feature that is applicable in a per UE basis (Cap. 1A) or in a per Band/CC (Cap. 1B) basis
				+ FFS: whether Cap. 1B is per band or per CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ Note: Prioritization of other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing can be discussed separately and it’s related to all of the above options.
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa
 |
| MTK | For capability 1 mentioned by QC, it seems to us that we can actually further consider measurement larger than active BWP. At least there is a use case that MG is configured and MG is partially overlapped with PRS instances. So, for the measurement outside gaps, to align using large UE BW within MG, we don't need restrict to be within active BWP . |

**Question 4.4-2**

* For the companies who support PRS measurement without MG and think PRS processing prioritization window needs further study at the same time, under which condition can you accept the window being supported?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | We are quite firm on keeping the PRS prioritization window for further study. We have concern that this PRS priorization window involves dropping of DL data/control channels by the UE within this window which is a major limitation in IIoT scenarios that need to serve URLLC traffic with positioning as an ad-on service. Furthermore, from FL’s description above, the window may not be explicitly configured by the gNB. More discussion is needed on how the gNB knows where the window is. |
| OPPO | We sympathize the intention of PRS processing window. To process PRS outside MG, the PRS should have prioritization over other DL signals/channels. The UE shall not be requested to process both PRS and other DL signals simultaneously. Using PRS processing window is one way to support that. Our problem is how the PRS processing window is configured. It seems that both gNB and UE should be aware of the configuration of this window. Thus how to provide it with low lantency is a key problem. One way to move forward is we first agree that PRS measurement out side MG with PRS prioritization over other DL channels and signals. And FFS on how to support this prioritization and PRS processing window is one possible solution for that.* Subject to UE capability, **for the purpose of low-latency positioning**, support PRS measurement outside the MG, with PRS prioritization over other DL channels and signals, ~~within a PRS processing prioritization window,~~ and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ FFS how to support PRS prioritization over other DL channels and signals, e..g, PRS processing window, PRS process priority rules.
 |
| ZTE | We prefer OPPO’s suggestion. We haven’t aligned the understanding of many issues,* What signaling is needed for UE/gNB/LMF to have the same interpretation of processing window. Does the signaling exchange really reduce the the latency compared with MG based method.
* Do we expect the processing is on-demand or a periodic window(e.g. pattern of processing window is the same as SMTC or MG) ?
* Do we expect that the DL PRS should always configured in the processing window (i.e. with scheduling restriction)?
 |
| vivo | We think the PRS process window for PRS processing capability has been supported in Rel 16 based on the following description. So, in our view, the first bullet should not be an obstacle to reaching an agreement.

|  |
| --- |
| TS 38.214For the purpose of DL PRS processing capability, the duration *K* msec of DL PRS symbols within *P* msec window, … |

For the second bullet, consider some company's concerns, such as “ all the symbols”, “URLLC traffic”, could we modify the second bullet as following?* + Inside the PRS processing window, support ~~consider~~ at least the following:
		- PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in ~~all~~ the PRS symbols and other potential symbols which are used to process the measured PRS(e.g N-T ms) inside the window. ~~For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis~~
			* Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR, ~~or~~ per band, or per UE basis.
		- Consider, in addition to the above capability, the following option, and decide by next meeting: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels **only** in the PRS symbols inside the window, and associated PRS processing capability.
 |
| CATT | Maybe we could consider two scenario for supporting MG-less measurements: a) the UEs that are able to support DL PRS measurements within the active BWP without any interruption of DL/UL data service; and b) the UEs that are only able to support DL PRS measurements within the active BWP under some conditions, e.g., there are some interuptions of DL data service within a time window. Then, we may have separate discussions on the requirements for the UEs that are able to support DL PRS measurements without any interruption of DL/UL data service; and the requirements for the UEs that are only able to support DL PRS measurements within the active BWP under some conditions. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay in principle with the compromise proposal from QC above. It is important from our side that multiple categories of processing prioritization are introduced and the case of DL PRS priority is studied (as that can alleviate some concerns that communication is potentially harmed in our view).  |
| Xiaomi | We share same view as OPPO/ZTE since we are not sure what the PRS processing window is at this time. Is it a periodical window or aperiodic? If it is a periodical one, how long the periodicity, how about the length of the window. If it is aperiodic, when to trigger it. If no configuration is needed, how does gNB align the time location of the window? We think there are many issues need to be studied before agree it.  |
| MTK | The PRS processing window is quite similar to SMTC defined in Rel-15. RAN4 defines scheduling restriction within SMTC. It is also okay for RAN1 handling prioritization. The leading group is boss  |

**Question 4.4-3**

* Will it be acceptable for both sides to accept to conclude in RAN1 that introducing PRS processing prioritization window will be beneficial for latency reduction, but leave the priority between PRS and data up to RAN4 to decide?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Ericsson | With limited time left in the WI, we are not supportive of introducing this PRS processing or prioritization window in Rel-17. Please see our answer to Question 4.4-3. |
| OPPO | The priority between PRS and DL channels/signals shall be dicussed together with non-MG PRS processing in RAN1. It can not be left to RAN4. |
| Qualcomm | It should be decided in RAN1. To ZTE questions:* *What signaling is needed for UE/gNB/LMF to have the same interpretation of processing window. Does the signaling exchange really reduce the the latency compared with MG based method.*
* **[QC] If companies don’t believe that the latency can be reduced, then we are OK to drop the whole feature of MG-less Processing.**
* **[QC] It is clear that there are a few solutions that will reduce the latency: LMF sends to serving gNB an NRPPa message that says: I am sending a high-priority/low-latency PRS request to the UE, and expect that for Xmsec starting from the Y subframe will focus on my task (what “focus on the PRS task” means depends on the UE capability that we suggest above). This does NOT introduce latency because the LMF sends the message simultaneously with the location request to the UE.**
* *Do we expect the processing is on-demand or a periodic window(e.g. pattern of processing window is the same as SMTC or MG) ?*
* **[QC] It could be something as simple as: The LMF will say to the serving gNB: I am sending a high-priority/low-latency PRS request to the UE, and for Xmsec starting from the Y subframe will focus on my task.**
* *Do we expect that the DL PRS should always configured in the processing window (i.e. with scheduling restriction)?*
* **[QC] The LMF decides the PRS config, the LMF sends the location request & the response time. So, the LMF looks at the UE capabilities, and determines how much time the UE will need after the last PRS symbol in a PRS instance, and sends the information to the serving gNB to notify him that there wll be PRS prioritization over other channels. In other words, there may not be a concept of “PRS window” configured to the UE, but rather a period of time, where the communication traffic is affected. From our side, at a minimum, there is not even an explicit need to send to the UE a processing window configuration: it is more about information sent to the serving gNB/ to know what to expect.**
* **[QC] There are some comments from some companies: what if other channels are more important than PRS? OK lets discuss that also, no concern there at all! The UE will drop PRS, and the low-latency Positioning will suffer. However, asking from the UE to do both simultaneously, as if it business-as-usual, will just increase the overall latency, or no UE will have a low-latency feature at all.**

**To Ericsson:** * *With limited time left in the WI, we are not supportive of introducing this PRS processing or prioritization window in Rel-17.*
	+ **[QC] We acknowledge that there is limited time left, so we are OK to not support MG-less PRS processing if a compromised solution is not found.**
 |
| Nokia/NSB | We feel it should be decided in RAN1.  |
| InterDigital | Priority between PRS and other channels should be discussed in RAN1. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | We also share the view that this should be prioiritization issue between PRS and data should be handled in RAN1. |
| FL: | Conclusion: the priority (if defined), should be defined by RAN1. |

**Question 4.4-4**

* Are there any other comments you would like to share?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | 1) Both QC and FL expressed their understandings of the difference between MG and this window, however, we are still confused at some point. In the first Note, it is said that “Strive to avoid …request and/or configuration signaling …”, which indicates that the window may not be configured by explicit signaling, and this is pointed out as a difference between the two. However, reagrding the MG activationa deactivation, we just made an agreement with the following option:* Option. 3: UE autonomously applies the MG

Then, it seems that it is also possible to apply MG without explicit signalling, no? And as the 1st sub-bullet under the 2nd bullet said, the PRS processing can be prioritized over all DL signals/channels within the window, and in such a case, the data transmission completely interrupted, of which the result is equivalent to applying MG as well. From this perspective, we are not sure what is the difference with this window and the MG (which can be autonomously applied).FL; The understanding from my side on the “strive” clause is about avoidance of signaling between UE and gNB, but it does not preclude the signaling between LMF and gNB. In fact, it is already under discussion as one option for MG request enhancement. Based on my understanding, if MG-based and MG-less both are to be supported, we should strive unify the new signalings that approves to be latency friendly.Even if we cannot avoid signaling between UE and gNB, and we may resort to another option under MG request enhancement by the UE (e.g. UCI/UL MAC CE), so that gNB is aware of the PRS that UE is expected to measure.2) Regarding the two bullets under the 2nd bullet, our understanding is that as long as the DL signals/channels are overlapped with the DL PRS in the same symbol, the DL signal/channels will be dropped, the difference is whether it applies in the whole window, or just on symbols carrying DL PRS. However, with the above Note, which may imply that the window can be up to UE implementation, and then our concern is that, the gNB may know nothing about the window, and if gNB schedules important data (e.g. URLLC traffic), there may lead to some unexpected issues. So, my question is, are we totally leave this up to RAN4, or in RAN1, we can further discuss whether/how some priority indication/rules that can be applied in the window. |
| ZTE | For the highlighted in first sub-bullet of the second main bullet,* + - PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window. For the purpose of this feature, a UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per UE basis
			* Consider and decide by next meeting whether to additionally support a UE that can declare a PRS processing capability & window applicable in a per FR or per band basis.

As mentioned by FL, the processing window is different from MG because it can be per CC/band. However, as stated in highlighted part, if the the processing window is “ per UE basis”, we don’t see any difference from MG. From our understanding, we should further study whether the processing window is per CC/band/FR/UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not want to overcomplicate this issue, but if we take look at the whole picture of Rel-17 positioning, multiple enhancements could be affecting each other.For MG-based and MG-less, we believe there should be a way for the gNB to know that UE is doing PRS measurement, to either avoid scheduling in MG or avoid scheduling on PRS symbols without MG.In addition, if we consider DL/DL+UL in RRC\_INACTIVE, this is also some form of measurement without MG, and we believe a measurement time window is anyway needed, and we may also need to consider the relation between PRS reception and SIB/paging reception, although in that case latency is not top priority, but it should share some discussion with MG-less measurement. |
| Qualcomm | To ZTE:* In our new compromised proposal from our side, we have cap. 1B that addresses your concern.
* The differentces of cap 1A vs legacy MG-based processing is still are 3: No retuning time, no explicit MG request, UL is not affected.

To CMCC: * The serving gNB could be informed by the LMF that a UE has a low-latency location request which means that the UE will prioritize PRS over other channels for some period of time. If the serving gNB gets that signaling, it will know to avoid scheduling other channels in that period of time.

To Ericsson: * URLLC & Positioning traffic on different CCs/bands can be addressed by cap. 1B in our compromised proposal.
* URLLC & Positioning traffic on same CC can be addressed by cap. 2 in our compromised proposal, if there are no symbol collision. If there are symbol collision, we can decide whether we want to drop PRS (and have the Positioning latency affected), or drop data/control. No concern on having dropping rules
 |
| Nokia/NSb | From our side the MG-less positioning is very important to reach low latency for some use cases so we should strive to make some steps forward at this meeting.  |

I copy-pasted QC’s compromise proposal, with following modification to make it clear.

So it is proposed to introduce different UE capabilities to support different levels of priorization (different level of impact to communication/URLLC traffic).

In addition, I think data overriding PRS is still under discussion.

I personally would suggest companies to be constructive on the compromised proposal for the sake of progress. If you do not like it, you may consider adding a new capabilities that you desire, so that we can at least have some opportunity for the use cases in the future. Otherwise, we may have to conclude no consensus on support of MG-less PRS measurement in Rel-17.

**Proposal 4.4-1**

* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs are affected.
			* Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
				+ FFS: band or CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window
		- A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.
			* FFS signaling granularity
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be downselected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ Note: Prioritization of other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing can be discussed separately and it’s related to all of the above options.
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | We are okay with FL or QC version |
| Nokia/NSB |  | For Cap 1 and Cap 2 is the common understanding that the full meaning of “PRS prioritization” is still open? I.e., if PRS is prioritized over all DL signals/channels or only some DL signals/channels. FL: According to reply from QC to Ericsson in Question 4.4-4: “*URLLC & Positioning traffic on same CC can be addressed by cap. 2 in our compromised proposal, if there are no symbol collision. If there are symbol collision, we can decide whether we want to drop PRS (and have the Positioning latency affected), or drop data/control. No concern on having dropping rules*”My interpretation is that at least within the window, UE should be allowed to (may) drop data on PRS symbols. Yet it is still FFS whether other dropping rule can be defined, based on the Note “Prioritization of other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing can be discussed separately and it’s related to all of the above options.” in proposal.My understanding on QC’s concern is that spec should not specify MG-less measurement that does not allow PRS taking higher priority than data or forcing UE to always process both PRS and data.So I think it is open that different DL channels/signals may have different priorities over DL-PRS, and that even a single DL channel may have different priorities over DL-PRS dynamically. |
|  |  |  |

## Round 5

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.
			* Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
				+ FFS: band or CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window
		- A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.
			* FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.)
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ Note: Prioritization of other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing can be discussed separately and it’s related to all of the above options.
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa.
 |

It is the understanading from the FL that this proposal does not restrict the network control over positioning measurement and communication, since it is talking about UE capabilities. It is also the FL’s understanding that it should be network’s responsibility to ensure that communication and positioning can satisfy the respective requirement or balance the trade-off between the latency.

With that said, I have the following proposal update. Companies are encouraged to check it and provide their views.

### Proposal 4.5-1

* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.
			* Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
				+ FFS: band or CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window
		- A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.
			* FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.)
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell (e.g., TRP synchronization to the serving cell, time domain overlapping with the serving cell, single IFFT window at the receiver).
	+ Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ Note: Prioritization of other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing can be discussed separately and it’s related to all of the above options.
	+ Note: This does not preclude the gNB to indicate to the UE of the priority between PRS and other DL signals/channels.
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | To Nokia all: Again, the major issue for us is the UE to be required to do simultaneous DL processing over this period of time. * If the network considers that some other channels are more important than PRS, then the UE will drop PRS.
* But, when the UE reports a capability and commits on a timeline, it needs to be understood under which conditions this commitment holds.
	+ For us, the spec should say to the UE that the PRS processing timeline is under the assumption that the UE will not be required to do any other DL channels/signals/processing: PDSCH, PDCCH, CSIRS & report.
	+ Now, if, we want to have the network indicate that some PDSCH are more important, or some PDCCH, then the UE could just drop PRS and not satisfy the LMF response request. Likely this will be a scenario without measurement period requirements in RAN4, etc.

I really want to make sure we understand the fundamental problem here: UE gets a location request to measure and report back with a very short response time. To do so, it stops all the remaining DL things it is doing to satisfy the very short response time. If the network has informed the UE that it should still prioritize some DL channels, the UE will not satisfy the response time; it will take longer, but that will be discussion in RAN4 to say “measurement period requirements are not satisfied”Again, the UE will report the PRS processing capabilities assuming it is allowed to drop the processing of the other DL signals/channels (similar to MG processing actually), but in this case, different from MG-based processing, if the UE has determined that some other channel is more important (further discussions what channels we want to include there), then the UE will just drop PRS (FYI: In NR rel-16 we agreed that PRS is always dropped over any other channel; since now we are talking about low-latency positioning; the starting point is that PRS is the most important, and we can build on top this, more priority rules). No concern on dropping PRS or the other channel; but the concern has been from the beginning on doing these simultaneously. Dropping rules is about balancing priorities between different tasks, and these are totally fine for us. On the other hand, simultaneous processing though is something completely different; it is pushing the load to the UE or rendering a feature unimplementable. To make this more clear,* Capability 1: PRS prioritization over the reception and processing of **all** other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
	+ Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.
	+ Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
		- FFS: band or CC

Suggest to change the new note to the following, since it may not be “indication from the gNB”, it may just be rules defined in the spec (as we do for other channel collision rules): * Note: This does **not** preclude the UE to drop PRS processing over other higher priority DL signals/channels that appear within the window.
	+ FFS: which channels can be higher priority than PRS and related indication.

A last point: With regards to the PRS capability without MG and this bullet:* + *A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.*
		- *FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.)*
* E.g., A UE will report MG-less PRS with cap. 1A and say it can do X PRS resources per slot. That same UE, may want to report that it can do MG-less PRS with cap. 2 and say it can do Y PRS resources per slot Y<X?
* In other words does the bullet above preclude the same UE supporting different capabilities? Or is this part of the “details of capability signaling”?
 |
| CATT |  | 1. For the “PRS-related conditions” to be specified, there are two alternatives. Should it be down-selected, or should either of them can be supported by UE up to UE’s capability?
2. For the note, “Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency,” our concern is that the serving gNB may not have the information of the DL transmission of the neighbpring cells. Thus, we prefer to say “*Note: PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB should strive to avoid increase the positioning latency*.”
* For “Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement”, it is unclear to me what “*PRS measurement time*” refers to. I assume the DL processing is completed within the PRS-processing-window. Is the *PRS measurement time* the measurement reporting time?
 |
| Intel  | No | Thank you for the discussion and the efforts made by the FL and companies.We are not supportive of the proposal in the current form, the incremental latency benefits using MG-less operation are not clear at this stage compared to MG-based solution. As it follows from discussion, this operation will be applicable to the limited set of the scenarios and specific set of UEs optimized for this functionality. In addition, it may require prioritization of the DL PRS signals processing over other signals of gNB (from transmission) and UE (from reception) perspective. Furthermore, it requires additional work on multiple details starting from BWP and DL PRS alignment. In general, we believe that the current proposal is not mature, and it has a complex structure with the multiple FFSs and potential significant impact to other WGs (for example, RAN2/3/4), which we think will not be possible to resolve with only two meetings left. Therefore, we think that RAN1 should not make an agreement without considerations from other WGs. Having said that, we propose not to consider the MG-less operation in Rel.17. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | To QC, thanks for the detailed explanation. We are okay with the latest version given the explanation. To Intel, we think that the latency gain is not incremental at all. Given we identified that MGs are one of the main time consuming items during the SI phase we feel it would be very hard for us to meet the latency requirements for Rel-17 without this feature.  |
| Qualcomm |  | To CATT, yes the alternatives are expected to be downselected, i don’t see the need now to have another capability there; unless we really get stuck next meeting. The FFS statements could be clarified more. * + To FL/CATT: if the note: “Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement” has been added to try to address QC’s concerns, we are OK to remove it, given that we are introducing different UE capabilities in this proposal.

To Intel: * The latency gains, at least of Cap. 1A UE, over rel-16 are:
	+ No MG request/response,
	+ no retuning time.
	+ UE, at least in cap. 1A can do PRS without interruptions (as it is the case for rel-16 MG-based Processing).
		- I acknowledge that cap 1B or 2, the UE would likely be spending more time in processing, so higher latency, at least with regards to the PRS processing but that’s the compromised proposal that is being considered.
	+ If conditions on PRS is included (e.g. PRS expectedRSTDuncertany is very small, so that all PRS can be processed with single IIFTT), it is likely that a UE might be able to do faster the processing of the same number of PRS resources compared to Rel-16.
* The latency gains over MG-based rel-17 (with enhancements) are:
	+ No retuning time
	+ If conditions on PRS is included (e.g. PRS expectedRSTDuncertany is very small, so that all PRS can be processed with single IIFTT), it is likely that a UE might be able to do faster the processing of the same number of PRS resources compared to Rel-16.
	+ Faster MG request/response (if agreed)

Is Intel suggesting something else? Do they want to remove a subset of capabilities? But that’s what we have been debating all along. Lowest latency is for cap 1A, but most flexibility is for cap 2.  |
| Ericsson |  | Thank you all for the detailed explanation. It is also not our intention to require the UE to perform simultaneous processing of DL PRS and other DL signals/channels.As mentioned in our comment during the online, we want to ensure that the network (i.e., the serving gNB) can indicate to the UE which among DL PRS measurement/processing and processing of other DL signals/channels is higher priority. If the network does not have much control over controlling the priority, we don’t see much use case for this enhancement in a IIoT scenario. So, the current formulation is not agreeable to us. The network should know which is more important. i.e., if it is urgent URLLC data, the network should be able to ask the UE to prioritize DL PDSCH over measurement/processing of DL PRS. Note that this is the main condition for us to agree to a compromise. So, we prefer not to discuss this separately. If this is not agreeable, we are also ok not to pursue MG-less PRS measurements in Rel-17. Also, does the serving gNB know the location of the prioritization window? The following note implies that the serving gNB does not configure the prioritization window, or?* + Note: Strive to avoid PRS-processing-window request and/or configuration signalings between UE and serving gNB that would increase the positioning latency.

In our view, the serving gNB needs to know where the prioritization window is in order to minimize collision between DL PRS and other signals as much as possible. So we suggest to delete this Note or make it FFS.Regarding the PRS conditions, we think alt 1 could be sufficient. For alt2, we do not support the details of conditions in alt2. It seems that such conditions are more RAN4 responsibility if a requirement is defined. From RAN1 perspective, for capability 2 to work in alt2, what matters is that the non-serving cell should be in the same active bandwidth part/numerology as the serving cell, and the serving cell should be made aware of the non-serving cell PRS pattern to be able to predict what data symbols will be dropped. Taking the above comments from us into account, we propose the following revised proposal with tracked changes:Proposal 4.5-1* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, subject to the serving gNB configuring/indicating DL PRS to be higher priority, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.
			* Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
				+ FFS: band or CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window
		- A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.
			* FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.)
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
	+ Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement
	+ Note: When the serving gNB configures/indicates higher priority for other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing, the UE is not expected to measure/process DL PRS which is applicable to all of the above capability options.
		- FFS: further details of which other DL signals/channels to be prioritized
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa.
 |
| Qualcomm |  | Thanks to Ericsson for the reply. How could we satisfy “subject to the serving gNB configuring/indicating DL PRS to be higher priority” without increasing latency?* If UE, after it gets the Location request, it asks for permission from the serving gNB, it will be like UE asking for MG request, so no latency reduction compared to MG-based processing. We could do DCI/MAC-Ce but these are the same solutions as MG-based procedure.
	+ So, i assume having the UE to ask for request to prioritize PRS would not differentiate enough from MG-based solutions.
* Is your thinking that the LMF asks for permission from the serving gNB to send a low-latency PRS request to the UE?
	+ Wouldn’t that introduce an additional NRPPa signaling/handsake between the LMF and the ~~UE~~ gNB that is not needed in the current architecture?

To E//: Would it be acceptable to change from “gNB sending indication” to: “subject to UE determining that PRS is higher priority than other channels”, so that we can discuss different ways (implicit, or explicit, or signaling from LMF after it has done a handsake with the serving gNB), instead of focusing on a specific solution on how the UE will determine that PRS has higher priority? New Proposal 4.5-1* Subject to UE capability, support PRS measurement outside the MG, within a PRS processing window, and UE measurement inside the active DL BWP with PRS having the same numerology as the active DL BWP.
	+ Inside the PRS processing window, subject to the UE determining that DL PRS to be higher priority, support the following UE capabilities:
		- Capability 1: PRS prioritization over all other DL signals/channels in all symbols inside the window.
			* Cap. 1A: The DL signals/channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected.
			* Cap. 1B: Only the DL signals/channels from a certain band/CC are affected.
				+ FFS: band or CC
		- Capability 2: PRS prioritization over other DL signals/channels only in the PRS symbols inside the window
		- A UE shall be able to declare a PRS processing capability outside MG.
			* FFS: Details of capability signalling (e.g., per UE or per band, etc.)
	+ For the purpose of this feature, PRS-related conditions are expected to be specified, with the following to be down-selected:
		- Alt. 1: Applicable to serving cell PRS only
		- Alt. 2: Applicable to all PRS under conditions to PRS of non-serving cell.
	+ ~~Note: Strive not to increase the PRS measurement time compared with Rel-16 MG-based measurement~~
	+ Note: When the UE determining higher priority for other DL signals/channels over the PRS measurement/processing, the UE is not expected to measure/process DL PRS which is applicable to all of the above capability options.
		- FFS: further details of which other DL signals/channels to be prioritized
		- FFS: How the UE determines that DL PRS is higher priority
	+ Further study
		- Whether UE can do the measurement for both inside MG (if MG is configured) and outside MG in a measurement period
		- How to do the PRS measurement when the conditions cannot be satisfied, e.g. when BWP switching happens
		- Prioritization conditions of processing PRS over other DL channels/signals or vice versa.
 |
| Ericsson |  | @Qualcomm: Thanks for the revised proposal and for the good discussion. We are not thinking about UE requesting permission to prioritize PRS over other signals from the gNB. To us, it is crucial that the serving gNB maintains control of what happens to the serving cell traffic. The indicator from the serving gNB can be sent via RRC or DCI to the UE, and this indicator signals to the UE the priority of the data channels/signals compared to PRS (i.e., whether the data channels/signals are of higher priority or lower priority compared to PRS). There are some priority indication mechanisms introduced in rel-16 for URLLC, we could do something similar here, the details of which can be discussed later. But we are not fixed to a particular solution as long as the serving gNB can have control over the priority of different DL channels/signals.Note that the priority level of PRS can also be notified to LMF so that the LMF would know which PRS can be measured with high priority, without having to ask for permission. Again, the detailed solution can be discussed later.The alternative to indicating/configuring priority is discard all traffic when PRS is transmitted, effectively making the solution worse than using measurement gaps from the network efficiency perspective. At least with measurement gaps, the network can plan traffic around some of the PRSs (the one present in gaps). Without a priority indication, the network would have to assume that all PRS are measured at all time by the UE.On your latest revisived proposal, could we list down some high-level alternatives for how the UE determines the priority of the DL PRS? May be it is useful to understand which other ways companies are thinking of determining priority. I assume the network still controls the priority of different DL channels/signals compared to DL PRS. I added one Alt below. Please feel free to add more alternatives so that we have a better understanding of what companies have in mind:* FFS: How the UE determines DL PRS’s priority based on one or more of the following:
	+ Alt 1: Based on indication/configuration from serving gNB
 |
|  |  |  |

# UL grant for measurement report

## General information

The following sources mentioned enhancements on UL grant for measurement report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Samsung [5] | **Proposal 1:** Configured grant PUSCH type 1 and type 2 is used for positioning measurement report in order to reduce the latency. **Proposal 2:** The DG PUSCH with high priority is considered for positioning measurement report to reduce the latency. |
| CATT [6] | **Proposal 4:** To reduce the measurement latency, support LMF to inform serving gNB when the UE will report location measurement result, which allows the serving gNB sends the UL grant to UE before the measurement gap. The UL grant schedules the UL resource for the UE to send the measurement report in a proper time right after the measurement gap.  |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 1:** UE could request the expected measurement report resource from the serving gNB via RRC signaling to minimize the positioning measurement report delay. |
| LGE [12] | **Proposal 2:** * For latency reduction of positioning measurement reporting, preconfigured resource based measurement reporting (e.g., CG-based PUSCH) should be introduced.

**Proposal 3:** * If CG-based PUSCH is applied for positioning measurement report, ‘the lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of measurement gap(s) (MG(s)) (which is discussed as a method for MG enhancement in the previous meeting [2]) can be reused for activation of CG-based PUSCH resources for positioning measurement reporting.

**Proposal 4:** * The information for indicating which CG-based PUSCH is used for is necessary to be included in lower layer signaling for triggering/activation of MG(s) when CG-based PUSCH is supported for the MG without case.
 |
| Apple [15] | **Proposal 7**: At least for the case of M-BWP switching, NW configures (as part of M-BWP configuration and/or indication) PUSCH resource for UE to report positioning measurements and/or location information* The grant is specifically configured for positioning measurement report, e.g. Nx symbols after the end of last symbol of last DL-PRS resource, or after the end of M-BWP
* Nx is determined based on UE capability
 |
| Xiaomi [18] | **Proposal 3:** Support PRS measurement report by PUSCH including configured grant PUSCH and dynamic grant PUSCH. |

**For enhancement on assistance for the PUSCH resource to contain the measurement report**

* Samsung generally support CG and higher priority DG PUSCH to carry the positioning measurement report.
* CATT proposed to support LMF indication to the gNB on the measurement reporting time.
* Nokia proposed to support UE indication to the gNB on the measurement reporting resource (PUSCH) via RRC.
* LGE proposed to support CG-PUSCH for positioning measurement reporting, and propose to define joint request and activation of CG-PUSCH and MG with lower layer signaling.
* Apple proposed to support joint configuration/indication/grant of M-BWP and PUSCH resource.
* Xiaomi proposed to support CG-PUSCH and DG-PUSCH for measurement report.

## Round 1

Based on the input, and considering that this issue was discussed in RAN1#105-e, and some companies expressed concern, the FL has the following initial tentative proposal.

**Proposal 5.1-1**

* Further study assistance information to the gNB for configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the positioning measurement report, where the assistance information includes at least the expected time of the positioning measurement report.
	+ Note: the PUSCH may include dynamic grant (DG) based PUSCH and configured grant (CG) based PUSCH (type 1 and type 2)
	+ FFS initiated from UE or LMF
	+ FFS details of assistance information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | OK to study. However, our feeling is that even if the reporting time is provided to the gNB, gNB still does not know the scheduled payload size for the PUSCH, which means a BSR is anyway needed. Yet RAN2 already defined how BSR is reported, and we think this needs RAN2 MAC expert to check. |
| ZTE |  | There is no impact in RAN1 since location report is a NAS message, prefer to discuss it in RAN2. |
| OPPO |  | That shall be dicussed in RAN2, not RAN1. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  |  |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Ericsson |  | We don’t see the RAN1 impact. Better to leave this to RAN2 |
| Samsung  | Yes | We think the related PUSCH configuration design should belong to RAN1’s work, i.e., it involves the CG-PUSCH configuration periodicity and starting position of the PUSCH and so on. Surely joint attention from both RAN1 and RAN2 will be needed. |

## Round 2

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 5.1-1*** Further study assistance information to the gNB for configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the positioning measurement report, where the assistance information includes at least the expected time of the positioning measurement report.
	+ Note: the PUSCH may include dynamic grant (DG) based PUSCH and configured grant (CG) based PUSCH (type 1 and type 2)
	+ FFS initiated from UE or LMF
	+ FFS details of assistance information
 |

FL comment: It seems like most concerning companies see it can be up to RAN2 to decide. We can have a second round to see if an LS to RAN2 is needed.

**Proposal 5.2-1 (High priority)**

* Send an LS to RAN2, with the following information
	+ RAN1 considers it beneficial in terms of reducing latency to support assistance information to the gNB for configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the positioning measurement report, where the assistance information includes at least the expected time of the positioning measurement report.
	+ The assistance information can be either from UE or LMF, subject to RAN2 consideration.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | I guess the main bullet should say RAN2 not RAN4, we support the intention. FL: fixed. Thanks you. |
| OPPO |  | This is part of RAN2 work and why do we RAN1 make decision and suggest it to RAN2? In our view, such a LS is not needed. If RAN2 think such scheme is benefical, they would do their job. We do not think we need to discuss the work that shall be done by RAN2, not RAN1.FL: I think the intention here is to provide RAN1 perspective on the benefit, which can be taken into account in RAN2 future work. I believe RAN2 is now struggling with multiple options on similar functionalities but for other purposes (not for latency). |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | OK for the proposal. We should treat Proposal 3.2-1 in the same way. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Apple | OK |  |
| Ericsson |  | We share similar concerns with OPPO. This is clearly in the scope of RAN2, and RAN2 has the competence to decide if this is beneficial or not. No need for RAN1 to tell them that RAN1 finds this beneficial. We do not support sending this LS. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |

FL comment:

Based on the comments received, only two companies expressed concern on the necessity of the LS to RAN2. I think the can be discussed in the GTW, on whether we need an LS to RAN2.

### After GTW

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:RAN1 considers it beneficial in terms of reducing latency to support assistance information to the gNB for configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the positioning measurement report, where the assistance information includes at least the expected time of the positioning measurement report. |

## Round 3

Some refinement on the wording seems necessary. It is clear that we may not have concensus to conclude the benefit from RAN1 perspective. Then I think it could be useful to conclude on this aspect given the wide support. I drafted a tentative proposal for conclusion, please provide the comments/revision.

### Proposal 5.3-1 (High priority, for conclusion)

* It is up to RAN2 to decide whether or not to support assistance information to the gNB for the configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the positioning measurement report, whereas the benefit in terms of reducing physical layer latency for positioning was observed by the majority of sources in RAN1.
	+ The assistance information includes at least the expected time of the positioning measurement report.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | According to our RAN3 colleagues, it seems RAN3 has agreed this week LMF assistance information to gNB that restrics the gNB to send the measurement response within a certain time. The related email discussion can be found in R3-214310. It seems the above conclusion is highlinghting the same issue (i.e., in the first subbullet). But given the RAN3 agreement this week, do we still need the conclusion in RAN1?Other than assistance information to the gNB, various other enhancements are proposed by companies according to FL summary above. But not sure if we RAN1 can have a broad conclusion saying that all these proposals are beneficial in terms of reducing physical layer latency. Plus, such conlusions are more suitable for SI TR. We are now in a WI phase. Perhaps what can be written down is the list of proposals for specific enhancements proposed by companies for assistance information to the gNB for the configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH that carries the measurement report. The rest can be left to RAN2 to decide. |
| ZTE |  | As mentioned by ERicsson, since RAN2/RAN3 is discussing the proposal, it’s anyway will be decided by RAN2/RAN3. We don’t need the LS. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We support this conclusion. We sympathize with Ericsson that this would have been better discussed in the SI but we unfortunately did not have time. We only had extremely high level discussions and that is reflected in the vague objectives in the WID w.r.t. latency. From our side this conclusion helps RAN2 to at least see what RAN1 finds beneficial and at worst doesn’t harm anything to have it.  |
| Apple |  | Support |
| Xiaomi |  | We support this conclusion.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support the conclusion. If RAN3 made the decision to make LMF send expected time of positioning report to the gNB, If RAN2 decides to proeed with the work, RAN2 can work on the details (how to make the UE deliver the report by the time). Detailed solutions such as CG/DG-based solutions may be discussed in RAN1 and RAN2 jointly. It may help RAN2 to prioritize discussions if RAN1 identifies that there are benefits in latency reduction with configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH configuration/scheduling of the PUSCH. |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Ideally we would have preferred an agreement on this aspect along the similar lines made with regard to the benefits of response times in the previous RAN1#105-e meeting, which was also sent to RAN2. If RAN2 is expected to do some work to reduce the PHY layer latency, an LS should be sent to them at the very least. It seems strange that RAN1 has identified the benefits of reducing the PHY layer latency (within RAN1 scope) but are not doing anything actionable aside from drawing a conclusion. Nonetheless, we are also fine to support the conclusion. |
| FL |  | According to the t-doc from RAN3 (thanks for Ericsson), indeed RAN3 is discussing something similar.In 3.2, the NRPPa response time, the same mechanism as LPP response time was introduce, but I do not think this has relevance to the discussion here.In 3.3, they discussed the assistance information from LMF to assist CG-SDT configuration, which I believe is more relevant to the discussion here, although the movitivation is different.So from RAN1 perspective, it should be useful also to provide the latency benefit for such an information (in addition to the INACTIVE state positioning), whether it comes from LMF (as RAN3 discussed) or from the UE can be further decided by RAN2/RAN3.Reply to Ericsson: I think the effort attempting to extract the commonality among various sources could help proceed the discussion, so that at least some high level concept can be adopted, and then we can work on details. |

# Triggering PRS and measurement report in lower layers

## General information

The following sources mentioned lower layer triggered PRS (AP/SP PRS) and positioning measurement report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 15:** * + - The request of the measurement via MAC-CE and/or physical layer procedure should be supported.
 |
| CATT [6] | **Proposal 1:** AP PRS and SP-PRS receptions triggered by serving gNB should be supported for single gNB positioning, in which a UE is informed to measure the DL PRS of the TRPs of the same gNB. **Proposal 2:** Reception of AP-PRS or SP-PRS triggered by LMF through LPP message should be supported. **Proposal 3:** UE can be triggered to receive periodic PRS through the DCI or MAC CE to reduce the latency. |
| Apple [15] | **Proposal 5**: NW provides assistance data to UE based on which UE is configured with one or more MG configurations and A-PRSs associated with each MG. * A MG and PRS resources associated with that MG may be triggered/activated by UE specific DCI, or GC-DCI or MAC-CE signaling

**Proposal 6**: In case of A-PRS, triggered by lower layer signaling, collides with a SP/P-PRS, SP/P-PRS is fully or partially (only overlapping symbols) cancelled. |
| Xiaomi [18] | **Proposal 1:** on-demand PRS should support periodical transmission, semi-persistent transmission and aperiodic transmission.**Proposal 2:** gNB initiated of on-demand PRS transmission can be supported by RRC, MAC CE and DCI.**Proposal 5:** Suggest to associate a state ID with a PRS configuration, a measurement gap configuration and a PRS measurement report configuration, and MAC CE or DCI can activate/deactivate or trigger the PRS measurement report by indicating a state ID. |

**On AP/SP PRS**

* Supported by: CATT [6], Apple [15], Xiaomi [18]

**On measurement reported triggered by lower layers**

* Supported by: vivo [3], CATT [6], Xiaomi [18]

## Round 1

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

**Proposal 6.1-1**

* Study mechanisms to support AP-PRS and SP-PRS reception.
	+ Note: including priority between periodic PRS and AP-PRS/SP-PRS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | No | Suggest to discuss AP/SP PRS along with on-demand PRS.  |
| CMCC |  | Based on the discussion during the last RAN1 meeting, seems that most companies agreed that AP/SP-PRS is out of the scope of R17 WI. On the other hand, it is not precluded to use low layer signaling (e.g., MAC-CE, DCI) to trigger the on-demand DL PRS, therefore, we agree with Nokia that it can be discussed under the on-demand DL PRS AI. |
| ZTE |  | Related to on-demand PRS. |
| OPPO |  | Ok to study. |
| LG |  | We prefer to discuss it under on-demand PRS AI. |
| Xiaomi | Yes  | We are fine to study it here or along with on-demand PRS. |
| SONY |  | Similar view as NOKIA, it is strongly related to on-demand PRS |
| Qualcomm | Comments | Even though we were supportive of this feature earlier on, it was within the context of LMF in the RAN: Latency reduction is achieavable only in the case of LMF in the RAN. This feature is not included, so having AP/SP-PRS would not reduce the latency. Even in the on-demand PRS, the configuration will happen from LPP directly; there is no architecture support or discussions in RAN2/RAN3 to enable any different type of signaling.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| Ericsson | no | There are already too many study proposals and with only two meetings left in the release we should not open new issues. If this can be related to on demand PRS, we are ok to discuss it there.  |

**Proposal 6.1-2**

* Study mechanisms to support positioning measurement and measurement report triggered via lower layers.
	+ Note: lower layer-based MG activation is a separate issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Okay to study |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | OK to study. However this would require gNB/LMF coordination since the origainl measurement request should be from LMF. |
| ZTE |  | We don’t think this should be discussed for LMF-centered architecture.  |
| OPPO |  | Ok to study |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  |  |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Since it’s a study, ok to discuss. |
| Qualcomm | Comments | Even though we were supportive of this feature earlier on, it was within the context of LMF in the RAN: Latency reduction is achieavable only in the case of LMF in the RAN. This feature is not included, so having low-layer reporting would not reduce the latency.  |
| Ericsson | no | We don’t think we should expand the architecture beyond LPP/NRPPa. Therefore we don’t support lower layer triggering of measurement. Additionally we have a similar comment to 6.1-1. There are already too many study proposals and with only two meetings left in the release we should not open new issues.  |

## Round 2

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 6.1-1* Study mechanisms to support AP-PRS and SP-PRS reception.
	+ Note: including priority between periodic PRS and AP-PRS/SP-PRS.
 |

FL comment: based on the input so far, it is advised to discuss it with on-demand PRS. If on-demand PRS introduced lower layer triggering mechanism, it can be regarded as “AP/SP-PRS”. I have the following proposal for conclusion.

### Proposal 6.2-1 (for conclusion, closed)

* The support AP-PRS and SP-PRS is subject to the discussion of the on-demand PRS objective.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Support the conclusion.  |
| OPPO |  | Ok with the conclusion in principle |
| Qualcomm | Comments | As we pointed out, we don’t really see the connection of AP/SP-PRS to the on-demand, given the current architecture. We tend to believe that Latency reduction using AP/SP-PRS is not possible (or is not significant enough) with current architecture. |
| CATT |  | fine with the conclusion. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are fine with the conclusion |
| LG |  | Agree for conclusion. |
| Sony |  | Support the conclusion |
| ZTE |  | Ok for the conclusion. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 6.1-2*** Study mechanisms to support positioning measurement and measurement report triggered via lower layers.
	+ Note: lower layer-based MG activation is a separate issue.
 |

FL comment: based on the comment received, it is not clear how latency reduction can be achieved based on 5GC LMF architecture. Some company suggested that that even if it is lower layer triggered, it needs coordinate between LMF and gNB first. We can have a second round discussion mainly to address the concern.

### Follow-up discussion for Proposal 6.1-2 (Closed)

Please proponents of the proposal try to address the concern received so far including

* How latency gain is justified considering the current LCS architecture.
* Any specific handling between LMF and gNB.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| LG | Yes | As we all know, in the proposal 5.2-1, CG-PUSCH and DG-PUSCH are currently considered for measurement report. Considering it, if related information such as activation/trigerring is transmitted before PRS measurement, for example, we believe that it will reduce the latency because additional procedure for scheduling request is not required anymore.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Round 3

We do not have round 3 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Discuss potential AP-PRS and SP-PRS in the on-demand PRS agenda, with justified latency reduction for the current architecture.
* Consider whether following aspect is essential to latency improvement
	+ Mechanisms to support positioning measurement and measurement report triggered via lower layers.

# SRS priority

## General information

The following sources mentioned enhancements on SRS priority.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 6**: RAN1 should study and work on new priority rules of transmitting SRS for positioning with other UL signals/channels, in order to reduce positioning latency for UL and DL+UL positioning methods. |
| CMCC [11] | **Proposal 5:** The SRS for positioning priority enhancements is within the WI scope, and should be further studied. **Proposal 6:** Support introducing physical layer priority indication for SRS for positioning. |

## Round 1

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

**Proposal 7.1-1**

* For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, at least support dropping of lower priority PUSCH that is overlapped with higher priority positioning SRS.
* FFS: How priority is indicated.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| CATT |  | We don’t see the need to have the requirement. Both SRS and PUSCH are scheduled by the gNB. It should be up to gNB’s scheduler to schedule the UL resources and avoid the overlapping of the UL resources for PUSCH and SRS.FL: I believe the intention here is that gNB may have changed its mind during the scheduling for the purpose of priorizing a task over another. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | We think that enhancing SRS priority benefits more on accuracy than latency, but anyway this enhancement should be discussed in R17 WI, as what we have already agreed in the SI phase.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We have some difficulty understanding how dropping SRS would impact latency. At least based on our understanding, this is related to accuracy, if gNB also does 4 sample measurement, in which case only 3 samples will be used for average.There is no gNB measurement period requirement, and whether a dropping of SRS at UE/failure of measurement at TRP would result in extension of measurement period of the TRP. |
| ZTE |  | Doubt the need to discuss this since Rel-16 supports SP-SRS and AP-SRS, which enables enough flexibility. |
| OPPO |  | We do not see motivation to support that. The collison between SRS for positioning and other UL signal can be avoid or minimized by scheduling in the serving cell because both SRS for positioning and other UL signal are configured by the same serving cell.  |
| LG | Yes | We are supportive of the proposal. In terms of latency, we think the priority of SRS also needs to be considered. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support the proposal. Prioritiy rules for SRS are used to achieve flexbile shceduling. This feature is useful for latency reduction and performance enhancement. |
| Ericsson | yes | Ok to discuss further.  |

## Round 2

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 7.1-1*** For the purpose of positioning latency reduction, at least support dropping of lower priority PUSCH that is overlapped with higher priority positioning SRS.
* FFS: How priority is indicated.
 |

FL comment: based on the comment received, it is not clear whether such an enhancement is needed. Some company suggested it might impact accuracy instead of latency, while others think it should be up to gNB’s scheduler to handling that case. We can have a second round discussion mainly to address the concern.

### Follow-up discussion for Proposal 7.1-1 (Closed)

Please proponents of the proposal try to address the concern received so far including

* Why this is related to latency, instead of accuracy.
* Why this cannot be left up to gNB implementation.
* Necessity given that Rel-16 already supported SP/AP SRS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB |  | If the UE is configured with SRS for positioning but drops some of the occasions due to other signals (e.g., lower priority PUSCH) then it will take longer for the UE to transmit SRS for positioning. Therefore, it will take longer to complete the measurement and finish the positioning estimation. Especially in the case where the SRS may have a longer periodicity (e.g., 50 ms or higher) this can have a big impact on the latency. As commented by Huawei the gNB may change its mind about certain traffic. In addition, the gNB may not be fully aware of the urgency of some UL positioning procedures and therefore we don’t feel it is possible to leave up to gNB implementation. Periodic SRS is the baseline behavior in our understanding and it will be beneficial for many positioning use cases (e.g., asset tracking) for periodic signals to be used. So restricting UEs to only use SP/AP SRS is not a good solution in our mind.  |
| CATT |  | From the comments, it seems we are discussing the cases when the gNB scheduler does not schedule the PUSCH and SRS properly, which results in an overlapping of the UL transmission of the PUSCH and SRS. If the understanding is correct, then this seems to be corner cases that should/can be addressed through gNB implementation. At least, it is not an high-priority issue. |
| CMCC |  | We are supportive of this enhancement, however, regarding Q1, we think that this benefits more on accuracy.Regarding Q2, we share similar views as Nokia. And a question for companies supporting gNB implementation, note that the priority indication and rules were discussed and introduced in R16 URLLC UL channels. Followed by the logic of gNB implementation, all UL transmissions are under the scheduling of gNB, then why URLLC agreed to do such enhancements. |
| InterDigital |  | We support Proposal 7.1-1. We present our views related to the questions in the follow-up discussion below.Assinging higher piroiritzation for SRS for positioning will increase the chance of requierd amount of SRS for positioning collected at gNB. Prioritization is intorduced for scheduling flexibilit. This has been the motivation for assigning prioritzation to SRS for MIMO in the past relesaes. SRS for positioning (with higher priority) and lower priority PUSCH can be intentionally scheduled in overlapping resources and allow the UE to transmit SRS for positioning. SP/AP SRS can be dropped as well if they collide with channels with higher priority and we do not think they can replace benefits of periodic PRS.  |
| LG |  | As we all know, the priority of SRS for positioning currently has not described in the current specification and it follows SRS for MIMO and we have been discussed many things to reduce the latency. Because of this, we've been discussed the priority in the SI and decided to discuss the related issues in the WI. We think that we need to open the issue again and discuss it in detail. |

## Round 3

We do not have round 3 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Consider whether following aspect is essential to latency improvement
	+ Define a new priority rule between positioning SRS and PUSCH

# Multi-stage measurement report

## General information

The following sources mentioned enhancements on measurement report with multiple stages.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| ZTE [2] | **Proposal 1:** In order to reduce UE measurement time of a location information report, LMF should be allowed to select a subset of DL PRS from DL PRS in ProvideAssistanceData message for UE to measure and report the location information report.**Proposal 2:** In order to get quick response of an early location information report, LMF should be able to configure an early location information report associated DL PRS used to derive the early location information report.**Proposal 3:** For the purpose of reporting new location measurements in time, Rel-17 should allow UE to report multiple early location information reports prior to a response time. |
| Lenovo [19] | **Proposal 1:** RAN1 to support explicit priority indications to increase flexibility of the UE of processing and providing different low latency measurement reports to the LMF, which is applicable to the following:* Assistance Data (e.g., subset of PRS resources, TRP, beam info).
* Measurement and Reporting Configurations (enable multiple low latency response times).
 |

## Round 1

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

### Proposal 8.1-1 (Closed)

* Further study procedures to enable positioning measurement reports in multiple stages, including
	+ Multiple response times
	+ Relationship with early location report.
	+ Whether and how PRS resources for measurement and report are selected in each stage.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Okay |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support, enables improved flexibility of reporting different measurements with different latency constraints. |
| Ericsson |  | We don’t see the ran1 impact of the proposal. shouldn’t this be treated by ran2? |
| ZTE | Yes | As mentioned in our contribution, the measurement period defined in TS 38.133 has to consider all DL PRS configured in ProvideAssistanceData message for a location information report as shown in the equation in section 1. For example, the value of the measurement period shall consider the processing time of DL PRS from all positioning frequency layers and all TRPs, which leads to large UE processing latency. Third sub-bullet enables LMF to select some of DL PRS from assistance data so that a quick report can be acquired.In addition, we prefer to avoid using multiple-stage,* Further study procedures to enable more flexible positioning measurement reports ~~in multiple stages~~, including
	+ Multiple response times
	+ Relationship with early location report.
	+ Whether and how PRS resources for measurement and report are selected from assistance data ~~in each stage~~.
 |

FL comment: There is limited input showing less interest among companies. Some companies think that this should better be discussed in RAN2.

## Round 2

We do not have round 2 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Consider whether following aspects are essential to latency improvement
	+ A flexible positioning measurement report with multiple response time QoS
	+ Selected PRS resources each the report from the assistance data

# Additional UE PRS processing capability

## General information

The following sources mentioned additional UE PRS processing capability.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei [1] | **Proposal 3:**  Support a new set of (N, T) with N being the slot duration or 1 msec value.* The measurement period requirement if UE supports multiple sets of (N, T) (one for Rel-16, and one for Rel-17) is adapted to be the smaller one.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to ask them to check the feasibility of the following equation.

|  |
| --- |
| $T\_{RSTD,i}=\min\_{j}\left(CSSF\_{PRS,i}\*N\_{RxBeam,i}\*\left⌈\frac{N\_{PRS,i}^{slot}}{N^{'}}\right⌉\left⌈\frac{L\_{available\\_PRS,i}}{N\_{j}}\right⌉\*N\_{sample}-1\right)\*T\_{effect,i,j}+T\_{last}$ $T\_{effect,i,j}$ is the periodicity of the PRS RSTD measurement in positioning frequency layer i for the jth set of PRS processing capability defined as: $$T\_{effect, i,j} =\left⌈\frac{T\_{i,j}}{T\_{available\\_PRS,i }}\right⌉\*T\_{available\\_PRS,i}$$ |

 |
| Lenovo [19] | **Proposal 4:** Introduce additional T values for UE (N,T) processing capabilities. FFS suitable T values that meet <10 ms requirement. |

## Round 1

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

### Proposal 9.1-1 (For email endorsement)

* Further study the benefit of introducing additional UE PRS processing capability(ies) for the purpose of latency reduction.
	+ Note: UE PRS processing capability without MG is a separate issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Yes | Okay with further study |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Okay to study |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes  |  |
| Lenovo,Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | OKay for further study. |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

FL comment: It seems we have some consensus for this proposal. I will propose it for email endorsement for the first check point.

## Round 2

# Other proposals

## General information

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| vivo [3] | **Proposal 1:** * + Physical layer latency reduction should be independent of scheduled location time.
	+ The method with scheduled location time can be considered as a further optimization to be discussed in Rel-17 if scheduled location time is supported.
 |
| Nokia [7] | **Proposal 7:** RAN1 should study mechanisms for controlling and/or assessing the way the UE performs positioning measurements, e.g. how flexible the beamed IF measurement is, and how long each measurement gap needs to be. **Proposal 8:** RAN 1 should study solutions which can accommodate a reduced positioning session, in the sense that they allow for a reduced measurement report from UE, based on the RX beam information of the UE.**Proposal 9***:* RAN 1 should study mechanisms and/or revise the current SRS transmission/reception procedure to optimize for latency, particularly for higher carrier frequencies and for densely populated cells. |
| Qualcomm [10] | **Proposal 6:** For low latency positioning, support a UE to report as a UE capability the $N\_{rxbeam}$ for the case that the UE receives a low-latency positioning request.  |
| IDC [14] | **Proposal 7:** Support dynamic muting of PRS. |
| Xiaomi [18] | **Proposal 9:** To indicate the first arrival path by reporting the arrival time of each beam in beam measurement report. |
| Ericsson [20] | **Proposal 4** Do not support lower PRS periodicities for DL PRS in rel17.* + Note: periodicity of measurement reporting is a separate discussion
 |

## Round 1

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

**Suggestions from proponents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | With regards to Proppsoal 6* **Proposal 6:** For low latency positioning, support a UE to report as a UE capability the $N\_{rxbeam}$ for the case that the UE receives a low-latency positioning request.

We are just saying that in FR2, RAN4 decided to add a fixed “8” in the measurement period. So, even if RAN4 eventually supports N-sample=1, in FR2, the measurement period will be 8, unless someone addresses the Nrxbeam factor. If the motivation is clear, we can reword the above propsaol to say: * Enhancements related to the UE Rx beam sweeping factor ($N\_{RxBeam,i}$ )for the purpose or reduing latency can be studied further.
 |
| InterDigital |  | Dynamic muting is to allow the UE or netwrok to reconfigure muting patterns dynamically such that PRS reception can be changed flexibily. We see beneifts of this feature in terms of latency reduction. |
|  |  |  |

FL comments:

**Number Rx beam capability:** I think the number of Rx beams can be discussed for latency reduction at least for FR2, since the benefit is straightforward.

**Dynamic muting:** Since in proposal 6.2-1, the current wayforward to merge AP/SP PRS with on-demand PRS, is it possible to consider this as part of the “AP PRS” to be discussed with on-demand PRS?

## Round 2

Based on request from individual companies, let’s have a second round on the collection of views if companies are willing to share.

### Follow-up discussion (Closed)

Please companies provide their on the following aspects

* Define a new UE capability on the number of Rx beams (<8)
* Dynamic muting

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | Support the first bullet. Companies are encouraged to see that currently RAN4 has introduced a factor of “8” in any measurement period. It is straighfroward to do something about, and it needs to be optimizedDynamic-sginaling of muting is very similar to dynamic AP-PRS, and should be discussed there.  |
| ZTE |  | For the first bullet, we think it could be useful for FR2. Aside from new UE capability, we think LMF can also can request the number of Rx beams that is required to be used in a measurement report, which is similar to what we have agreed for M-sample.For the second bullet, we share similar view with Qualcomm. |
|  |  |  |

## Round 3

We do not have round 3 discussion for this item in this meeting, nor do we need to list the study items in the Chair’s Notes. From FL perspective, I would like to provide some recommendation for the future work to help finalize this aspect.

### FL recommendation

* Companies are encouraged to consider whether the number of Rx beams can be changed (to lower than 8) subject to UE capability in FR2.

# Conclusion

The following proposal are to be discussed in the GTW session.

**DL-PRS measurement without MG**

**Assistance information for the positioning measurement report**