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# Introduction

This document provides a summary of the following email discussion for AI 8.5.1:

[108-e-R17-ePos-01] Email discussion for maintenance on accuracy improvements by mitigating UE Rx/Tx and/or gNB Rx/Tx timing delays – Ren Da (CATT)

* 1st check point: February 25
* Final check point: March 3

One of the RAN1 objectives of this work item is to:

* *Specify* ***methods****,* ***measurements****,* ***signalling, and procedures*** *for improving positioning accuracy of the Rel-16 NR positioning methods by mitigating UE Rx/Tx and/or gNB Rx/Tx timing delays, including [RAN1]*
  + DL, UL and DL+UL positioning methods
  + UE-based and UE-assisted positioning solutions

The WI was closed in RAN#94e from RAN1’s perspective. The document covers the remaining issues related to related to the accuracy improvements by mitigating UE Rx/Tx and/or gNB Rx/Tx timing delays based on the contributions [1-16]:

**Notes:**

* The following highlights will be used in this summary:
  + “Pink highlights” are used for proposals with high priority
  + “Turquoise highlights” are used for offline consensus/conclusion
  + “Grey highlights” are used for proposals resolved in this meeting.

Note: The above priority highlights are used mainly as a suggestion of the priority for *online* discussion. The priority indications may be changed based on the received comments. During the email discussion, interested companies are encouraged to provide comments to all proposals regardless of the priority indications.

* When providing the comments, it would be helpful to indicate explicitly whether to“*support*”, or “*not support*”, or provide a suggestion of modification. A comment of “*high/low priority*” is only interpreted as a suggestion for the priority for email/online discussions. For a proposal with multiple options, it would be helpful to indicate which of the option(s) are “*supported*” and/or “*preferred*”.
* For a proposed enhancement, if we cannot reach a consensus, we may conclude that “*a consensus cannot be reached for the proposed enhancement*” for this email discussion in this meeting. It does not necessarily mean the proposed enhancement will not be further discussed in future meetings.

# Methods for mitigating UE/TRP Tx/Rx timing errors

## Reporting of SRS port IDs with the RTOA measurements

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 1:*** *It is up to RAN3 to decide whether to support SRS port ID reporting associated with RTOA measurement.*

FL Comments

The proposal to support gNB to report the associated SRS port ID for improving the positioning performance was discussed in the previous meetings, but only a few companies provided the comments during the email discussions [17]. In [1], it suggests leaving the reporting of the SRS ports with RTOA measurement for RAN3. In FL’s understanding, the support of SRS port ID reporting has no impact on UE side.

### (Closed) Question 2.1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposals should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 1*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | We think that reporting port-specific RTOA can have benefits of supporting high accuracy positioning for the legacy UEs.  The change is quite simple and can be directly discussed by RAN3.  We support this proposal. |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support this proposal to be discussed by RAN3. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  | Support the proposal for MIMO-SRS |
| OPPO |  | No | Is it only for SRS for MIMO, or for both SRS for MIMO and SRS for positioning?  For SRS for positioning, the mechanism based on TEG has been supported.  For SRS for MIMO, the mapping of SRS port(s) and the RF chain(s)/antenna(s) may be changed without notifying gNB. Thus, how about the performance for this case? |
| ZTE |  |  | Interested companies can bring their proposals in RAN3. We don’t need to further discuss it in RAN1. |
| CMCC |  |  | Up to RAN3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 |  |  | Reply to OPPO:  Assuming a 2-port SRS resource, the RTOA measuremnets from 2 TRPs measuring the same port 1001 at the same time can be ideally UE Tx group delay free. A TRP may choose to measure both ports 1000 and 1001, and LMF may combine the all RTOA measurements for port 1000 associated with a transmission occasion and combine all RTOA meausrements for port 1001 assocaited with a transmission occasion, and jointly determine the UE location without specifying UE behaviour at all. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | We are fine to leave this to RAN3. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  | Support this proposal to be discussed by RAN3. |
| LGE |  | O | We think RAN1 does not need to discuss the proposal. |
| Intel |  | No | Low priority for maintenance phase in Rel-17 |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback from the companies, 5 companies (Huawei, CATT, Fraunhofer, Ericsson, DCM) support the proposal, while while 5 companies (vivo, OPPO, LGE, Intel, Qualcomm) do not support it. It seems difficult to reach the consensus on the proposal. Thus, FL would suggest the proponent to bring the proposal directly to RAN3, and close the discussionof the issue in this meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Additional comments** |
| InterDigital2 | @Huawei, thank you for illustration. The example illustrated can be one of the cases. Alternatively, at time 2, SRS0-Tx0 can be associated with TEG1. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Reporting of UE Tx TEGs

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 4****: For static SRS-TEG association, UE may report the association before positioning SRS transmission.*

FL: Suggest focusing on whether to support the reporting of Tx TEG association before SRS transmission w/o defining the static/dynamic SRS-TEG association, since it is up to UE to determine the change of the TEG association based on RAN4’s LS. Further discussion in Proposal 3.2-1.

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 5****: For dynamic SRS-TEG association, UE shall only report the association for the previously transmitted SRS.*

FL: Suggest focusing on whether to support the reporting of Tx TEG association before SRS transmission w/o defining the static/dynamic SRS-TEG association, since it is up to UE to determine the change of the TEG association based on RAN4’s LS. Further discussion in Proposal 3.2-1.

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 6****: For triggered SRS-TEG association reporting, it is up to RAN2 to consider whether to support it.*

FL: Further discussion in Proposal 3.2-1.

* ***(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 3****: Allow UE to respond to a request for Tx TEG associations with an indication that it will report, or has already reported, directly to LMF (if responding to gNB) or to gNB (if responding to LMF).*

FL: Similar proposal was discussed in the previous meeting but it was lack of the support. It seems the issue is not critical. Suggest checking with all companies to see if we want to have further discussion in this meeting.

* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 1:*** *Support the UE to report the association information between UE Tx TEG and SRS resource for UL-TDOA at periodically configured reporting occasion only if there is a change in the Tx TEG association compared to the last reporting.*

FL: Similar proposal was discussed intensively in the previous meeting. Given that RAN1 has made the decision of supporting periodic reporting, and RAN4 to decide the UE determines the previous association information is no longer valid, Suggest checking with all companies to see if we want to have further discussion in this meeting.

* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 2:*** *Support the UE to report the association information between UE Tx TEG and SRS resource whenever the UE determines the previous association information is no longer valid.*

FL: Similar proposal was discussed intensively in the previous meeting. Given that RAN1 has made the decision of supporting periodic reporting, and RAN4 to decide the UE determines the previous association information is no longer valid. Suggest no further discussion in this meeting.

* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 3:*** *Support validity time for TEG, i.e., within the validity time, the UE may not report the TEG association information.*

FL: Similar proposal was discussed in the previous meeting but it was lack of the support. Suggest no further discussion in this meeting.

* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12]) Proposal 1****: For M-RTT, support a UE to report, within the UE Rx-Tx measurement report, the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted, together with the associated timestamp(s) for which a particular association is valid.*
  + *Send an LS to RAN2 to continue the signaling design*

FL: Further discussion in Proposal 3.2-1.

* ***(LGE, R1-2202291[13]) Proposal 1:*** *Regarding measurement with different Rx TEGs at both UE and gNB, RAN1 should support that related information needs to be transmitted through location measurement request message (e.g. RequestLocationInformation for LPP and MEASUREMENT REQUEST for NRPPA)*

FL: High-layer message for Rx TEG reporting can be decided by RAN2/RAN3. Suggest no further discussion in this meeting.

FL comments

The time when LMF/gNB request UE to report UE TxTEG association and the time when UE transmits positioning SRS resources and the time when the gNB receives the SRS resources could all be different. For periodic reporting of UE TxTEG for UL-TDOA, the issue may not be critical since the LMF will obtain all of the updates of UE TxTEG association through the reportings, although it may cause positioning latency. For non-periodic reporting of UE TxTEG, than there may be a need to specify the time or time duration for the reporting of the UE TxTEG association.

### (Closed) Question 2.2

*Please indicate whether any of the following proposals should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + ***P1:*** *(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 3: Allow UE to respond to a request for Tx TEG associations with an indication that it will report, or has already reported, directly to LMF (if responding to gNB) or to gNB (if responding to LMF).*
  + ***P2:*** *(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 1: Support the UE to report the association information between UE Tx TEG and SRS resource for UL-TDOA at periodically configured reporting occasion only if there is a change in the Tx TEG association compared to the last reporting.*
  + ***P3:*** *(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 2: Support the UE to report the association information between UE Tx TEG and SRS resource whenever the UE determines the previous association information is no longer valid.*
  + ***P4:*** *(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 3: Support validity time for TEG, i.e., within the validity time, the UE may not report the TEG association information.*
  + ***P5:*** *(LGE, R1-2202291[13]) Proposal 1****:*** *Regarding measurement with different Rx TEGs at both UE and gNB, RAN1 should support that related information needs to be transmitted through location measurement request message (e.g. RequestLocationInformation for LPP and MEASUREMENT REQUEST for NRPPA)*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partly |  | P1: Not clear why we need this. The understanding of the Tx TEG reporting is initiated by LMF, and it appears that the proposal is addressing the issue LMF already requested gNB to get the TEG association from the UE, while LMF additionally request UE to report it directly again.  P2: We do not think this is needed. If there is such a need, we also need to define “change”.  P3: This triggered TEG change report relies on a clear definition of “change” in the first place. And we would like to note that this report is indicating future association for the SRS not transmitted yet.  P4: Why is this needed? If the association is not longer needed, network could simply request UE not to provide it any more. We think this should be directly discussed by RAN2.  P5: No need to discuss this. This is purely RAN2/RAN3 business, and we believe this is already supported. |
| CATT |  |  | We prefer the P1~P5 to be low priority. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| OPPO |  | No | For P1-\_4: The benefit is doubtable  For P5: Not RAN1 issue |
| ZTE |  |  | P1: No.  It’s up to LMF’s implementation. No further indication is needed.  P2/P3/P4: No  As we have already agreed in last meeting, it’s up to RAN2 to further design the details.  P5:No  It’s up to RAN2/RAN3 to design the corresponding signalings. |
| MTK |  | No | P1-P4: the benefit not clear  P5: seems not RAN1 issue |
| CMCC |  | No |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | P1 : We support to discuss this issue to reduce signaling overhead and redudancy  P2 : @ Huawei, the “change” here refers to a difference in Tx TEG association compared to the assocatgion reported in the last occasion.We don’t see a need to report TEG association at evey occasion if there is no change. To reduce redundancy in reporting, the proposal is made.  P3, P4 : These are corelated proposals. These describe validty for Tx TEG asocation. Simlar to the motivation discussed for P2, the goal here is to reduce redundancy in reporting.  P5: Is the aim to provide more assisatnce information? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 |  |  | Reply to IDC: we would like to understand whether this case corresponds to a TEG association change. |
| Ericsson |  | P1, P3, P4, P5  P2, P5 can be discussed in RAN2 and/or RAN3 | P1: The problem is not very clear to us. It seems these proposals are some optimizations for TEG reporting overhead reduction. We don’t see them as high priority.  P2: This can be discussed directly in RAN2 if it is beneficial. RAN1 does not need to discuss it.  P3: Low priority.  P4: The need for this is not clear to us. So, Low priority.  P5: No need to discuss in RAN1. |
| LGE |  |  | Regardign the issue (P1~4): according to LS from RAN4 (R1-2200902) that it is up to UE implementation, we think that P1~P4 are not necessary to be discussed. In case of R5, we would follow majority views. |
| Intel |  | No | Low priority for discussion, current agreements are sufficient for operation |
| Nokia/NSB |  |  | P1: The issue is that the gNB does not know if the UE is measuring or reporting Rx-Tx measurements. So the gNB may be asking the UE to report something that it is already reporting directly to the LMF. This is unnecessary overhead so we support the proposal.  P2-P3: agree with Huawei, this is not needed.  P4: We are open to discuss this proposal but it may depend on RAN4 discussion of TEG margins in our understanding.  P5: Unclear. Seems not needed. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, none of the proposals in Question 2.2 has a majority support for a further discussion, and thus it seems unlikely we can reach a consensus on any of the proposals in this meeting. Thus, FL would suggest closing the discussion of these proposals in this meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### (Closed) Proposal 2.2

* *For M-RTT, subject to UE capability, support the LMF to request a UE to report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning together with the associated timestamp(s) within a configured time window:*
  + *The starting time of the time window can be earlier than the time when the UE reports the UE Tx TEG association*
  + *The end time of the time window can be later than the time when the UE reports the UE Tx TEG association*
  + *It is up to UE’s capability and implementation on whether and how to provide the UE Tx TEG association according to the request from the LMF.*
  + *It is up to RAN2 to define the starting and the end time*
  + *Send an LS to RAN2 to continue the signaling design*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the issue covered by the above proposal should be discussed in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We are OK to discuss the MTW, and MTW can be applied to Tx TEG association reporting. |
| CATT | Yes | Support the configured time window for UE to report the UE Tx TEG association. |
| vivo | No | The motivation of using a window for SRS-TEG report needs to be clarified.  We prefer to discuss SRS-TEG report in aspect 2.4 |
| Fraunhofer |  | Agree with vivo on the time window cofigutation. Support associating a UE Tx TEG with the associated timestamp, |
| OPPO | No | Periodic reporting has indicated windows implicitly. |
| ZTE |  | Open to further discuss. But we don’t see the need to define staring time and end time.  From our point of view,the mechanism for M-RTT could be similar to the following agreement for UL-TDOA.. For M-RTT, we think the association information should be provided together with measurement report. There is no need to configure another report for the association information.  **Agreement**   * For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:   + Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period     - It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)     - It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed   + The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2   + Note: Tx TEG association information reporting by single request/response mode is assumed already supported with the previous agreement. * Send an LS to RAN2/RAN4 (cc: RAN3)   + to RAN2, including the following RAN1’s agreement related to the reporting of the UE Tx TEG, for RAN2 to work on the signaling   to RAN4 for checking the agreement and work on how to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed |
| MTK | No | Don't support.. same view as vivo for the motivation of having a window |
| CMCC |  | Confused about the motivation to introduce a time window to report the association information for multi-RTT? What is the relationship between the time window here with the measurement time window? |
| InterDigital | No | We prefer to discuss MTW. |
| Ericsson |  | Open to discuss and conclude this issue in RAN1 this meeting. |
| LGE | No | We are also confused about the proposal. If does the proposal imply the MTW?, we prefer to discuss the proposal after some clarifications are discussed. |
| Intel | No | Do not see the issue reflected in the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | No |  |
| Qualcomm |  | We don’t really see the need of periodic report of SRS-TEG association for M-RTT.  FL: Proposal 2.2-2 is not about periodic report of SRS-TEG association for M-RTT. QC proposed the reporting of the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted, thus, it seems there is a need to define how the time window for the report. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, most companies do not support Proposal 2.2-2. Thus it seems unlikely we can reach a consensus on any of the proposals in this meeting. Thus, FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal in this meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **A comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Reporting of UE Tx TEGs

Background

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Make the following modification of the previous agreement:  For mitigating UE Tx/Rx timing errors for DL+UL positioning, a UE ~~may~~ should support, up to UE capability, either one or both of the following options:   * Option 1: Reporting of UE RxTx TEG ID ~~is supported by the UE~~   + FFS: Further details on how the UE RxTx TEG IDs are related/associated to UE Tx TEG IDs and/or UE Rx TEG IDs and to the UE Rx-Tx measurements. * Option 2: Reporting of ~~UE RxTx TEG ID is not supported by the UE; reporting of~~ UE Rx TEG ID and UE Tx TEG ID ~~is supported~~. * In either option, a UE Tx TEG ID is associated with (downselection needed)   + Alt. 1: an UL SRS resource for positioning corresponding to the Tx timing of the UE Rx-Tx measurement   + Alt. 2: the Tx timing of the UE Rx-Tx measurement   + Alt. 3: one or more UL SRS resources for positioning * Note: An UE Rx TEG ID is associated with one DL PRS resource (or more DL PRS resources) corresponding to the Rx time of the measurement * FFS: How to resolve potential mismatch between UE and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements (e.g. UE provides the UE Rx-Tx measurements associated with a Tx TEG with SRS1, while gNB provides the gNB Rx-Tx measurements with a Rx TEG associated with SRS2). * FFS: The potential impact and modification on the definition of Rx-Tx time difference measurements   Agreement:   * If a Tx TEG ID is reported with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE should also report the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s)   + FFS: how the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s) is determined by UE.   + FFS: details of the signalling   Agreement:  If a RxTx TEG ID is reported with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE may optionally also report a Tx TEG ID. |

Submitted Proposal

* ***(vivo, R1-2201093[2]) Proposal 1:*** *For mitigating UE Rx/Tx timing errors for DL+UL positioning, up to the UE capability, the following should be supported:* 
  + *The UE provides the association information of UE Tx TEG(s) with all UL Positioning SRS resources to LMF.*
  + *For a Rx-Tx time difference measurement for a PRS resource, the UE may report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources.*
    - *wherein, the maximum number of Tx TEGs here is N, N={1,2,3,4,6,8}, subjective to UE capability.*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 4:*** *The UE can be configured by the gNB with a list of SRS resource sets and SRS resources for which UE TX TEG association reporting should be performed. In case an SRS resource set is listed rather than an SRS resource then the UE should report the UE TX TEG association for all SRS resources in the SRS resource set.*

FL comments

Based on the previous agreement, if a UE supports Option 1, UE may (or may not) report TRP Tx TEG ID with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement. For a UE supporting Option 2, FL shares the similar view with vivo in that it is highly desirable for UE to report UE Tx TEG(s) of all UL Positioning SRS resources to LMF. However, further discussion is needed on whether the UE can be forced to report the mapping of *all SRS respurces to TEGs.* In UE feature, it says “lf the UE does not include TxTEG-ID associated with a measurement, no assumption can be made on the [mitigation of] UE Tx timing errors for this SRS resource for positioning.” Thus, it is still up to UE implementation to decide how the UE to provide the mapping of *the SRS respurces to TEGs.*

### (Closed) Question 2.3

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(vivo, R1-2201093[2]) Proposal 1*
  + *(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 4*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | We think that the baseline is that the TEG association with all the configured positioning SRS should be considered as requested by the network. Not clear why network would pick a few from all the configured positioning SRS.  In addition, if UE is not able to determine the TEG association, UE may simply not include the TEG information for a particular positioning SRS. |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support to discuss the proposals and decide whether the UE can be forced to report the mapping of all SRS respurces to TEGs. |
| vivo | √ |  | Proposal 1 is to address the potential mismatch problems between UE and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements. For example, the UE reports Rx-Tx time difference measurements associated with a RxTx TEG ID and a Tx TEG ID, but it cannot gurantee that the SRS resources associated with the Tx TEG can be measured by the target TRP (e.g. the target TRP measures the SRS resources associated with another Tx TEG). When the LMF combines the Rx-Tx time difference measurements of both UE and TRP sides, due to mismatch of Tx TEGs, the LMF cannot determine which RxTx TEG ID can be used in subsequent ‘differential RTT’ calculations. To address this problem, for a Rx-Tx time difference measurement for a PRS resource, the UE may report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources.  For FL comment about “TxTEG-ID association” in the UE feature, whether we can add a condition, as follows, to address   * *For mitigating UE Rx/Tx timing errors for DL+UL positioning, up to the UE capability, the following should be supported:*    + *The UE provides the association information of UE Tx TEG(s) with all UL Positioning SRS resources which can associate with a TxTEG-ID to LMF.*   + *For a Rx-Tx time difference measurement for a PRS resource, the UE may report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources which can associate with a TxTEG-ID.*     - *wherein, the maximum number of Tx TEGs here is N, N={1,2,3,4,6,8}, subjective to UE capability.* |
| OPPO | Yes for proposal 1 | No for proposal 4 | For Proposal 1: Another way to match the measurement results at UE and gNB is that gNB reports Rx-Tx timine difference measurement results based on different SRS resources. But we are open to discuss it in this meeting (Yes)  For Proposal 4: The motivation to restricting TEG information reporting is not clear (NO) |
| ZTE |  |  | OK to clarify the proposed issue.  To our understanding, this should be discussed in RAN2 on how to report the SRS association information. At least for us, we think UE should provide the association information for positioning SRS. There is no need for additional indication on which positioning SRS should be reported with association information. |
| MTK |  | No | Don't support. Similar view as Huawei |
| CMCC | Yes |  | We are open to disucss this issue, to help the LMF find the proper match of Rx-tx time difference measurements at UE and TRP sides. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | The mismatch problem highlighted by vivo is valid and the relevant proposal should be discussed in RAN1. Also, we share CATT’s understanding. So we support discussing these proposals. |
| Intel |  | No | Current agreements are sufficient |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | Agree with Huawei that the UE by default will already report all the configured SRS resources when it reports the associations. |

FL Comments

It seems the first proposal has slightly majority support (5 companies support, 4 companies do not support). Thus, FL would suggest a further discussion on the revision of the first proposal by the proponent. For the second proposal, there is no majority support (4 companies support, 5 companies do not). FL would suggest closing the discussion since there is no majority support for the discussion.

### (Closed) Proposal 2.3

* *For mitigating UE Rx/Tx timing errors for DL+UL positioning, up to the UE capability, the following should be supported:* 
  + *The UE provides the association information of UE Tx TEG(s) with all UL Positioning SRS resources which can associate with a TxTEG-ID to LMF.*
  + *For a Rx-Tx time difference measurement for a PRS resource, the UE may report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources which can associate with a TxTEG-ID.*
    - *wherein, the maximum number of Tx TEGs here is N, N={1,2,3,4,6,8}, subjective to UE capability.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Unclear motivation.  For the first bullet, we assume it is already supported even without the bullet.  For the second bullet, why would a single measurement be associated with multiple pairs? The clause in the second half is already supported. |
| ZTE |  | For the first bullet, although we acknowledge that would be helpful for the mismatch. We also think this somehow could be RAN2 issue on how to design the signaling.  For the second bullet, to our understanding, we have already agreed that Tx TEG can be reported together with RxTx TEG. So the following work can up to RAN2. In addition, UE feature already defined the following item. Why do we need to define another value N?   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 27-1-2a | Support of UE-TxTEGs for Multi-RTT positioning | The maximum number of UE-TxTEG, which is supported and reported by UE for Multi-RTT positioning | |
| LGE |  | We have a similar view to Huawei about first sub-bullet, if our understanding is right, since UE normally expects to report all of Tx TEGs associated all configured SRS resources. In addition, we think it seems unnecessary (or restriction) for UE even thogh UE does not expect to report all association information.  To clear understading, we have a question about second mainbullet. If UE reports all of association information about every pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG} before positioning measurement, why does UE need to report some of them again after positioning measruements? That is, we think there is no problem UE report TEG ID only when the association information is alrady reported. If our understanding is incorrect, could someone tell us the details. |
| CATT |  | For the first bullet, it seems that this case can be supported by current specs.  For the second bullet, we can understand that this proposal just want the UE report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources. But the wording of “for a Rx-Tx time difference measurement” in the proposal maybe need to updated to “for each Rx-Tx time difference measurement”. |
| InterDigital |  | For both bullets, the proposals seem to gurantee “fail-safe” operation. They can be supported as optional reporting. |
| Qualcomm |  | To HW: I thought this proposal says that, independent of the RTT measurement report, a UE, in LPP should be able to report the SRS-TxTEG association. This proposal says that there is going to be a separate report/procedure specified in LPP for the report of SRS<->TxTEG association.  We could accept the first bullet, but we think it s much lower priority compared to Proposal 2.4 that talks about the reporting of SRS<->TxTEG within the RTT measurement report. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Thanks Qualcomm for the clarification. However, we do not think that separate LPP reports are needed for multi-RTT. In fact there is only single response time, which is common to all positioning; we are not sure whether this can be feasible to set positioning method specific response time, and even multiple response times within a single method for different reporting types. |
| vivo |  | We support the proposal and try to explain the second sub-bullet.  To Huawei and all  Let’s further clarify our intention for the second bullet.  In Rx-Tx measurement report, for each Rx-Tx time difference measurement, UE may report a pair of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG} as the following.  nr-ue-RxTx-TEG-r17 CHOICE {  case1-r17 SEQUENCE {  nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17)  },  case2-r17 SEQUENCE {  nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17),  nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17)  },  case3-r17 SEQUENCE {  nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17),  nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17)  },  case4-r17 SEQUENCE {  nr-UE-RxTx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTxTEGs-1-r17),  nr-UE-Tx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfTxTEGs-1-r17),  nr-UE-Rx-TEG-ID-r17 INTEGER (0..maxNumOfRxTEGs-1-r17)  }, FFS  ...  },  ...  }  In addition, UE may also report SRS-TxTEG association in ‘*NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation*’ with SRS-TxTEG association set as the following. It is possible that the Tx TEGs in SRS-TxTEG-set will include the Tx TEG of the above {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG} pair, and other Tx TEGs different from the above Tx TEG. Then, when gNBs measures SRS resource associated with the other Tx TEGs and LMF combine measurements from UE and gNB, there will be no information of RxTx TEG. So, for each Rx-Tx time difference measurement for a PRS resource, the UE may report one or more pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG}, which are used to represent the mapping relationship with all Tx TEGs of all SRS resources(e.g. all Tx TEGs in nr-SRS-TxTEG-Set-r17)  NR-Multi-RTT-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16 NR-Multi-RTT-MeasList-r16,  nr-NTA-Offset-r16 ENUMERATED { nTA1, nTA2, nTA3, nTA4, ... } OPTIONAL,  ...,  [[  nr-SRS-TxTEG-Set-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..maxTxTEG-Sets-r17)) OF  NR-SRS-TxTEG-Element-r17 OPTIONAL  ]]  }  To CATT, we are OK to update to ‘for each Rx-Tx time difference measurement’.  To LG, we are open to discuss report one or more mapping pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG} before positioning measurement, but there is no related agreement achieved.  To ZTE, Yes, our intention is not to introduce a new capability, the capability of FG27-1-2a should be reused. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | We don’t feel this proposal is needed. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, most companies do not support Proposal 2.3. Thus it seems unlikely we can reach a consensus on any of the proposals in this meeting. In my understanding the proposal may have the impact on UE behavior, but no impact on the high-layer signaling. There is no urgency to make the decision in this meeting. Thus, FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal in this meeting so we can focus on other higher-priority issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Periodict Reporting of UE Tx TEG for Multi-RTT

Background

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement (RAN1#107e)**   * For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:   + Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period     - It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)     - It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed   + The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2   + Note: Tx TEG association information reporting by single request/response mode is assumed already supported with the previous agreement. * Send an LS to RAN2/RAN4 (cc: RAN3)   + to RAN2, including the following RAN1’s agreement related to the reporting of the UE Tx TEG, for RAN2 to work on the signaling   + to RAN4 for checking the agreement and work on how to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed |

|  |
| --- |
| RAN4 LS (R1-2200902)  “The UE Tx TEG association between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning is up to UE implementation, so it is not necessary nor practical to define the condition when the TEG association is changed.” |

Submitted Proposal

* ***(vivo, R1-2201093[2]) Proposal 2:******Support UE Tx TEG updating in Multi-RTT as the following:***
  + For ~~UL-TDOA~~ Multi-RTT, supporting the following for the ~~serving gNB~~ LMF to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:
    - Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period
      * It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)
      * ~~It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed~~
    - The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2
    - It is up to RAN2 to decide whether to include UE Tx TEG association information request/report in Rx-Tx measurement request/report or in a separate IE
    - Note: Tx TEG association information reporting by single request/response mode is assumed already supported with the previous agreement.
  + Send an LS to RAN2~~/RAN4~~ (cc: RAN3)
  + ~~to RAN2,~~ including the following RAN1’s agreement related to the reporting of the UE Tx TEG, for RAN2 to work on the signalling

FL: Further discussion in Proposal 3.4-1 for Multi-RTT.

* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6])******Proposal 1:*** *Support UE to provide periodic reporting of TEG association*

FL: Periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG is supported for UL-TDOA. See Proposal 3.4-1 for Multi-RTT.

* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6])******Proposal 2:*** *Periodic TEG association report and aperiodic TEG association report can be both supported. LMF can configure the UE on the selected reporting type.*

FL: Periodic and aperiodic reporting of UE Tx TEG is supported for UL-TDOA. See Proposal 3.4-1 for Multi-RTT.

FL comments

Periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG associationfor UL-TDOA was agreed in the previous meeting. However, Periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG associationfor Multi-RTT was not agreed. There were different views on whether there is a need to support, Periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG associationfor Multi-RTT with the consideration that the UE may report UE Tx TEG associationfor Multi-RTT together with the measurement reports of the UE Rx-Tx measurements.

Proposal 2.4

* + *For Multi-RTT, supporting the following for the LMF to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:*
    - *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period* 
      * *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*
    - *The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2*
    - *It is up to RAN2 to decide whether to include UE Tx TEG association information request/report in Rx-Tx measurement request/report or in a separate IE*
    - *Note: Tx TEG association information reporting by single request/response mode is assumed already supported with the previous agreement.*
  + *Send an LS to RAN2 to continue the signaling design*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the above proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | RAN2 is already implementing the feature by including SRS TEG association in the Multi-RTT measurement report, and the periodicity for both report should be aligned. |
| CATT |  |  | We prefer this proposal to be low priority since UE may report UE Tx TEG association for Multi-RTT together with the measurement reports of the UE Rx-Tx measurements. |
| vivo | √ |  | In RAN1#107e, we reached the following mirror agreements of Tx TEG request/report for both UL-TDOA and Multi-RTT. However, for periodic Tx TEG report, we only reached agreement for UL-TDOA. Therefore, a mirror agreement for Multi-RTT needs to be reached. |
| OPPO |  | No | Share similar view as Huawei |
| ZTE | Yes |  | We don’t see the need to have a separate IE to report association information. LMF only cares about the association information when there is on-going measurement report. SO, we prefer to include UE Tx TEG association information in Rx-Tx measurement report. |
| MTK |  | No | Same view as Huawei/OPPO |
| Ericsson |  | No | For multi-RTT, UE Tx TEG association with SRS resources can be reported along with UE Rx-Tx measurement reports. Hence, there is no strong need to further introduce periodic UE Tx TEG association reporting for multi-RTT. |
| LGE |  |  | We are open to the proposal. But, in our understanding, reporting the UE Tx TEG association is required not only for UL-TDOA but also for multi-RTT. If there is no crucail reason to oppose the proposal, we are agree with the proposal. |
| vivo2 | Yes |  | we are OK with Tx TEG and SRS association in Rx-Tx measurement report, but we are not sure the current CR considers the issue of Tx TEG change. Without corresponding conclusions for Multi-RTT achieved, RAN2 may only consider Tx TEG change for UL-TDOA but not for Multi-RTT. For example, it may only include SRS-TEG association corresponding to one period, but we are not sure the period of SRS is the gNB measured, and then the misalignment will occur. So, we prefer the reporting can include the multiple periods' SRS-TEG association. |
| Intel |  | No | Share similar view with Huawei |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | Same view as Huawei. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | RAN2 is trying to implement the feature of TxTEG-SRS for M-RTT, but from our understanding, there is confusion still for M-RTT. We think that a simple proposal where we explain that M-RTT TxTEG-SRS can just be part of the measurement report would be helpful:   * *For M-RTT, TxTEG-SRS association is reported as part of the UE Rx-Tx measurement report together with the necessary timestamps to provide information on the TxTEG-SRS association change.*    + *Up to RAN2 the signaling details* |
|  |  |  |  |

FL Comments

It seems the majority view is that the reporting of the SRS TEG association and the reporting of the Multi-RTT measurement should be aligned including the periodicity. There may be different understanding on whether RAN2 needs RAN1’s inputs on that. Maybe we can try to use the suggestion from Qualcomm as the starting point to see if we need to provide some inputs to RAN2.

(Round 2) Proposal 2.4

* *For Multi-RTT, supporting the LMF to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning as part of the UE Rx-Tx measurement report:*
  + - *A UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted*
    - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association*
    - *Send LS to RAN2 the signaling details to continue the signaling design*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| vivo | Yes | This proposal avoids RAN2’s different understanding of Tx TEG change for Multi-RTT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Not sure why we need this agreement. RAN2 is already implementing the LPP running CR based on this understanding. |
| ZTE |  | Fine with the proposal. As commented by Huawei, RAN1 may not have to further discuss this issue. |
| OPPO |  | We share similar view as Huawei. However, for the sake of progress, we can accept it. |
| LGE |  | Similar view with our comment in the proposal 2.3.  If UE reports all of association information about every pairs of {RxTx TEG, Tx TEG} before positioning measurement, why does UE needs to be requested to report some of them again after positioning measruements again? we cannot understand the intention of the proposal. |
| CATT |  | We can live with this proposal, since RAN2 maybe need such input from RAN1 for LPP. |
| InterDigital |  | We notice that “Based on a configured periodicity” is missing from the proposal. Does the reporting take place at one of the periodic occasions or is it done based on the request from the LMF? Going through the previous round of dicussions, it was not clear. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To HW/all: There is no agreement, it is just a running CR, and there have been questions about that running CR, specifically on this aspect. We think that if the above statement is the common understanding in RAN1, we should just agree to it, and not debate whether RAN2 is already doing this or sth else.  To IDC: there is no periodicity, since this is just reported together with the Rx-Tx measurement report.  To LGE: Where is the agreement that the UE has reported the SRS<->TxTEG before the positioning measurement? We are not talking about the {RxTxTEG, TxTEG} pairs here, but the TxTEG<->SRS association. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Thanks Qualcomm for the clarification. From our side, if we are to make the agreement, we would suggest to make it further.  For example, we would like to see if there is common understanding that the association between SRS and TEG ID should not be included in the per-TRP measurement result, which is also part of othe RAN2 debate. Otherwise, we do not see much value of this proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | We can accept the proposal if we remove the 2nd sub-bullet. There is no need to say anything about “association change” |
| **FL** |  | Proposal Modify the previous agreement as follows:   * If a Tx TEG ID is reported with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE should also report the association of the Tx TEG ID ~~to~~ with all of the UL SRS resource(s) that are associated with the Tx TEG ID.   + The SRS resources for positioning in the reported UE Tx TEG association may be transmitted before the time of the reporting.   + It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association * Send LS to RAN2 the signaling details to continue the signaling design   + ~~FFS: how the the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s) is determined by UE.~~   + ~~FFS: details of the signalling~~ |
|  |  |  |

FL Comments

We have the following agreement that if UE sends a Tx TEG ID, the the UE should also report the association between the Tx TEG ID with UL SRS resource(s). I assume it is common understanding is that the reported association should include all of the UL SRS resource(s) associated with that Tx TEG ID. If not, we could make a clearification on that, e.g.,

Agreement:

* If a Tx TEG ID is reported with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE should also report the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s)
  + FFS: how the the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s) is determined by UE.
  + FFS: details of the signalling

For example, if Tx TEG ID\_1 with a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, and the Tx TEG ID\_1 is associated with multiple SRS resources {SRS1, SRS2, …, SRSn}. The UE needs to include {SRS1, SRS2, …, SRSn} with reporting the Tx TEG association of Tx TEG ID\_1.

For Huawei’s comments, my understanding is that the association between SRS and TEG ID does not nned to be per TRP measurement result. One Tx TEG ID can reported with multiple UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements. In this case, there is no need to report multiple UE Tx TEG association for the same Tx TEG ID.

By the way, for a Tx TEG ID, if it is not assocated with any UE Rx-Tx time difference measuremen, it seems also no benefit to send the SRS-TxTEG association for that Tx TEG ID.

### (Round 3) Proposal 2.4

Modify the previous agreement as follows:

* If a Tx TEG ID is reported with any UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE should also report the association of the Tx TEG ID to all of the UL SRS resource(s) that are associated with the Tx TEG ID.
  + The SRS resources for positioning in the reported UE Tx TEG association may be transmitted before the time of the reporting.
  + It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association
* Send LS to RAN2 the signaling details to continue the signaling design
  + ~~FFS: how the the association of the Tx TEG ID to the UL SRS resource(s) is determined by UE.~~
  + ~~FFS: details of the signalling~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| vivo | Yes | Support  To Huawei, we agree with the association between SRS and TEG ID should not be included in the per-TRP measurement result. So, maybe we add a note as following  The association between SRS and TEG ID is applicable to all the TRP measurements in a measurement report  To Nokia, just like Huawei said, the reporting behavior discussing RAN2 is similar, in addition, based on the previous RAN1 discussion, the agreement of Tx TEG request/report for both UL-TDOA and Multi-RTT also is similar. So, we don’t think bullet 2 needs to be removed since UL-TDOA has agreed. |
| Qualcomm |  | We are generally supportive of the intention and we think it will be useful for RAN2. However, we think that the SRS<->TxTEG association reporting should be about SRS that have already been transmitted, and should not be about the UE committing to a specific SRS<->TxTEG association. It was a same agreement for UTDOA:  **Agreement**   * For UL-TDOA, supporting the following for the serving gNB to request a UE to report the Tx TEG association information between UE Tx TEG IDs and SRS resources for positioning, subject to UE capability of supporting UE Tx TEG:   + Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning **that have already been transmitted** during the configured period     - It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)     - It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed   ***Updated proposal:***   * If a Tx TEG ID is reported with any UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, the UE should also report the association of the Tx TEG ID to all of the UL SRS resource(s) that have already been transmitted and are associated with the Tx TEG ID.   + ~~The SRS resources for positioning in the reported UE Tx TEG association may be transmitted before the time of the reporting.~~     - It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association (e.g., using the timestamps) * Send LS to RAN2 the signaling details to continue the signaling design   FL: If we want to add “RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association design”, then thre is need to deifne the changes are under which time window, e.g.,, since the last report. But, it seems many comapneis are not in favour of defining the time window. |
| ZTE |  | We agree that there is no need to report SRS-TEG association per TRP measurement. We prefer Qualcomm’s updates to align the same descriptions for UL-TDOA. It would be better that this proposal can have another bullet to say: The association of the Tx TEG ID to all of the UL SRS resource(s) that have already been transmitted is reported together with measurement report for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement |
| Intel | No | It should be decided in RAN2  FL: Would it better if RAN1 can reach the agreement to help RAN2 in the signalling design? |
| LGE | No | First of all, we still cannot understand the proposal since it seems that RAN1 does not need to discuss the proposal anymore.  If RAN1 continues the discussion even if there are concerns from some companies, we have a comnent about the proposal.  First of all, the agreement that in the QC’s comment is about reporting UE Tx TEG association information it self and it does not mean the reporting of measurements including association information. But, for the proposal, it looks like a dealing with measurement report based on Multi-RTT. That is, we think we need to clarify the distinction between both of them. If the intention of the proposal is for periodic reporting of the SRS TEG association, we are generally fine after that the current version of the proposal is modified. If the proposal is for measurement report including association infmration about SRS-TEG, we still cannot agree with the proposal.  FL: My undersatdning is that the proposal is the reporting of the SRS-TEG together with the measurement report of the Multi-RTT, but not a separate periodic reporting of the SRS TEG association. |

## Reception of the DL PRS with different UE/TRP Rx TEGs

Submitted proposals

* **(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 7:** *UE is not required to measure the same DL PRS resource with the exactly the same number of Rx TEGs as requested by LMF or indicated in the capability signaling*.

FL Comments

In FL’s understanding, similar to other positioning measurements, it is up to RAN4 to decide the conditions under which the UE is required (or not required) to *measure the same DL PRS resource* with the number of different Rx TEGS as requested by LMF or indicated in the capability signaling. There is no need for RAN1 to make an agreement on that.

### (Closed) Question 2.5

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 7*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | Let’s say  For FG 27-1-4, UE reports 2 for a band. Then LMF requests UE to measure a PRS on a target band with 2 Rx TEGs. Should UE be mandated to report 2 TOA for the same PRS?  For FG 27-1-4a, UE reports 2 for a band. Then LMF requests UE to measure a PRS on target band. Should UE be mandated to measure the target PRS simultaneously and report the TOA with 2 Rx TEGs with the same time stamps? |
| CATT |  |  | It seems that RAN4 can discuss this issue. |
| vivo |  | √ | But we share a similar view with Huawei proposal that UE is not required to measure the same DL PRS resource with exactly the same number of Rx TEGs as requested by LMF |
| Fraunhofer |  | No | Our understanding is that RAN1 agreemenet is clear that the LMF **optionaly** requests a UE to measure DL PRS with different Rx TEGs |
| OPPO | Yes |  | We sare simiar view as Huawei, and think it is common understanding. We can make a conclusion to make it clear. |
| ZTE |  | NO | No need to discuss it in RAN1. |
| MTK | Yes |  | A conclusion seems okay (same view as OPPO and Huawei) |
| CMCC | Yes |  | We are OK to discuss this issue.  In our understanding, the LMF can explicit request a UE to measure the same DL PRS resource with N different Rx TEGs based on the capability reporting, however, the LMF cannot ensure that the UE is always capable to do so. |
| Ericsson |  |  | In our understanding, the UE is not required to measure the same PRS resource using the exact same number of Rx TEGs as requested by LMF. This is why we included ‘UE to optionally measure’ in the following agreement. The remaining issues can be discussed in RAN4.  **Agreement**   * Subject to UE capability, support the LMF to request a UE to optionally measure the same DL PRS resource of a TRP with N different UE Rx TEGs and report the corresponding multiple UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements.   + - N=[2, 3, 4, 6, 8], where the maximum value of N depends on UE capability, and applies to all DL PRS positioning frequency layers     - Note: If N is not explicitly included in the request, it is up to UE to determine the number of different UE Rx TEGs to measure the same DL PRS resource within its capability   + FFS: details of the signalling, procedures, and UE capability   The timestamps of the multiple UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements in the same measurement report can be the same or different. |
| LGE |  |  | We are generally understand the intention. But, we think RAN1 does not required to discuss the proposal. |
| Intel |  | No | Do not see the need in this proposal |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, it seems the majority companies don’t think the proposal is needed. In FL’s view, RAN4 will work on the conditions and requirement for UE to report the measurement. Thus, the suggestion is to close the discussion of the proposal in this meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## UE TX/RX temporal timing error index

Submttted proposals

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 11****: Support UE to maintain a UE RX temporal timing error index (TTEI). The state of the UE RX TTEI at the instance of DL PRS reception for an RSTD or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement should be reported together with UE RX TEG association, timestamp and RSTD/UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement in the DL-TDOA/multi-RTT measurement report.*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 12:*** *Support UE to maintain a UE TX temporal timing error index (TTEI). The state of the UE TX TTEI at the instance of UL SRS transmission should be reported together with UE TX TEG association and timestamp.*

FL Comments

The timing errors of UE Rx/Tx/RxTx TEGs may changes over time for various reasons. In previous meetings, different options regarding the reporting/updating of Tx TEG association with positioning SRS/PRS resources were discussed, including the use of a temporal timing error index (TTEI) as proposed in [16]. For Tx TEG changes, RAN1 made an agreement in RAN1#107e that “It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed” and “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)”.

### (Closed) Question 2.6

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + ***P1****: (Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 11*
  + ***P2****: (Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 12*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | We think this is to discuss the link consistency between TEG ID and group delay, which is a useful clarification. |
| CATT | Yes |  | We can discuss the issue and TTEI in RAN1, or leave this issue to RAN2/RAN4 as our agreement in RAN1#107-e. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |  |
| OPPO |  | No | Leave it to RAN2/RAN4 sinc we have agreement |
| ZTE |  | No | It’s up RAN2/RAN4 to further discuss this issue. |
| MTK |  | NO | Up to RAN2 and RAN4 |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | We can discuss about TTEI and the information regarding TTEI to report to the network. |
| Ericsson | Yes. |  | In the UE features agreed so far, the maximum number of TEGs is limited by UE capability:   * In FG 27-1-1, the maximum number of UE Rx TEGs for DL TDOA and/or Multi-RTT is agreed to be one of {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8}. * In FG 27-1-2, the maximum number of UE-TxTEG for SRS resource for positioning, which is supported and reported by UE for UL TDOA is agreed to be one of {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8}. * In FG 27-1-2a, the maximum number of UE-TxTEG, which is supported and reported by UE for Multi-RTT is agreed to be one of {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8}.     These maximum number of TEGs may not be enough to indicate time domain variation of group delays and the indication of consistency of TEGs over time. For instance, in FR2, a UE may be equipped with 4 UE antenna panels, and 8 TEGs may not be enough to indicate TEG consistency over time for all 4 UE antenna panels. Hence, we support to discuss temporal index in RAN1. |
| LGE |  | O | We are not sure whether the TEG changes extremely depends on temperature. Likewise, since there is not obvious reason like as simulation result, we cannot agree with the proposal. |
| Intel |  | No | Up to RAN2 |
| Nokia/NSB |  |  | We are not fully convinced of the need for the proposal but it seems worthwhile for RAN1 to discuss it and see if any further agreements or changes are needed. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | We agree that some discussion is needed on time domain variation of group delays and the indication of consistency of TEGs over time. |

FL Comments

It seems there is slightly more companies are okay to discuss the proposals. Thus, suggest having a more discussion on the following proposals.

### (Closed)Proposal 2.6

* *Support UE to maintain a UE RX temporal timing error index (TTEI). The state of the UE RX TTEI at the instance of DL PRS reception for an RSTD or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement should be reported together with UE RX TEG association, timestamp and RSTD/UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement in the DL-TDOA/multi-RTT measurement report.*
* *Support UE to maintain a UE TX temporal timing error index (TTEI). The state of the UE TX TTEI at the instance of UL SRS transmission should be reported together with UE TX TEG association and timestamp.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| vivo |  | RAN4 achieved the following agreement in last meeting. From our point of view, when the timing error margin of the TEG changes over time, the corresponding TEG ID should also change. So, there is no need to maintain UE temporal timing error index.   * Agreements in GTW (1.19)   + A single timing error margin is associated with each Rx TEG     - FFS if same or different margins are used for measurements with different time stamps   + FFS: whether the timing error margin is the same or not for all Rx TEGs if UE/TRP has multiple TEGs |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | From our side, we think the only valuable feature following the concept of TTEI is UE to report consistency between TEG ID and group delays, which means that the group delay difference between two TEG IDs across different time instances remain unchanged.  We are open to disucss it in the first round, but we do not think RAN1 should agree introducing directly TTEI per se. |
| ZTE | No | The timing error is impacted by various factors e.g. clock drift, temperature, etc, which cannot fully control by UE itself. So, how UE can maintain the TTEI? Do we expect that UE should do on-line calibration all the time? That’s not practical. We prefer to let RAN4 to evaluate this issue first. |
| LGE | No | We are not sure why does RAN1 needs to discuss the issue and we don’t have enough time to discuss the proposal in details even if it is agreed. |
| CATT |  | It looks like RAN4 related issue, suggest to discuss the details in RAN4. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Support |
| Qualcomm | Yes | To vivo, all:   * Assume a single measurement report with 100 measurement instances. Please recall that there is an agreement that he UE can include in a single report, multiple cases. Previous meeting we even discussed that, there can even be thousands of instances in a single report. * Assume the UE has 2 TEGs at any given time, so it uses IDs 0, 1 at each measurement instance. Are really all the measurements associated with ID=0 within the same TEG? The point here is that this is not true! Solutions:   + Solution 1: If 2 measurements have the same TEG-IDO AND the same timestamp, then they really have the same timing error.     - This solution is too restrictive since a UE may be able to guarantee the same timing error across measurements with different timestamps.   + Solution 2: If 2 measurements have the same TEG-ID AND are in the same measurement report, then they really have the same timing error.     - This solution will break in the feature that i described above where we have multiple instances in a single report. A UE cannot guarantee the same timing errors across 1000 instances obviously.   + Solution 3: If 2 measurements have the same TEG-ID AND are in the same measurement instance of a measurement report, then they really have the same timing error.     - This solution will restrict the applicability of the feature, since it may be possible, for a few consecutive instances, the UE to guarantee the same timing error   + Solution 4: The proposed solution     - Allows the UE to make the decision which meausurement, associated with the same TEG-ID, really have the same timing errors.   If we don’t do anything, my undersantding is that Ran4 eventually may either pick a very conservative solution (e.g. Solution 1), or a solution like 3. In either cae, without additional signaling, the applicability of the feature reduces.  Final Thought: Indeed a UE that has up to 2 panels, may, up to implementation, reuse the available 32 total TEGs that LPP report will allow, or even not report TEG-ID, if it is not confident that the timing errors are the same. For example, it has 2 panels, so one would say that this UE has 2 TEGs, but, across time, it cannot guarantee that the timing error stay the same, so at t1 reports ID=0 and ID=1, then at t2 reports ID=2, ID=3, etc, even if there are really only 2 panels (and the UE has reported a capability of up to 2 TEGs, eventually it uses more TEGs). This is another allowed solution, which again, looks to me like a “hack” rather than a good specified solution. |
| OPPO | No | It should be discussed in other WG(s). |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with points made by Qualcomm. As we commented in the previous round, the number of TEGs available is limited by UE capability and in most cases it is 8 TEGs. 8 TEG IDs is surely not enough when the UE is equipped with multiple panels and there are a large number of measurement instances within a single measurement report. The proposed solution will remove this bottleneck. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Reply QC/Ericsson:  First, when we discuss TEG, we are not talking about the other timing drift issues, but rather group delay, right? For example for SRS Tx, the TA adjustment, which results in the overall SRS transmission timing change, is not accounted for TEG. So actually this proposal is saying that the group delay of a panel/antenna used for Rx/Tx may actually change significantly from time to time.  Second this proposal is treating Rx TEG and Tx TEG altogether. For Rx TEG and SRS-TEG association report in LPP for multi-RTT, our understanding is that the solution 3 from Qualcomm is the most natural way even if we have multiple measurement instances. We do not think that combining a multiple measurement instances in the measurement domain is feasible, since the reference TRP may be different in different measurement instances (for DL-TDOA). For Tx TEG, does it mean that for the SRS transmission instances within the span of a TTEI, the Tx TEG ID is used to uniquely identify a group delay, meaning the group delay difference between two Tx TEG IDs remain the same in a sense of accuracy-level within the time span of a TTEI. |
| ZTE2 |  | We think solution 3 in Qualcomm’s comment is a more appropriate method rather than define TTEI. Since we have agreed that UE can report multiple measurement instances, UE can try to claim that 2 measurements shared the same TEG-ID in the same measurement instance of a measurement report have the same timing error. However, we don’t agree with the following statement,   * *This solution will restrict the applicability of the feature, since it may be possible, for a few consecutive instances, the UE to guarantee the same timing error*   If UE can guarantee the same timing error in a few consecutive instances, why not just pack them together in a single measurement instance in measurement report. We haven’t agreed that every measurement instance should have the same time span. This why we propose to allow UE to report a starting time stamp and an ending time stamp in Proposal 3.2 for a measurement instance. By this way, it’s up to UE to report a corresponding time span for a measurement instance, where 2 measurements shared the same TEG-ID in the measurement instance have the same timing error.  We don’t need to define a new feature that can already be supported by approved agreement. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | We think the argument from Qualcomm makes sense. We would be limiting the feature if we don’t introduce this type of indiciator. So we support the proposal.  To companies suggesting to leave to RAN4 we think that is not a good way. RAN4 in our understanding is having trouble with the basics of the TEG feature. This type of agreement can help to clarify from RAN1 what we mean and help RAN4 to finish their work. |
| Intel | No | We believe that this issue should be considered in other WGs |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, it seems the majority companies don’t think the proposal is needed. It seems it is unlikely for us to reach the consensus through the email discussion in this meeting. Thus, the suggestion is to close the discussion of the proposal in this meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## UE Tx TEG sweeping

Submttted proposals

* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 4:*** *Support the LMF to request the TRP to fix TRP Rx TEG, configure the UE to use N different UE Tx TEGs and report respective RTOA, if the TRP and UE support more than one Rx TEGs and Tx TEGs, respectively.*

FL: The condition of more than one TRP Rx TEG may not be needed.

* ***(CMCC, R1-2201856[10]) Proposal 1****: Support UE Tx TEG sweeping as an optional UE capability:*
  + *Introduce a new indication for UE sending N SRS pos resources by using N different UE Tx TEGs in turn*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 5****. Support UE TX TEG sweeping over SRS resources for positioning in a SRS resource set configuration.*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 6****. The UE shall report the number of UE TX TEGs as part of UE capabilities.*

FL: This seems already covered in UE feature session.

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 7****. It shall be possible to configure a UE with an SRS resource with a restriction for the UE to utilize a certain UE TX TEG when transmitting the SRS.*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 8****. The total number of UE beams needed to sweep all UE TX TEGs and all directions should be reported as part of UE capabilities.*

FL: It is unclear how to define the total number of UE beams for all directions.

FL Comments

The approach of configuring a UE to use different UE Tx TEGs for UL transmission of SRS positioning resources or UE TX TEG sweeping over SRS resources for positioning was proposed by multiple companies [9][10][16]. The simulation results in [16] also shows the significant performance improvement under certain conditions. Similar proposals were discussed in the previous meeting [17], but only few companies provided the comments, and some companies did not support UE TX TEG sweeping. One potential issue related to UE TX TEG sweepingmay be the overhead on the UL resource usage and also increase of the UL interferences. We would need more inputs from interested companies to above proposals to decide whether to support UE TX TEG sweeping in Rel-17, and if yes, which of the options to support.

Proposal 2.7

* *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*
  + *LMF configures the UE to use N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning,* 
    - *FFS: N, which is subject to UE capability*
  + *LMF requests the TRP to use the same Rx Tx TEGs to receive the SRS resources for positioning transmitted from different UE Tx TEGs*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the UE TX TEG sweeping over SRS resources for positioning should be supported (or not supported) in Rel-17, and if yes, whether it is the high priority in this meeting and any additional comments on above proposal.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | We support the UE Tx TEG sweeping.  However, we believe from UE perspective, the indication of Tx TEG sweeping should be from the gNB. |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support to discuss the UE Tx TEG sweeping. However, maybe a subset of UE Tx TEG should be sweeping for one TRP due to low SINR. |
| Vivo |  | √ | It is too late to discuss it in the maintenance phase, we prefer to reuse Rel-16 SRS mechanism (e.g. beam sweeping or spatial relationship) for SRS transmitting  1.Tx TEG sweeping will increase the number of Tx TEGs, resulting in unnecessary errors.  2.When the SRS is transmitted, the relationship between the SRS and the Tx TEG depends on the UE implementation, and we do not think that the LMF can control the use of the Tx TEG. |
| Fraunoher |  | No | Share the views of vivo |
| OPPO |  | No | Simiar to Issue 2.5, it cannot force UE to use a configured number of Tx TEGs. Tx TEG is not only related to RF chains/antennas, but also related to other factors (e.g., TA).  If the spatial relationship is configured, the Tx beam for SRS transmission is determined and UE cannot use a sweeping way of Tx TEGs. If no spatial relationship is not configured. If the spatial relationship is not configured, a sweeping way for SRS transmission may lead to mismatch between the UL Tx beam and PL RS. |
| ZTE |  | No | We don’t seed the strong need. It’s up to UE to decide how to associate the TEG with SRS. In addition, we think the SRS spatial relation info has implicitly indicated the preferred panel to transmit SRS. |
| CMCC | Yes |  | We are supportive of UE Tx TEG sweeping, as we have agreed that a UE can measure the same DL PRS resource with different Rx TEGs if the UE is with multiple Rx TEGs in order to mitigate the Rx timing error difference between different Rx TEGs, it is reasonable to support a symmetric design for UL.  Regarding the proposal, we would like to further discuss whether it should be the LMF to request. UL SRS pos is by gNB to configure, why not let gNB to indicate the UE to perform the UL Tx TEG sweeping? |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | We support to discuss the feature and we support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | We have shown results that UE Tx TEG to SRS association reporting alone is not enough to fully mitigate timing errors. In the Figure below, the orange curve includes timing error mitigation using only UE Tx TEG to SRS association reporting. As seen in the figure, this only achives ~20cm positioning accuracy for around 80% of the time. Hence, UE Tx TEG to SRS association reporting alone is not enough to meet positioning accuracy requirements.  With combination of UE Tx TEG to SRS association reporting with UE Tx TEG sweeping, the positioning requirements can be met as shown by the Red curve in the figure below.  Note that UE Rx TEG sweeping in the following agreements was made to meet positioning accuracy requirements for similar reasons:  **Agreement**  Make the following modification on the previous agreement made in RAN#106bis-e:   * Subject to UE capability, support the LMF to request a UE to optionally measure the same DL PRS resource of a TRP with N different UE Rx TEGs and report the corresponding multiple RSTD measurements.   What we are after is a reciprocical agreement like the following:   * Subject to UE capability, support the serving gNB to request a UE to optionally transmit the SRS resource(s) of an SRS resource set for positioning with N different UE Tx TEGs, if the UE supports multiple UE Tx TEGs for UL TDOA.     **@Vivo: In Rel-16 SRS mechanism, which UE Tx TEG the SRS is transmitted from is up to UE implementation. Hence, the network has no control over if the UE transmits all SRS resources with a single UE Tx TEG or over multiple UE Tx TEGs.**  **@OPPO: Regarding your comment, we don’t agree that spatial relation being configured will prevent a UE from sweeping across Tx TEGs. Assume different Tx TEGs are associated wth different UE panels. Then, for a given spatial relation, the UE can determine Tx beams for each UE panel. Sweeping across Tx TEGs here essentially means each UE panel transmitting using the determined Tx beams for each of its panels.**  **@CMCC: We agree with you that the serving gNB can indicate the UE to perform UL Tx sweeping.**  **@vivo, @Fraunhofer, @OPPO, @ZTE: Given our results above, we’d be interested if you have any different results that show that positioning accuracy requirements can be met even without UE Tx TEG sweeping proposed above for all scenarios considered in Rel-17. Otherwise, if you still have concerns on the proposal, will you be ok to conclude that rel-17 positioning accuracy requirements may not be met for UL-TDOA with only UE Tx TEG to SRS association reporting mechanism specified in Rel-17 for all scenarios consided in Rel-17?** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  | We are supportive to the UE Tx TEG sweeping. |
| LGE |  |  | We are completely agree with the intention. But, we think that the proposal would be related with PRS resource configuration and than the more time to discuss the issue is required. So, we prefer to discuss the issues in the Rel 18 than this meeting. |
| Vivo2 |  | No | We do not think it is an essential issue or a symmetric design for UL. Let us further explain the difference between UL and DL.  If LMF wants to know the UE Rx TEG error between different Rx TEG IDs, it only can be known by the UE measurement. But if LMF wants to know the Tx TEG error between different Tx TEG IDs, it can be known by multiple gNB(s) that is because the SRS from one UE can be measured by multiple gNB(s). That is, if a gNB can measure the LOS path(or same path) from different SRS resources with Tx TEG, the Tx TEG error between those Tx TEG IDs can be achieved. In addition, considering the different locations of gNBs, the Tx TEG error between all the Tx TEG IDs can be achieved by different gNBs |
| Intel | Yes |  | Open to discuss this proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | We are okay to discuss this proposal. It may have some dependency on RAN4 progress on TEG margins in our understanding. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | We are OK to discuss it. Assuming there is a UE capability for the feature, and the understanding that the UE will eventually pick the TxTEG to be used, we can be open to it. |

FL Comments

It seems there is a clear majority for further discussion of the proposal. But, there is a concern on whether it is too late to discuss it in the maintenance phase. Maybe we can try to raise the priority on the proposal in the discussion to see if we can reach some quick resolution in this meeting.

(Round 2) Proposal 2.7 (H)

* *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*
  + *A UE can be configured by serving gNB to use N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning,* 
    - *FFS: N, which is subject to UE capability*
  + *A TRP can be requested by the LMF to use the same Rx TEGs to receive the SRS resources for positioning transmitted from different UE Tx TEGs.*
  + *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*

Comments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Fraunhofer |  | In reply to Ericsson’s comment, the compensation performance is achievable under the assumptions that the same channel conditions applies on the first path (RtoA path) and the SRS resources corresponding to different Tx TEGs are coherently transmitted. If these assumptions do not hold, the overall performance can worsen when the LMF presumes the errors can be perfectly calibrated.  That said, we are okay with the proposal if the number of SRS resources is not limited to N (gNB can configure M≥N resources). Limiting the SRS resources to the number of UE Tx TEG might also lead that SRS is corresponding to a NLOS path or even not detected by a certain TRP. |
| Vivo | No | For the first sub-bullet, we don’t think it works. The actual number of Tx TEGs used by the UE for SRS transmission may be less than the UE capability. For example, the UE supports 4 Tx panels, and only uses 2 Tx panels for SRS transmission in general. However, with this proposal, the Network requests the UE to use 4 Tx panels (Tx TEG sweeping) for SRS transmission. Does it increase the number of Tx TEGs and further introduce additional Tx timing error?  For the second sub-bullet, it also has some problems. How does the gNB know about ‘different UE Tx TEGs’? Does this mean that the LMF or the serving gNB should forward the ‘SRS-Tx TEG association information’ to the gNBs participating in UL-TDOA? This question has been discussed many times, but it has not passed.   |  | | --- | | * + - * FFS: whether to support the serving gNB to forward the association information to the neighboring gNBs       * FFS: whether to support the LMF to forward the association information to the serving and neighboring gNBs | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partly | We are general OK with only the first subbulet, but prefer to change N to “up to N”. In addition, in this case, we think that the association between SRS and TEG-ID/group delay should remain unchanged.   * *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*   + *A UE can be configured by serving gNB to use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning,*      - *FFS: N, which is subject to UE capability*     - *The association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID remain unchanged.* |
| ZTE |  | We tend to agree with the comments from Fraunhofer. If majority companies still think it’s necessary to have this feature., we prefer to treat the request from serving gNB as assistance data. Serving gNB is not required to configure each SRS resource with a explicit Tx TEG ID. For example, serving gNB may configure M SRS resources to UE. Then, serving gNB requests UE to use N(N<=M) different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning. In the end, it’s up to UE to decide on how to map M SRS resources to N different Tx TEGs. This has small spec impact and leave more room for UE to decide the association information.  For the second bullet, we had discussion that LMF will not forward the association information to neighbor TRPs. We don’t need to discuss it again. |
| OPPO | No | In addition to the issues spotted by other companies, we would like to have more comments as below  1. The WI is closed in RAN1. It is not a good way to introduce new functionarity in maintenance stage.  2. Whether the performance of R17 can meet the requirements, the group had a lot of study in SI stage. Thus, we don’t need to reopen this issue at the very late stage  3. For the result showed by the figure, some too ideal assumption was used, e.g., the issue pointed by Fraunhofer.  4. If the UL Tx sweeping is introduced for SRS configured with spatial relationship info, it totally changed the basic principle and meaning of spatial information. It is a fundamental change of UL beam indication.  5. Due to the large latency of SRS sweeping, it is more likely the Tx timing changes (e.g., due to automotous TA adjustment, …) during this long procedure. |
| LGE |  | We are open to the issue. But, we have a concern about the accuracy performance. If the feature is supported and same SRS resources (similar to legacy) are configured for UE, we cannot sure which performance is better. We think that many factors could be related. Even though we are understand the intention of the proposal, we prefer to the issue after Rel-17. |
| CATT | Yes | We support the proposal. The N different UE Tx TEGs can be a subset of all the UE Tx TEGs, use the subset instead of all UE Tx TEGs to do UE Tx TEG sweeping can reduce the latency and overhead. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are also ok with the modification proposed by Huawei. |
| Qualcomm |  | We could be flexible to have this feature assuming UE capability is clearly agreed and also clearly say that it it is up to the UE how to do the mapping of TxTEGs to SRS resources. We think RAN1 should progress on the signaling design also so that RAn2 doesn’t get confused.  Our understanding is that the SRS resource set will have a flag that says the UE is requested to use different TxTEGs. We also agree that “N TxTEGs” can be less or equal to the number of resources in the set.  Since we are in maintenance phase, we should try to have a complete proposal as much as possible.  We unfortunately don’t agree with HW’s addition. It may be good the association to remain unchanged, but we don’t want to have this additional constraint. It can be a best effort feature to sweep the TxTEGs, but we don’t think there should be an explicit requirement. A UE may do { SRS1 <-> TxTEG1, SRS2 <-> TxTEG2} at a first time, and { SRS1 <-> TxTEG2, SRS2 <-> TxTEG1} at a 2nd time.  We make the following proposal:   * *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*   + *a UE, up to an optional, per band, UE capability, can be requested by the serving gNB to optionally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*      - *It is up to the UE to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources.*     - *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to the UE capability.*   + *A TRP can be requested by the LMF to use the same Rx TEGs to receive the SRS resources for positioning transmitted from different UE Tx TEGs.*   + *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design* |
| CMCC | Yes | We are supportive of the proposal.  To Fraunhofer: In our understanding, this assumption also holds for UE using multiple Rx TEG to receive the same DL PRS resources, and RAN1 has already agreed that, therefore we believe an symmetric design for UL is reasonable. Also, the evaluation reulsts provided by Ericsson shows the performance gain.  To vivo: For the 1st comment, same question was raised for MIMO SRS for antenna switching. In my understanding, in MIMO cases, the UE will tell the NW its capability of 2T4R and 1T2R, and NW may select one of them for the SRS configuration. As long as the NW configures the SRS resources for, e.g., 2T4R, then the UE will follow the NW configuration. Maybe similar mechanism can be used here. Regarding the 2nd comment, in my understanding, the gNB does not need to know the specific UE Tx TEGs. When the gNB configures the SRS resources for UE Tx TEG sweeping, it can indicate to the UE to send the N resources using different Tx TEG in turn. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Thank you for the constructive discussion.  We are fine with the suggestion for the gNB to configure M SRS resources in an SRS resource set for positioning, and let the UE transmit up to N (where N<=M) SRS resources using N different UE Tx TEGs, and how the N different SRS resources can be mapped to N different UE Tx TEGs can be left up to the UE.  Regarding the comment of large latency of SRS sweeping made by OPPO, we note that 2-4 SRS resources in a SRS rsource set should be enough for UEs that have up to 4 panels. The serving gNB which configures an SRS resource set for UE Tx TEG sweeping, can configure the SRS resources in that SRS resource set close to each other. So, sweeping across 2-4 SRS resources that are configured close to each other should not result in large SRS sweeping delays.  For this UE Tx TEG sweeping feature, our understanding is similar to that of Qualcomm that an SRS resource set configured for UE Tx TEG sweeping will have a flag that tells the UE that the SRS resources in that set is to be used for Tx TEG sweeping. Plus, for such an SRS resource set, the gNB can configure the same spatial relation for all the SRS resources (i.e., when different SRS resources in this set are transmitted using different SRS resources, the target TRP is the same) which can be achieved by implementation. In terms of RRC impact, the only changes we forsee are the addition of a flag per SRS resource set and the associated UE capability.  It seems Qualcomm’s updated proposal captures these aspects quite well. Regarding association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID, our understanding is similar to that of Qualcomm. We think it is sufficient that the Tx TEG ID to SRS resource associations remain unchanged for the transmit duration of a single UE Tx TEG sweep. What if we clarify the bullet added by HW as follows:   * + - *The association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID remain unchanged during each single UE Tx TEG sweep.*   Please check if the below revised proposal is acceptable:   * *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*   + *a UE, up to an optional, per band, UE capability, can be requested by the serving gNB to optionally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*      - *It is up to the UE to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources.*     - *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to the UE capability.*   + *A TRP can be requested by the LMF to use the same Rx TEGs to receive the SRS resources for positioning transmitted from different UE Tx TEGs.*   + *The association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID remain unchanged during each single UE Tx TEG sweep.*   + *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*   Finally, regarding this open issue being discussed during maintenance phase, there was some discussion about this when we discussed the draft SR before the WI was closed in RAN#94-e. See 1st issue we flagged in the email discussion below.  [LISTSERV - 3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG1 Archives - LIST.ETSI.ORG](https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG1;e2f9c4a4.2111E&S=)  The understanding from rapporteur and other companies is that this open issue can still be discussed in maintenance phase. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Thanks for the reply from Ericsson/Qualcomm.  I understand it may be difficult to keep the same SRS – TEG ID association, but what Ericsson added may be a little bit unclear in “during a single UE Tx TEG sweep”. What does “association change” during a single sweep mean?  In the Qualcomm’s example   |  | | --- | | A UE may do { SRS1 <-> TxTEG1, SRS2 <-> TxTEG2} at a first time, and { SRS1 <-> TxTEG2, SRS2 <-> TxTEG1} at a 2nd time. |   Even if we somehow agree with such flexibility, this feature should at least guarantee unique association between TxTEG and group delay. In our understanding network can only benefit from the assumption that in this particular example, the group delay difference d(SRS1) – d(SRS2) at time 1 is equivalent to the group delay difference d(SRS2) – d(SRS1) at time 2, i.e. d(TEG 1) – d(TEG 2) = constant, so that network can continuously track the inter-TEG group delay..  We suggest the following rewording.   * *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*   + *a UE, up to an optional, per band, UE capability, can be requested by the serving gNB to optionally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*      - *It is up to the UE to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources, but the association between TxTEG ID and group delay remain unchanged.*     - *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to the UE capability.*   + *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*   Otherwise we would stick to our original.   * *Support UE Tx TEG sweeping, in which*   + *a UE, up to an optional, per band, UE capability, can be requested by the serving gNB to optionally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*      - *UE may, subject to its capability, indicate the association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID remain unchanged.*     - *For UE not supporting the above, it is up to the UE to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources across time instances.*     - *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to the UE capability.*   + *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design* |
| Nokia/NSB |  | We are generally supportive of the feature. We are okay with the update from Ericsson. |

FL Comments

In my understanding, in order to UL Tx beam sweeping to work properly, it requires the UE not chaning the Tx TEG association during the sweeping. Given that UE needs to report the Tx TEG association based on the previous agreement, there is no need for UE to specicially indicate the association between the SRS resources for positioning and TEG ID remain unchanged. The proposal is revised as follows for further discussion.

(Round 3) Proposal 2.7 (H)

* *Support a serving gNB to request a UE to use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,* 
  + *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to per band UE capability.*
  + *The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged.*
  + *It is up to the UE on whether to support the request.*
* *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Apple |  | No | The achievable gain is not yet clear to us, and it seems if there is any gain it will be subject to couple of assumptions (some for example mentioned by Fraunhofer. This proposal is a bit late to be discussed at this stage. |
| OPPO |  | No | To Erisson: In RAN email discussion, the common understanding is that we can discuss it, but doesn’t meen we should support it.  From the technical perspective, it is not proper to introduce a new functionality in the maintainence stage since it is too later and lack enough time for thorought investigate the design.  For the proposal, there are lots of remaining issues  1. “*The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged*”, it is confliting with our previous principle that the maping is up to UE.  2. The design totally changed the basic principle and meaning of spatial information. It is a fundamental change of UL beam indication.  3. Panel sweeping should have sufficient gap, which we have not throughout study so far, and don’t know its impact on UE implementation and performance  4. How to address the collision with other UL signal transmission? For example, for transmission of these SRS transmission, UE will have to switch the panel and the normal transmission will be impact.  5. …  In summary, it is not a good practice to support a new feature in a so rush way, especially in the maintainence stage. |
| CATT | Yes |  | We think it is reasonable to keep the association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources unchanged during the period of UE Tx TEG sweeping. And the sentence of “It is up to the UE on whether to support the request” means that no restriction on UE behavior. We can live with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | This issue has been proposed for several meetings now. Unfortunately, we were not able to discuss this issue due to a large number of proposals in this agenda. The issue is quite critical as it helps meet positioning accuracy requirements, and there are two operators supporting this proposal.  Regarding OPPO’s the comment *‘In summary, it is not a good practice to support a new feature in a so rush way, especially in the maintainence stage’*, we note that there are several proposals in other ePOS agendas that RAN1 is still discussing. One example is in latency reduction agenda (8.5.4) where OPPO is proposing introducing UL PRS processing window activation request via UL MAC CE (proposal is copied below):    Shouldn’t the same argument apply to OPPO’s proposal above? If we are going to follow the ‘it is too late for new features’ argument, we’d like to see some consistency across agendas. The problem is when companies use this argument selectively for proposals they dislike. |
| ZTE |  |  | Regarding the second subbullet, we don’t know how to understand it. If a SRS set is periodic, do we mean the association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged in all occasions? This conflicts with our previous agreement. UE may change its TEG association(e.g. each with its own time stamp) and finally report them in a TEG report. We have agreed that RAN2 will further design the details on how to report the TEG association. We don’t need to mention it again.  Another question as mentioned by OPPO, if the UE TEG sweeping is similar to antenna switching, do we expect that we have to further discuss other details(e.g. switching gap, collision handling...)? We think it’s hard to finalize that may fundamentally change the UE behavior on positioning SRS at maintenance phase. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | From our side, we think that bullet 2 is should be essential. It is fine if we can agree to a UE capability for it.  We do not mind to also clariy it that if UE is not able to determine the TEG association for an SRS will remain unchanged, UE may not report the related association for the SRS as agreed in the UE feature discussion.  For ZTE’s comments: the ealier agreement only says SRS without mentioning TEG sweeping feature, in which UE may change and report the association periodically. From our side, the key to associate TEG-ID and group delay is important, regardless of whether SRS/TEG-ID association changes; but we have to acknowledge that simply fixing the SRS/TEG-ID is a simple and a straightforward way. |
| **FL** |  |  | It seems further discussion is needed for converge.  To address some of the concern, how about we add “optionally” and remove the bullet of second subbullet. Then, it will be totally up to UE on whether to keep the Tx TEG association. The LMF will based on Tx TEG reporting, wiich will indicate the changes if any, to decide how to use the measurement report. (Round 3) Proposal 2.7 (H)  * *Support a serving gNB to request a UE to optinally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*    + *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to per band UE capability.*   + *~~The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged.~~*   + *It is up to the UE on whether to support the request.* * *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design* |
| **InterDigital** | Yes |  | We support the FL’s latest proposal in principle. If this can be a compromise, we are ok with removing the second bullet or coverting it as a note (where we added the duration during which the association shouldn’t change). We agree with the proponents that during the sweep, the association between TxTEG and SRS resources should remain unchanged for this operation to be effective. However, it is also true that the UE determines the ssociation and the association can be changed at any time. If the UE decides to change the association during the sweep, the gNB will be aware of it and it will disregard the sweep operation. This can be “the best effort” operation.  Modified Proposal   * *Support a serving gNB to request a UE to optinally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*    + *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to per band UE capability.*   + *~~The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged.~~*   + *It is up to the UE on whether to support the request.* * *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*   Note : The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged during the sweep. |
| **Qualcomm** |  |  | We are OK with the new proposal from the FL (i.e. without the 2nd bullet) assuming we stll add the following note (which I think it is common understanding for the proponents of this proposal):  *Note: It is up to the UE to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources.* |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** |  |  | We are not OK with the new proposal from the FL.  If there is concern over the second bullet, we propose to add the following subbullet.   * *Support a serving gNB to request a UE to optinally use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,*    + *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to per band UE capability.*   + *~~The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged.~~*   + *The association between TxTED ID and group delay should remain unchanged, meaning the Tx timing error difference between SRS transmissions from TxTEG IDs should be within a margin.*   + *It is up to the UE on whether to support the request.* * *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*   It means that if UE sweeps 4 Tx TEGs via SRS resources 0,1,2,3 with TEG IDs 0,1,2,3 at the time instance A while sweeps 4 Tx TEGs via SRS resources 0,1,2,3 with TEG IDs 3,2,1,0 at the time instance B, the Tx timing error difference between SRS resource 0 & 1 at time instance A should be close to the Tx timing error difference between SRS resource 3 & 2 at the time instance B within a margin, i.e. the error difference between to TEG 0 and TEG 1. |
| **vivo** |  | No | Just like our previous comments, if LMF wants to know the Tx TEG error between different Tx TEG IDs, it can be known by multiple gNB(s) because the SRS from one UE can be measured by multiple gNB(s). That is, if a gNB can measure the LOS path(or same path) from different SRS resources with Tx TEG, the Tx TEG error between those Tx TEG IDs can be achieved.  So, if the error can be mitigated by the current configuration and implementation, why do we need to add so many restrictions and enhancements in the maintenance meeting. |
| **Intel** | Yes |  |  |
| **LGE** |  | No | We think that the advantages derived from the feature are not proved in this time and we have a similar view to vivo’s comment about that the restriction seems quite unreasonable. |

FL Comments

It seems the main concern is still related to “The association between TxTEG ID and the transmission of the SRS resources should remain unchanged”. The note from Qualcomm could be a compromise if we want to introduce the UL Tx beam sweeping.

### (Round 4) Proposal 2.7 (H)

* *Support a serving gNB to request a UE to use up to N different UE Tx TEGs for the transmission of the SRS resources for positioning of an SRS resource set for Positioning,* 
  + *The values of N = [2,3,4,6,8] are subject to per band UE capability.*
* *Note: It is up to the UE on whether to support the request and how to decide the association between TxTEGs and SRS resources*
* *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for further signaling design*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | To HW’s concern: I am trying to understand better your example below   * *[HW] It means that if UE sweeps 4 Tx TEGs via SRS resources 0,1,2,3 with TEG IDs 0,1,2,3 at the time instance A while sweeps 4 Tx TEGs via SRS resources 0,1,2,3 with TEG IDs 3,2,1,0 at the time instance B, the Tx timing error difference between SRS resource 0 & 1 at time instance A should be close to the Tx timing error difference between SRS resource 3 & 2 at the time instance B within a margin, i.e. the error difference between to TEG 0 and TEG 1.*   Lets see where we are without progressing at all. A UE may be configured with 4 SRS resources, and transmit all of them with the same Tx TEG, or repeat TEGs. The proposal says, at least, a UE should try, if it supports the feature, if it is configured with 4 SRS resources, to ensure that at least each of the TEGs is being associated with one of the resources. The gain of observing all the TEGs from the UE is still there vs. the case, we don’t do this agreement. Now, on top of that, it seems you are considering essential to force a Time-domain consistency of TEGs when this sweeping is happening (across time instances), which is a general question; it may apply for RxTEGs, TxTEGs from the TRPs, RxTxTEGs, etc; and it is not specific only to the TxTEG-sweeping feature. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | Support. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | We support the FL’s proposal |
| ZTE |  |  | We still doubt whether the UE Tx timing error between different TEGs can actually be measured by TRP. For example, when 2 SRS resources are associated with 2 different UE Tx TEGs,   * The two SRS resources may not be possible to be received by the same TRP because different UE Tx TEGs generally correspond to different UE Tx beams. * Even two SRS resources are received by the same TRP, we cannot make sure that UE Tx timing error between different TEGs can be derived since different SRS resources may be detected with different first path.   In addition, we agree with Qualcomm that Huawei’s comment is about time-domain consistency, which should be discussed separately. |

## Options of multiple RSTD measurements of the same DL PRS resource

Submitted Proposals

* ***(ZTE, R1-2201193[3]) Proposal 1:*** *When multiple reference signals are used to determine the same Rx timing, support the followings,*
  + *For DL RSTD measurement, if multiple DL PRS resources are used to determine a start of one subframe from a TP, the multiple DL PRS resources should be associated with a same UE Rx TEG ID.*
  + *For UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement, if multiple DL PRS resources are used to determine a start of one subframe of the first arrival path of the TP, the multiple DL PRS resources should be associated with a same UE Rx TEG ID.*
  + *For UL RTOA measurement, if multiple SRS resources are used to determine a beginning of one subframe containing SRS received at a RP, the multiple SRS resources for positioning should be associated with a same TRP Rx TEG ID.*
  + *For gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement, if multiple SRS resources for positioning are used to determine a start of one subframe containing SRS, the multiple SRS resources for positioning should be associated with a same TRP Rx TEG ID.*

FL: The similar proposal was discussed in the previous meeting without conclusion. Some companies supported, while some companies commented that the proposals were not needed. In FL’s view, if the Rx TEG ID is reported together with the measurement, it implies the measurement is associated with the Rx TEG ID.

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 1:*** *Downselect which among the following options apply to UE feature row 27-1-4:*
  + *UE performs multiple RSTD measurements towards the same TRP based on different repetitions of the same DL PRS resource,*
  + *UE performs multiple RSTD measurements towards the same TRP based on different symbols of the same DL PRS resource,*
  + *UE performs multiple RSTD measurements towards the same TRP based on different occasions of the same DL PRS resource.*

FL: These options presented above are related to UE measures the same DL PRS resources at different times. How to support the perform multiple RSTD measurements towards the same TRP may be up to UE. It seems there is no need to further define how the UE made the measurement. Further discussion is needed on whether to specify these options directions in UE feature row 27-1-4.

### (Closed) Question 2.8-1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *ZTE, R1-2201193[3]) Proposal 1*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | Agree with the FL comment. The Rx TEG is associated with the TOA measurement (RSTD/UE Rx – Tx time difference), and if the TOA is determined based on multiple PRS resources, then it implies that the same Rx TEG is associated with “the multiple PRS resources”.  Likewise for gNB side. |
| CATT |  | No | This proposal seems to be not needed. |
| vivo |  | √ | Share a similar view with FL. |
| OPPO |  | No | Similar view as FL |
| ZTE | Yes |  | The current definitions in 38.215 support UE/gNB to derive the same timing by using multiple resources. Once multiple resources are used to determine the same timing, the same TEG association for the multiple resources should be satisfied. Otherwise, the timing may include not only the TOA but also the the timing error difference between TEG, where the later one is not desirable. |
| Ericsson | may be |  | It is a question of whether this should be capturted in the spec or not. Perhaps, we can have a conclusion on this. |
| LGE |  | O | We are on the same page with FL |
| Intel |  | No | Do not need to discuss |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### (Closed) Question 2.8-2

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 1*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | This is totally up to UE implementation. If any of the enhancements needs to modify the RAN4 PRS measurement period requirement, the enhancement should be discussed by RAN4. |
| CATT |  | No | It seems to a UE implementation issue. |
| vivo |  | √ | Share a similar view with FL. |
| OPPO |  | No | Similar view as FL |
| ZTE |  | No | It’s up to UE to decide. No further enhancement is needed. |
| MTK |  | No | Up to UE |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | Prefer to discuss this at least as part of UE features. |
| LGE |  | O | We think this issue is up to UE. |
| Intel |  | No | Up to UE implementation |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Timing error margins of TEGs

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 3:*** *Support to associate TEG ID with the timing error margin value (e.g., the smallest TEG ID represent the TEG with the smallest timing error margin.*
* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 4:*** *Define the certain margin of a TEG. This aspect can be investigated by RAN4.*
* ***(Fraunhofer, R1-2202366[14]) Proposal 1:*** *From RAN1 perspective, the timing error margin(s) will be defined by RAN4 and the definition takes the aspects Rx timing errors/Tx timing errors defined by RAN1 into account.*
  + *Send an LS to RAN4*

(Closed) FL comments

There were intensive discussion and multiple round of discussion of different proposals on how to define the *timing error margins* and *UE capability of timing error margins* w/o conclusion. Given that RAN4 is working on the issues related to *timing error margins,* the suggestion from FL is no further discussion unless RAN4 wants RAN1 to be involved in the discussion.

### (Closed) Question 2.9

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether there is a need for RAN1 to discuss (or not discuss) the timing error margins in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal) for the following proposals:*

* + *(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 3*
  + *(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 4*
  + *(Fraunhofer, R1-2202366[14]) Proposal*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | Agree with FL comments. |
| CATT |  | No | This issue should be discussed by RAN4. |
| vivo |  | √ | Up to RAN’4 discussion. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  | RAN1 Rx/Tx timing error definitions clarifies the UE or TRP assumptions taken to accommodate for possible implementations. RAN1 shall clarify if this will be captured in RAN4 specifications within the error margin or not.  This also addresses the aspect in Q2.10 |
| OPPO |  | No | Agree with FL |
| ZTE |  |  | Wait for RAN4’s decision. |
| CMCC |  | No | Up to RAN4 to decide. |
| InterDigital |  | No | Agree with FL’s suggestion that we can wait for RAN4. |
| Ericsson |  | No | Leave up to RAN4 |
| LGE |  | O | Agree with FL comments. |
| Intel |  | No | Up to RAN4 |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | RAN4 is discussing. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Reporting of self-calibration of a TEG

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 4:*** *Allow UE to report an indicator to LMF to inform if a positioning measurement has been calibrated for a specific TEG.*

FL comments

In FL’s view, UE/TRP will have always to perform a certain levels of calibration of the Rx timing delays for the positioning measurements in order to support meeting the measurement performance defined by RAN4, and the UE will determine whether the measurements in the same Rx TEG based on the UE implementation. Thus, it seems not meaningful for UE to indicate if a positioning measurement has been calibrated for a specific TEG unless there is a specific margin or value is defined to the calibration.

### (Closed) Question 2.10

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 4*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | Unclear why this report from the UE is required. UE reporting TEG information would mean that the measurement satisfies the corresponding requirement. Whether calibration is done or not to meeting the requirement is transparent. |
| CATT |  | No | It seems that no need to report this indicator to LMF to inform if a positioning measurement has been calibrated for a specific TEG. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| OPPO |  | No | Agree with FL |
| ZTE |  |  | OK for further discussion. According to previous discussion, the margin is defined for the timing error difference between measurements. However, this proposal means UE has also to determine its absolute timing error. Does the “ calibration” means the timing error has been fully estimated and calibrated? |
| CMCC |  | No |  |
| Ericsson |  | No | Proposed indicator seems not needed. |
| LGE |  | O | We are fully agree with FL’s view. |
| Intel |  | No | Not important issue |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | What we are referring to in our proposal is calibration beyond the type of calibration done for the initial TEG definitions. For example, the UE may measure different TRP Tx TEGs and measure the difference between those measurements. Then it is possible to remove the errors between the different Tx TEGs. So the UE could indicate this level of “calibration” to the LMF. |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## RSRP/RSRPP diversity

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 8:*** *For PRS-RSRPP, the reported value for a target DL-PRS resource can be Rx branch specific.*

FL comments

In [1], there was an observation that if the reported PRS-RSRP (and potentially PRS-RSRPP) is not lower than the PRS-RSRP (and potentially PRS-RSRPP) of any individual Rx branches, some TOA measurement associated with a Rx TEG ID may not have PRS-RSRP (and potentially PRS-RSRPP) value. Thus, the proposal is to support *Rx branch specific PRS-RSRPP* in order to have TOA measurement and *PRS-RSRPP* from the same Rx branch.

### (Closed) Question 2.11

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 8*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | If we agreed that RSRPP reporting can be associated with TEG feature, then we should be clear that some Rx branches (associated measurement with a specific Rx TEG ID) may have lower RSRP/RSRPP measurement than other Rx branches, and will not have RSRP/RSRPP reported following the existing RSRP definition. |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support to discuss this issue. |
| vivo |  | √ | In general, we think it is a Rel-16 issue, we would like to ask the majority whether Rel-16 PRS-RSRP reporting that is associated with RSTD or Rx-Tx measurement s not lower than the PRS-RSRPof any individual branches? For us, we think yes, that is the reporting PRS-RSRP can satisfy the definition. In this case, if the Rel-17 RSRPP is the same as the RSRP branches based on the RAN4 agreement, there is no other agreement, and restriction is needed.  ***RAN4 Agreements:***   * Same Rx branches as applied for PRS-RSRP measurement are used for path PRS-RSRP measurement |
| Intel |  | No | This proposal should be aligned with Rx diversity discussion in other AIs |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | Agree with Intel |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | We support discussing this feature. |
| **FL** |  |  | Based on the feedback, it is clear there is no majority support for the proposa from the responses. It seems many companies do not provide the response to Question 2.11. Maybe we can wait for more responses to see if we want to close or continue the discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 |  |  | We would like to emphysize the difference between RSRP for communication and RSRP/RSRPP for positioning.  For communication, the RSRP is used to denote the link between UE and a cell, and the highest quantity among Rx branches are used for that purpose.  For positioning, the RSRP/RSRPP is usually used for positioning calculation and positioning calculation assistance. Always restricing the highest quantity reporting will lose useful information to determine the location. For Rx TEG mapping to a distinct panel, we believe any panel specific RSRP/RSRPP would be useful for localization, e.g. to measure the link quality between the timing measurement derived by this panel/TEG and a target TRP. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedback, it seems half of the feedback support a further discussion, while another half of the feedback do not support further discussion. Based on the feedback, it seems it is unlikely to reach a consensus in this meeting. It seems the proposal does not have direct impact on high-layer signalling. Thus, the suggestion is to close the discussion of the proposal in this meeting.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Performance requirements for RSTD measurements of the same DL PRS resource

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 2:*** *Inform RAN4 with an LS that RAN4 requirements should capture that, subject to UE capability, a UE configured to perform and report multiple RSTD measurements towards the same TRP, utilizing different UE RX TEGs, shall report one RSTD measurement for each UE RX TEG association for which the DL PRS is received with an appropriate configuration and with high enough SINR..*

FL comments

In FL’s view, RAN4 will work the performance requirements for all features introduced in Rel-17 ePOS. It seems no need to specifically send LS to RAN4, asking them to define the performance requirements for RSTD measurements of the same DL PRS resource.

### (Closed) Question 2.12

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *• (Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 2*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | Open to discuss it.  Is it the correct understanding for the intention of the proposal that if UE supports measuring the same TRP with multiple Rx TEGs, then if the side conditions is stasfied, UE shall report TOA measurement associated with the same number of the multiple Rx TEGs for a TRP.  If we understand the proposal correctly, this proposal is to discuss the UE Rx TEG sweeping. However, we would like to note that this may have potential impact on PRS measurement period requirement. |
| CATT |  | No | This issue should be discussed by RAN4. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| OPPO |  |  | Agree with FL |
| ZTE |  | No | It’s in RAN4’s scope. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  | Prefer to discuss it.  @Huawei: Your understanding is correct that the proposal discusses UE Rx TEG sweeping. |
| LGE |  |  | Agree with FL’s comments. |
| Intel |  | No | Up to RAN4 |
| Qualcomm |  | No | Leave it up to RAn4 |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Association of UE Tx TEGs with the MIMO SRS

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 3:*** *The UE can be configured by the gNB to send UE TX TEG association reports for all SRS types including SRS for MIMO.*

FL comments

In previous meetings, there were intensive discussions related to whether to support a UE to provide the association information of UL SRS resources for MIMO with Tx TEGs without conclusion. Given that the WI was closed from RAN1 pespective, FL would suggest “no further discussion on the association of UE Tx TEG with MIMO SRS in Rel-17”.

### (Closed) Question 2.13

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *• (Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 3*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | This has been discussed for a couple of meetings, and we do not see possibility of progress on it. |
| CATT |  | No | From previous agreements, if SRS-MIMO is used for positioning purpose, it should be transparent to UE. |
| vivo |  | √ | Low priority for MIMO SRS. |
| OPPO |  | No | Share similar view as Huawei/CATT |
| ZTE |  | No | Low priority. It’s hard to converge in maintenance phase. |
| Ericsson |  |  | ok to conclude as proposed by FL. |
| LGE |  | O | Agree with Huawei’s view. |
| Intel |  | No | Agree with FL on “no further discussion on the association of UE Tx TEG with MIMO SRS in Rel-17” |
| Qualcomm |  | No |  |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Impact of TA on UE Rx-Tx time difference

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 9:*** *To mitigate transmission timing changes for multi-RTT measurements:*
  + *Support the LMF to configure a UE (with required capabilities) with a list of SRS resource sets and SRS resources for each TRP for reporting of transmission timing compensation.*
    - *In case, an SRS resource set is listed, then that should be interpreted as including all SRS resources in the SRS resource set.*
  + *Given a UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement reported in a multi RTT report, the UE should also report a transmission timing compensation for each SRS resource indicated for transmission timing compensation.*
    - *The transmission timing compensation is signaled together with two timestamps:*
      * *A first timestamp for the UL subframe #j closest in time to the DL subframe #i in which the DL PRS used for the UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement is received*
      * *A second timestamp for the subframe #k where the TX instance of the SRS resource occurs which is closest in time to the reception time of the DL PRS used for the UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement.*
    - *Transmission timing compensation is defined as the difference in transmission timing between the subframe #k and subframe #j.*
    - *Transmission timing is defined as the time between the transmission of UL subframe #i and the first detected path (in time) of the corresponding downlink subframe #i from the reference cell.*
    - *A transmission timing compensation in a multi-RTT report is only coupled to the two timestamps and is thus in the report not tied to a specific SRS resource or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement.*
* ***(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 10:*** *The transmission timing compensation should be reported by the UE to the LMF together with a quality estimate, giving a measure of the deviation of the transmission timing compensation from the true difference in transmission timing between UL subframe #k of UL SRS transmission and UL subframe #j closest in time to DL PRS reception.*

FL comments

Significant efforts have been spent on the impact of TA on multi-RTT in the previous meetings on the issue [17]. Based on various considerations and the resolutions of the impact of the timing adjustment on the UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement is not explicitly included in the WI objectives, the FL had suggested no further discussion of this topic in Rel-17, which was supported by majority companies. Given that the WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, and only one company proposes to revisit the issue, and there are many other more issues need to be resolved in this meeting, the FL would suggest no further discussion on the issue in this meeting.

### (Closed) Question 2.14

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 9*
  + *(Ericsson , R1-2202389[16]) Proposal 10*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | This has been discussed for a couple of meetings, and we do not see possibility of progress on it. |
| CATT |  | No | It seems that no need to re-open the discussion. |
| vivo |  | √ | Low priority. |
| OPPO |  | No | Agree with FL |
| ZTE |  | No | Low priority. It’s hard to converge in maintenance phase. |
| CMCC |  | No | Agree with the FL, no need to further discuss this issue. |
| Ericsson |  |  | Ok with FL’s suggestion |
| LGE |  | O | Agree with Huwei’s view. |
| Intel |  | No | Agree with FL no discussion needed |
| Qualcomm |  |  | Its unfortunate that this issue was not fixed/clarified still, but we achnowledge it is late and it has been discussed a few times. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Multiple reference timings

Submitted Proposals

* ***(LGE, R1-2202291[13]) Proposal 2:*** *RAN1 should consider/adopt configuring multiple reference timing to UE.*

FL comments

In FL’s understanding, LMF does not know UE channel condition and does not need to use the channel condition to configure the timing referencetoUE. The main purpose of configured *reference timing* with the uncertainty range is for the UE to search the DL PRS signals. In UE side, it is up to UE implementation on whether to use the LMF configured timing reference or define another DL PRS as the timing reference when reporting the RSTD measurements. Thus, it seems no need to consider the configuration of multiple reference timings. A similar proposal was presented in previous meetings w/o a conclusion since only few companies provided the comments.

### (Closed) Question 2.15

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the following proposal should be discussed (or not discussed) in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

* + *(LGE, R1-2202291[13]) Proposal 2*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | Although we think that multiple reference timing is helpful for PRS measurement from multiple positioning frequency layers, given the TDM nature of positioning frequency layer processing and the potential time drift at UE, we consider it being too late to introduce this feature in RAN1. |
| CATT |  | No | It seems no need to consider the configuration of multiple reference timings, it should be a UE implementation issue. |
| vivo |  | √ |  |
| OPPO |  | No | Agree with FL |
| ZTE |  | No | According to Rel-16, the reference timing is only for UE to decide the uncertainty window. While for reporting, UE can either choose the reference timing configure by LMF or select another reference timing. |
| Ericsson |  | No |  |
| LGE | O |  | For current specificiation, it only assumes one Rx TEG at UE. We partially agree with FL’s comment that is up to UE implementation on whether to use the LMF configured timing reference. But, LMF configure single reference timing even thouh there is no restriction for UE to follow it. We think it indicate how to LMF provides its preference that is based on the priori estimate of the target device location. In addition, since RAN1 considers/adopts introducing multiple TEGs at both UE and gNB, there is no reason to support/configure multiple referece timing. For concerns about lack of time, we don't think it's a problem at all since only extending the current design of configuration of reference timing to multiple is required. So, we prefer to RAN1 discuss the proposal in this meeting. |
| Intel |  | No | No discussion needed |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | We support the feature especially for the multiple PFLs. We acknowledge it is relatively late, but we think it is indeed a useful feature. |

FL comments

Based on the feedback, it is clear the majority companies don’t support further discussion on the proposal. FL would suggest closing the discussion of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Measurement enhancements for mitigating UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing errors

Background

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement (RAN1#104e)  Support enabling   * A UE to report one or more measurement instances (of RSTD, DL RSRP, and/or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements) in a single measurement report to LMF for UE-assisted positioning, and * A TRP to report one or more measurement instances (of RTOA, UL RSRP, and/or gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements) in a single measurement report to LMF, and * Each measurement instance is reported with its own timestamp   + FFS: The measurement instances are within a [configured] measurement time window * FFS: Each UE measurement instance can be configured with N instances of the DL-PRS Resource Set   + FFS: N (including N=1) * FFS: Each TRP measurement instance can be configured with M SRS measurement time occasions   + FFS: M (including M=1) * FFS: details of behavior, procedures, and UE capability if any * FFS: whether and how to consider the additional enhancement related to measurement reporting of multi-paths and quality metric * Note 1: A measurement instance refers to one or more measurements, which can either be the same or different types, which are obtained from the same DL PRS resource(s), or the same UL SRS resource(s). * Note 2: This enhancement has no intention to change the mapping of measurement types to Rel-16 positioning techniques and no intention to introduce new positioning techniques either.   Agreement (RAN1#106e)  Consider the following options (both could be selected) until RAN1#106b-e   * Option 1: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window (MTW) for a UE for the measurement instances included in a measurement report. * Option 2: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a gNB for the measurement instances included in a measurement report. * FFS: the details of the MTW configuration.   Any requirements can be discussed by RAN4 after decision on the options is made. |

## Measurement time window

Background

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement (RAN1#106e)  Consider the following options (both could be selected) until RAN1#106b-e   * Option 1: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window (MTW) for a UE for the measurement instances included in a measurement report. * Option 2: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a gNB for the measurement instances included in a measurement report. * FFS: the details of the MTW configuration. * Any requirements can be discussed by RAN4 after decision on the options is made. |

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 2:*** *The following procedures for the MTW indication from LMF is supported:*
  + *LMF to optionally recommend the measurement time window (MTW) for a UE for the measurement instances included in a measurement report.* 
    - *A new UE capability to receive the indication of MTW is defined*
  + *LMF to optionally recommend the measurement time window for a gNB for the measurement instances included in a measurement report.*
  + *For both cases, UE and gNB are not required to follow the recommendation.*
  + *Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3.*
* ***(Huawei, R1-2200920[1]) Proposal 3:*** *MTW configuration to UE/gNB should include*
  + *MTW starting/offset SFN*
  + *MTW length in the unit of 10msec*
  + *MTW periodicity for the cases of periodic reporting in the unit of 10msec*
  + *The UE/gNB expects MTW periodicity to be configured to a number close to the periodic reporting interval, which is a multiple of PRS/SRS periodicity and can divide or can be divided by 10.24s SFN period.*
  + *Include the parameters in the higher layer parameter spread sheet.*
* *(ZTE, R1-2201193[3])* ***Proposal 2:*** *There is no need to introduce measurement time window in Rel-17 NR positioning*
* *(CATT, R1-2201361[5])* ***Proposal 1:*** *The configurable measurement time windows should be supported, in which the UE or TRP measurement instances are obtained.*
* *(CATT, R1-2201361[5])* ***Proposal 2****: Support LMF to indicate a preferred measurement starting time to the UE/TRP for the measurement instances included in a single measurement report.*
* ***(CATT, R1-2201361[5]) Proposal 3****: UE/TRP measurement time window can be configured with the following parameters by LMF:*
  + *For UE measurement time window (via LPP signalling):*
  + *P1: The periodicity of UE measurement time window (for periodic UE MTW).*
  + *T1: The start time of UE measurement time window.*
  + *L1: The length of UE measurement time window.*
  + *For TRP measurement time window (via NRPPa signalling):*
  + *P2: The periodicity of TRP measurement time window (for periodic TRP MTW).*
  + *T2: The start time of TRP measurement time window.*
  + *L2: The length of TRP measurement time window.*
* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 5****: Support Option 1 (“Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a UE”) and Option 2 (“Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a gNB”) of the measurement time window.*
* ***(CMCC, R1-2201856[10])*** *Proposal 2: Support both of the following options:*
  + *Option 1: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window (MTW) for a UE for the measurement instances included in a measurement report.*
  + *Option 2: Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a gNB for the measurement instances included in a measurement report.*

FL Comments

Whether to introduce the measurement time windows (MTW) for UE and gNB have been discussed very intensively in the previous meetings (e.g., [17]). While majority companies were supportive, some companies did not think it is necessary to do so. For this meeting, multiple companies (e.g., [1][5][9][10]) propose again to introduce the MTW, while one company considers it is not needed to introduce MTW. Given than the WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, FL would like first check companies’ views on the priority of the issue, and the views on the latest proposal discussion discussed in the previous meeting, and then to decide whether we should have a further discussion on this issue in this meeting.

### Proposal 3.1

* *The measurement time window (MTW) configuration for a UE/gNB should include*
  + *MTW starting time (e.g., the offset of SFN)*
  + *MTW length, which may be configured with one of the following options* 
    - * + *Option 1: (explicitly) configured in the unit of 10msec;*
        + *Option 2: (implicitly) decided based on the configuration of UE/gNB measurement instances for the MTW, and the number of consecutive samples (PRS/SRS instances) for each UE/gNB measurement instance*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the issue covered by the above proposal should be discussed in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, whether you support the proposal).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think MTW is helpful to align the measurement instances between UE and gNB and between gNB. |
| CATT | Yes | Support the proposal. The configurable measurement time windows should be supported to help LMF to eliminate the influence of timing errors of TRPs and UE. |
| vivo | No | 1. From the perspective of Rx/Tx error mitigating, we believe that the role of this window can be replaced by LMF implementation by configuring the position of measurement report and batch report.  2. In addition, scheduled location information is supported by other groups, which indicates that the UE is requested to obtain location measurements or location estimates valid at the scheduledLocationTime T. It can also play the role of MTW. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Support the proposal |
| OPPO | NO | It has been discussed several meetings and no progress was made. The same purpose can be achieved by NW implemenation |
| ZTE | No | As we have discussed in previous meetings, it can be an implementation issue. |
| MTK | No | Don't support. And no need to bring this topic again |
| CMCC | Yes | Support to configure the MTW for both UE and TRP. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson |  | Open to discuss and conclude this issue. |
| LGE | Yes | We are supportive of both the proposal and option #1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support the need for an MTW for timing error mititgation. |
| Intel | No | Do not support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | No | This is not an essential correction in our view and we don’t support it. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Support the proposal |
| FL |  | Based on the feedback, while the majority companies (8) support the proposal, there are many companies (6) do not support it. It seems unlikely to reach the consensus in this meeting. |

## Timestamp of measurement instance

Submitted proposals

* ***(vivo, R1-2201093[2]) Proposal 3:*** *Support to enable the UE to report PRS measurements derived from the most recent measurement instances before the measurement report.*
* ***(vivo, R1-2201093[2]) Proposal 4:*** *The timestamp of the UE (or TRP) measurement instance corresponds to the reception time of the last DL-PRS resource (or the last SRS resource for the positioning purpose) that are used to determine the measurement instance.*
* **(ZTE, R1-2201193[3])** ***Proposal 3*:** *Support of a UE to report multiple measurement instances in a measurement report,*
  + *For PRS processing sample number=1, each measurement instance should be based on a single time instance of corresponding DL PRS resource. UE can report multiple measurement instances based on different time instances of the same DL PRS resource, where different time instances of the same DL PRS resource should be associated with the same UE Rx TEG.*
  + *For PRS processing sample number=4, each measurement value in a measurement instance can be based on a filtered/averaged results from at least four time instances of the corresponding DL PRS resource. UE should report a time stamp to indicate the time duration over which the filtering or average is performed, where the time stamp includes,*
  + *A starting time instance corresponds to the reception time of the first instance of the DL PRS resources to obtain the reported measurement instance, and*
  + *An ending time instance corresponds to a reception time of the last instance of the DL PRS resources to obtain the reported measurement instance.*
  + *Note: For both PRS processing sample number=1 and PRS processing sample number=4, UE should always follow the measurement period defined in Rel-16.*

FL Comments

Whether and how to define to the timestamp of measurement instances have been discussed very intensively in the previous meetings (e.g., [17]). Various options were discussed, while majority companies were supportive for RAN1 to provide the clear definition of the timestamp of measurement, some companies did not think it is necessary to do so. For this meeting, two companies (e.g., [2][3]) propose again the definition of the timestamp of measurement instances. Given than the WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, FL would like first check companies’ views on the priority of the issue, and the views on the latest proposal discussion discussed in the previous meeting, and then to decide whether we should have a further discussion on this issue in this meeting.

### Proposal 3.2

*The timestamp for a measurement instance in a measurement report is defined by one of the following options:*

* *Option 1: The timestamp of the UE (or TRP) measurement instance corresponds to the reception time of the last DL-PRS resource (or the last SRS resource for the positioning purpose) that are used to determining the measurement instance.*
  + *FFS: Whether to report an additional timestamp corresponding to the reception time of the first instance of the DL PRS (or UL SRS) resources, if multiple instances of the DL PRS (or UL SRS) resources are used to obtain the measurement instance.*
* *Option 2: Up to UE implementation.*
* *Option 3: Up to UE implementation but within the reception time of the first and last DL-PRS resource (or the first and last SRS resource for the positioning purpose) that are used to determining the measurement instance.*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the issue covered by the above proposal should be discussed in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, which options you want to support, etc.).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Already discussed, and it is best to up to UE implementation. |
| CATT |  | We prefer this issue to be low priority. |
| vivo | Yes | A clear definition of timestamp is especially important for measurement instance with N/M>1 PRS instances or SRS occasions. For example, the clear definition of timestamp makes the UE measurement results and the TRP measurement results with relatively uniform time domain distribution, which allows the LMF to better match the measurements from UE and TRP into calculation. |
| OPPO | Yes | A clear definition of timestamp is beneficial. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| LGE |  | we are supportive the option #2. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | No | This is not an essential correction in our view and we don’t support it. |
| Qualcomm | No |  |
| FL |  | Based on the feedback, there are 5 companies support the proposal, while 4 companies do not support it (i.e., leave to UE implementation). It seems unlikely to reach the consensus in this meeting. |
| ZTE2 |  | We think Option 1 can serve as a similar functionality as Proposal 2.6. The time stamp can be used to claim consistency between TEG ID and group delays. |

## Reporting of the timestamp of measurement instance

Submitted proposals

* **(ZTE, R1-2201193[3])** ***Proposal 4*:** *Further discuss the association between measurement instances and UE measurement report, at least consider one of the following alternatives,*
  + *Alt.1: For each indicated DL PRS resource in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource.*
  + *Alt.2: For each indicated DL PRS resource set in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource set.*
  + *Alt.3: For each indicated measurement element (i.e. TRP) in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated measurement element.*
  + *Alt.4: For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.*
  + *Alt.5: Multiple measurement instances are directly associated with a measurement report.*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12])Proposal 4:*** *With regards to the association between measurement instances and UE measurement report, at least support the following option:*
  + *Alt.4: For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.* 
    - *That is, a UE should be able to report, in a single NR-XXX-ProvideLocationInformation, multiple NR-XXX-SignalMeasurementInformation elements for UE assisted positioning, and NR-XXX-LocationInformation for UE-based positioning.*

FL Comments

The proposal of the association between measurement instances and UE measurement report was discussed in the previous meeting w/o conclusion. Some companies considered that the issue should be discussed and decided in RAN1, but some other companies commented the issue should be discussed RAN2. Given than the WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, FL would like first check companies’ views on the priority of the issue, and the views on the latest proposal discussion discussed in the previous meeting, and then to decide whether we should have a further discussion on this issue in this meeting.

Proposal 3.3

* *The association between measurement instances and UE measurements should be defined with at least one of the following alternatives,*
  + *Alt.1: For each indicated DL PRS resource in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource.*
  + *Alt.2: For each indicated DL PRS resource set in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource set.*
  + *Alt.3: For each indicated measurement element (i.e. TRP) in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated measurement element.*
  + *Alt.4: For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.*
  + *Alt.5: Multiple measurement instances are directly associated with a measurement report.*

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the issue covered by the above proposal should be discussed in this meeting, and if yes, please provide the additional comments (e.g., the priority, which alternative you want to support, etc.).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The alternatives are too vague.  From our side, to support this functionality, we think the explanation used by Qualcomm should be considered.   * + *Alt.4: For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.*      - *That is, a UE should be able to report, in a single NR-XXX-ProvideLocationInformation, multiple NR-XXX-SignalMeasurementInformation elements for UE assisted positioning, and NR-XXX-LocationInformation for UE-based positioning.* |
| CATT | Yes | We are OK to discuss this issue, and we prefer Alt.4, or we are also fine to leave this issue to RAN2. |
| vivo |  | We would like to confirm with the majority whether the measured TRPs in different measurement instances are different? In our view, the assistance date is the same for a measurement report, so the TRP priority is the same in the different measurement instances within a measurement report. Therefore, we would like to know whether the measured TRPs are the same in multiple instances if Alt.4 is supported. |
| Fraunhofer |  | We think this issue is better addressed in RAN2 |
| OPPO | Yes | Support to discuss this issue |
| ZTE | Yes | We should further down-select one of the alternatives. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Okay for RAN2 to handle it. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | RAN2 editor has not been able to implement this feature. Please see the draft CR. It is a feature introduced by RAN1, and some more guidance is needed to help RAN2 to finish the feature. |

FL comments

It seems there is a clear majority for further discussion of the proposal.

(Round 2) Proposal 3.3 (H)

* *The association between measurement instances and UE measurements should be defined with at least one of the following alternatives,*
  + *Alt.1: For each indicated DL PRS resource in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource.*
  + *Alt.2: For each indicated DL PRS resource set in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated DL PRS resource set.*
  + *Alt.3: For each indicated measurement element (i.e. TRP) in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated measurement element.*
  + *Alt.4: For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.* 
    - *E.g., a UE reports in a single NR-XXX-ProvideLocationInformation, multiple NR-XXX-SignalMeasurementInformation elements for UE assisted positioning, and NR-XXX-LocationInformation for UE-based positioning.*
  + *Alt.5: Multiple measurement instances are directly associated with a measurement report.*

Comments (please indicate which of the alternatives you prefer)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | Sorry to repeat our question, we would like to confirm with the majority whether the measured TRPs in different measurement instances are different if Alt.4 is supported? |
| ZTE | Okay to support either Alt.3 or Alt.4.  To vivo,  We’re fine to keep TRP unchanged across different measurement instances (e.g. Alt.3), so that LMF may be better to track the changes of clock drift, UE moving, etc.  We can also accept Alt.4. One explanation would be: different measurement instances actually correspond to different time occasions. When UE is moving, UE may not have the chance to see the same set of TRPs across different occasions. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal and we prefer Alt.4.  Reply to vivo: In our understanding, it is up to UE implementation and they can be different TRPs |
| LGE | We have a question for Alt.1. We think there is not different point beween Alt.1 and current specification. In our understanding, PRS resource ID and set ID currently could be provided in single measurement report and multiple measruemnet inastances already can be associated. What’s the difference? |
| CATT | Support Alt.4.  For vivo’s question, we think the measured TRPs can be the same or different for different positioning methods if Alt.4 is supported. |
| Qualcomm | Alt. 4 is the simplest one. Just simple concatenation of the measurement instances. Yes the TRPs can be difference for Alt. 4 (up to the UE measurements and implementation). We think that this is the right behavior here since, as the UE moves, the TRPs that can be detected is different. Even for static UEs, interference/fading can be different in different timestamps, and some TRPs may not be detectable in a first time instance, and be detectable in a 2nd time instance.  To LGE: Which multiple measurement instances can be provided in the current LPP? To top “for loop” is across all the TRPs, up to 256. So, are you suggesting, that a UE, uses the top-level “for loop” to report measurements for the same TRP?  NR-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16  NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),  If yes, this is not the reason such a “for loop” has been added. But, even if some UE does that now, and assume that an LMF accepts such a reporting, what would happen for the UEs that really want to report measurmeents across 256 TRPs? In that case, |
| vivo | Thanks for the explanations of the companies. We would like to further confirm:   * If the understanding of ‘measured/reported TRPs can be different for different measurement instances’ is correct, does it mean that the UE can measure/report TRPs less than the TRPs configured in *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData*, otherwise, we cannot find the case where ‘measured/reported TRPs can be different for different measurement instances’.   If the above description is common understanding, we can accept Alt4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Also support Alt. 4 given that it is easier to report measurements per positioning method (as in legacy). |

FL Comments

It seems Alt.4 is acceptable to majority of the feedbacks.

(Round 3) Proposal 3.3 (H)

* *The association between measurement instances and UE/gNB measurements should be defined as follows:*
  + *For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.* 
    - *E.g., a UE reports in a single NR-XXX-ProvideLocationInformation, multiple NR-XXX-SignalMeasurementInformation elements for UE assisted positioning, and NR-XXX-LocationInformation for UE-based positioning.*
* *Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3, asking them to take above information into account in their signalling work*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support Alt.4. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments |  | To vivo,  To our understanding, in current 37.355, UE can report TRPs less than the TRPs configured in NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData. Do you expect that UE should report 256 TRPs all the time ?  NR-DL-TDOA-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  dl-PRS-ReferenceInfo-r16 DL-PRS-ID-Info-r16,  nr-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16 NR-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16,  ...  }  NR-DL-TDOA-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement-r16  nrMaxTRPs-r16 INTEGER ::= 256 -- Max TRPs per UE  In addition, we think gNB measurement is a bit different from UE measurement. gNB is naturally report its measurement per NG-RAN node. Do we mean that each measurement instance may include measurements from all TRPs within an NG-RAN node? For example, RAN3 may extend the maximum number of TRP Measurement Response List.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **TRP Measurement Response List** |  | *0..1* | | **>TRP Measurement Response Item** |  | *1..<maxnoofMeasTRPs>* | | >>TRP ID | M |  | | >> TRP Measurement Result | M |  | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | We suggest to make this agreement limited to UE and LMF, and add the bullet that it is RAN1 understanding how to implement this feature in RAN3 specification is up to RAN3. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |  |
| Qualcomm |  |  | We are OK to limit this to the UE as Huawei, HiSilicon suggests. Indeed, the biggest issue is that there is a need to finish the feature with respect to the LPP. |
| vivo |  |  | Based on our question and the reply from FL, can we add the bullet  it is RAN1 understanding how to implement this feature in RAN2 specification is up to RAN2.(e.g. whether the reporting TRP are the same or different in multiple instances?) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  | Support. We are also okay with limiting the proposal for the UE. |
| LGE | Yes |  |  |
| FL |  |  | For Huawei and vivo’s comments:  We could add the bullet that how to implement this feature in RAN2/3 specification is up to RAN2/3. |

### (Round 4) Proposal 3.3 (H)

* *The association between measurement instances and UE/gNB measurements should be defined as follows:*
  + *For each indicated positioning method in a measurement report, multiple measurement instances are associated with the indicated positioning method.* 
    - *E.g., a UE reports in a single NR-XXX-ProvideLocationInformation, multiple NR-XXX-SignalMeasurementInformation elements for UE assisted positioning, and NR-XXX-LocationInformation for UE-based positioning.*
* *It is up to RAN2 and RAN3 on how to implement above agreement*
* *Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3, asking them to take above information into account in their signalling work*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |  |

# RAN2/SA2 Reply LSs on Positioning Reference Unit (PRUs)

Background

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement: (RAN1#105e)  Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3 (cc SA2), including the following content:   * RAN1 has evaluated the use of positioning reference units (PRUs) with known locations for positioning and observes improvements in using PRUs for enhancing the positioning performance. But, RAN1 has not identified specification enhancements needed in RAN1 specifications. RAN1 kindly requests RAN2/RAN3 (cc SA2) to determine if and what specification enhancements are adopted for PRUs for positioning. * Notes:   + The term “positioning reference unit (PRU)” is only used as a terminology in this discussion. PRU does not necessarily mean an introduction of a new network node.   + PRU may support, at least, some of the Rel-16 positioning functionalities of UE, if agreed, which is up to RAN2. The positioning functionalities may include, but not limited to, the following:     1. Provide the positioning measurements (e.g., RSTD, RSRP, Rx-Tx time differences)     2. Transmit the UL SRS signals for positioning   + PRU may be requested by the LMF to provide its own known location coordinate information to the LMF. If the antenna orientation information of the PRU is known, the information may also be requested by the LMF.   [R1-2106265](file://Users/renda000/Downloads/2021_11_RAN1_107e/Docs/R1-2106265.doc) [DRAFT] LS on Positioning Reference Units (PRUs) for enhancing positioning performance  Final LS endorsed in [R1-2106326](file://Users/renda000/Downloads/2021_11_RAN1_107e/Docs/R1-2106326.doc) (Email endorsement) |

SA2’s response to RAN1 LS [R1-2200862]

|  |
| --- |
| SA2 discussed the PRU and agreed to include the objective of how to support the ***PRU in Rel-18*** eLCS\_Ph3 Study Item, considering SA2 Rel-17 is already frozen and more time is needed to study how to support the PRU in SA2.  SA2 also noticed that RAN2 is under discussion of how *to support PRUs in Rel-17* and is considering solutions which may or may not have impacts to SA2. SA2 does not have enough time in Rel-17 to comment on such solutions at the present time but expects that a solution or solutions preferable to SA2 should be possible in Release 18. |

RAN2’s response to RAN1 LS [R1-2200857]

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 discussed support of PRUs as described in the RAN1 LS R2-2106920 (R1-2106326, S2-2105263). Based on the information provided by RAN1, RAN2's current understanding is that a PRU is a device with a priori known location (to some degree of accuracy at least) and which performs location measurements at this known location. In addition, the PRU can transmit SRS to enable TRPs to measure and report UL positioning measurements from PRUs at known location. The PRU or TRP measurements can then be compared by a location server with the measurements expected to determine "correction information" for other nearby target devices. The location measurements for other target devices may then be corrected based on the previously determined "correction information".  Further, RAN2 discussed the modelling of PRUs and agreed that the PRU can be considered (at least) as a UE (from LMF perspective). However, since the PRU location measurements are needed by an LMF itself different views exist in RAN2 on how this can be enabled in the current LCS architecture.  Some companies in RAN2 believe that PRU support has no impact on SA2 and CT specifications and think that the MT-LR procedures as currently specified in TS 23.273 can also be instigated by an LMF (e.g., an LMF may initiate a location request to a GMLC) or existing MO LR procedures as specified in TS 23.273 can be instigated by a PRU for enabling an LMF to obtain PRU location measurements or transmit UL-SRS.  Other companies in RAN2 believe that an LMF needs to be enabled to instigate location procedures for a PRU (e.g., LPP, NRPPa procedures) without receiving a location request for the PRU from an AMF (i.e., in the absence of an MT-LR or MO-LR for the PRU). These companies also believe that this effectively means that the LMF should act as an "LCS Client" for PRUs.  However, since the LCS procedures and overall architecture are in the realm of SA2, RAN2 would like to confirm with SA2 whether PRU support as described by RAN1 can be provided with the current LCS framework as specified by SA2 (e.g., TS 23.273) or whether any changes would be required.  In addition, RAN2 discussed whether the LMF determined "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements needs to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation. As mentioned by RAN1 in the LS, a PRU may provide "antenna orientation information" to an LMF and RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 to provide further details of the "PRU antenna orientation information".  2. Actions:  To RAN1 group.  ACTION: RAN2 kindly asks RAN1 whether the LMF determined "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements need to be ***provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation***, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to ***provide further details on the specific "correction information"*** which need to be provided to target UEs.  RAN2 also kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the "***PRU antenna orientation information***" which should be provided to an LMF. |

During the meeting, RAN1 received RAN2 LS [R1-2202620] with the following information related to PRU:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PRU** | RAN2 has agreed that RAN2 will not discuss PRUs further without further guidance from RAN1 (LS or feature list). | **RAN1 to decide whether PRU is supported in Rel-17;** |

*Submitted Proposals*

* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 5:*** *Support to provide UE capability information to LMF, which can assist LMF to select the capable UE to become PRU.*
* ***(Sony, R1-2201582[6]) Proposal 6:*** *PRU with known location support the following reporting: Location uncertainty information, stationary status, positioning measurement and/or estimated Tx/Rx Timing error report.*
* ***(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 1:*** *Prioritize UE-assisted PRU in Rel-17 and send an LS to RAN2 informing them of this decision.*
* ***(Nokia, R1-2201634[7]) Proposal 2****: Include in the reply LS to RAN2 that the PRU antenna orientation is the 3D angle in the global coordinate system at which the PRU antenna is location*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8])******Proposal 1:*** *For UE-based DL-TDOA positioning, support one of the following options for assistance information reporting from the LMF to the target UE to facilitate TRP TX timing errors mitigation:*
  + *Option 1:* 
    - *Support the LMF providing the DL RSTD measurement and the associated TX TEGs obtained with the Positioning Reference Unit (PRU) to the target UE*
    - *Support the LMF providing the PRU coordinates to the target UE*
  + *Option 2:* 
    - *Support the LMF providing the TRP TX timing errors difference (between the target and reference TRP) and the associated TX TEGs to the target UE*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8])******Proposal 2:*** *Support PRU antenna orientation information reporting in GCS from PRU to the LMF reusing the LCS-GCS-Translation-Parameter-r16 defined in Rel.16* 
  + *where the PRU antenna array boresight direction in LCS is aligned with the x axis, and*
  + *y and z axes in LCS are aligned with the row and column dimensions of the antenna array, respectively*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8])******Proposal 3:*** *Introduce the following UE capability/feature groups for PRU support:*
  + *FG x1: Support of the PRU functionality*
    - *UE may be requested by the LMF to provide its own known location coordinate information to the LMF to facilitate mitigation of UE/gNB TX/RX timing delay mitigation*
  + *FG x2: Support of the PRU with antenna orientation information reporting*
    - *UE may be requested by the LMF to provide antenna orientation information*
  + *FG x1 is a pre-requisite of the FG x2*
* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 5****: Support Option 1 (“Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a UE”) and Option 2 (“Support LMF to optionally indicate the measurement time window for a gNB”) of the measurement time window.*
* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 6****: Integrity metrics associated with location information of the PRU is used to verify “known location” of the UE.*
* ***(InterDigital, R1-2201824[9]) Proposal 7****: Time validity conditions for PRU should be specified.*
* ***(Samsung, R1-2202014[11]) Proposal 1****: The "correction information" could at least include the time difference and the angle difference for PRU or between PRU and target UE, and each of them should be associated with two or more cell ID or reference signal ID for location measurement.*
* ***(Samsung, R1-2202014[11]) Proposal 2****: Correction state indicator should be configured to trigger the target UEs to receive "correction information".*
* ***(Samsung, R1-2202014[11]) Proposal 3****: The "correction information" can be requested by target UEs or provided by LMF directly according to the correction state indicator.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 1:*** *LMF may use current capability signalling procedures to differentiate and identify PRU and normal UEs.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 2:*** *LMF can manage and process PRU reference measurements in a similar manner to normal UE measurements.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 3****: RAN1 to confirm that PRU UE basic operations may be supported in Rel-17 with existing LPP procedures based on RAN2 and SA2 input.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 4:*** *RAN1 to confirm that the PRU UE can report its known available location information to the LMF via:*
  + *LPP signalling;*
  + *RRC signalling (e.g. using CommonLocationInfo message) via gNB.*
  + *Offline/pre-configured location calibration*
  + *Note: It is up to RAN2 decide, which messages may be used to transfer the known location information.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 5:*** *RAN1 to support provision of double differential correction information for UEs performing UE-based positioning.*
* ***(Lenovo, R1-2202370[15])Proposal 6:*** *RAN1 to at least support the following differential correction information provided to the UE:*
  + *Pseudorange error corrections of associated TRPs including DL-PRS resource information of the measured TRPs;*
  + *Pseudorange error correction validity time;*
  + *Source type of the double differential correction information (e.g., PRU UE).*
* *(vivo, R1-2201046) And at least RSTD correction information should be included for UE-based DL TDOA.*
* *(ZTE, R1-2201205) RAN1 thinks LMF can obtain time/synchronization difference between a TEG i of a first TRP and TEG j of a second TRP based on the PRU/TRP measurements and the PRU location. Hence, the correct information refers to the time/synchronization difference between a TEG i of a first TRP and TEG j of a second TRP where a first TRP can be the same as the second TRP. It is like to extend NR-RTD-Info-r16 from TRP basis to TEG basis.*
* *(OPPO, R1-2201246) correction information” can be Tx timing error for PRS resource(s) / PRS resource set(s) to facilitate UE to compensate the timing-based measurement result.*
* *(CATT) Proposal 1: The support of providing "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation will be considered in a future release, but not in Rel-17.*
* *(***InterDigital***, R1-2201822) Proposal 1: Correction information can be provided by the LMF to the target UE for UE-based positioning*
* *(***InterDigital***, R1-2201822) Proposal 2: As correction information, estimated timing offset associated with TRP Tx TEG is provided by the LMF to the target UE for UE-based positioning*
* *(CMCC, R1-2201838) Proposal 1: Support LMF to provide correction information of timing errors to a target UE using UE-based positioning.*
* *(CMCC, R1-2201838) Proposal 2: The correction information should include the positioning method or positioning measurement used at the LMF to obtain the timing errors, and the specific timing error values*
* *(Qualcomm, R1-2202108) no new assistance data, or correction information has been identified in this release beyond the assistance data enhancements that has already been agreed.*
* *(LGE, R1-2202296) it would be a details about the value of estimated Tx/Rx/TxRx TEGs at gNB obtained by PRU measurements.*
* *(Ericsson, R1-2202323)* *During Rel-17 enhanced positioning normative phase, RAN1 agreed that there is no RAN1 specification impact with respect to PRUs. As such, details of “correction information” were not discussed nor agreed during Rel-17 enhanced positioning normative phase. From RAN1 perspective, such detailed discussion needs to be deferred to a future release.*
* *(Huawei, R1-2202454)* *Proposal 1: RAN1 confirm that PRU functionality as a UE can be specified in RAN in Rel-17 time frame.*
* *(Huawei, R1-2202454) Proposal 2: RAN1 to reply to RAN2 with the question of correction information for UE-based mode:*
  + *It is RAN1 understanding that the correction information for UE-based DL-TDOA can be provided via NR-RTD-Info in Rel-16 without change of specification, and that the correction information for UE-based DL-AoD can be provided via the Rel-17 TRP beam/antenna information already agreed.*
* ***(vivo, R1-2201046)*** ***the boresight direction information of PRU, and the contents are similar to (the boresight direction of a beam in AoD positioning(ie. DL-PRS-BeamInfoElement-r16))***
* *(ZTE, R1-2201205) a boresight direction where a PRU is used for receiving/transmitting reference signals, which can be expressed by azimuth angle information and/or elevation angle information.*
* *(OPPO, R1-2201246) For the type of PRU regarded as UE, the PRU antenna orientation information cannot be obtained.*
* *(CATT, R1-2201315)* *Proposal 2: If a PRU is a TRP, the TRP may provide its antenna orientation information, i.e., LCS to GCS Translation information, for the transmission of SRS resources for positioning to the LMF, which is similar to the case when TRP provides the antenna orientation information for the transmission of PRS resources to the LMF as supported in Rel-16. If a PRU is a UE, there is no need to support the UE to provide its antenna orientation information to the LMF in Rel-17.*
* *(***InterDigital***, R1-2201822)* Proposal 3: If requested by the network, the PRU can provide antenna orientation information where the antenna orientation information can include boresight angles of Tx and/or Rx panels
* *(Qualcomm, R1-2202108) RAN1 has not identified in this release, any further details on the "PRU antenna orientation information" which should be provided to an LMF*
* *(LGE, R1-2202296) Tx/Rx/TxRx TEGs (e.g. association information) and it may also include the coordination of antenna when the antennas are distributed.*
* *(Ericsson, R1-2202323)* PRU can be considered as a UE (from LMF perspective). As the UE’s orientation is likely to change, it doesn’t seem beneficial for a PRU UE to report “PRU antenna orientation information” to the LMF. Furthermore, details of “PRU antenna orientation information” were not discussed nor agreed during Rel-17 enhanced positioning normative phase.
* (Huawei, R1-2202454) Proposal 3: RAN1 to reply to RAN2 with the question of antenna orientation information:
  + It is RAN1 understanding that a single LCS-GCS translation per UE is sufficient to convey the antenna orientation of a PRU.

FL comments

SA2 Reply LS has made clear that from SA2 Rel-17 is already frozen, and thus any PRU features that has impact on SA2 will be considered in Rel-18, but not in Rel-17. Thus, for Rel-17, RAN may only consider the support of the PRU features that do not have the impact on SA2, e.g., MO-LR.

In RAN2 replay LS asks RAN1 to provide the response on the following question,

* Q1: whether the LMF determined "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements need to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the specific "correction information" which need to be provided to target UEs.
* Q2: RAN2 also kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the "PRU antenna orientation information" which should be provided to an LMF.

For the 1st question of providing "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, many companies propose providing the timing related correction information, e.g., estimated TRP TX timing errors difference (Intel, Samsung, OPPO, InterDigital, CMCC, LGE, Huawei), differential correction (Lenovo), RSTD correction (vivo), TRP time/synchronization difference (ZTE). Some companies also propose providing the angle related correction information (Samsung, Huawei).

However, there are also multiple companies propose either prioritize UE-assisted PRU in Rel-17 (Nokia), or consider the support of providing "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation in a future release, but not in Rel-17 (CATT, Qualcomm, Ericsson), mainly because RAN1 has so far not made the agreement on the correction information for UE-based positioning, and the WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective. In addition, Rel-16 already supports LMF to provide the RTD (real time difference) to UE. Thus, when LMF estimates the time synchronization errors between a reference TRP and a list of neighbour TRPs based on the information from PRU, the LMF can sent the *NR-RTD-Info* to UE to provide time synchronization information between a reference TRP and a list of neighbour TRPs.

For the 2nd question of “PRU antenna orientation information", most of companies consider the PRU antenna orientation information is the LCS-GCS transformation information of the PRU antenna (Nokia, Intel, CATT, InterDigital, LGE, Huawei) or the boresight direction of the signals (vivo, ZTE). However, some companies have pointed out that when a PRU is a UE, PRU antenna orientation information may not be available (OPPO, CATT, Ericsson). One company (Qualcomm) also proposes no further details on the "PRU antenna orientation information" should be provided to an LMF in Rel-17.

Based on the proposals from the companies, RAN1 will need to first discuss *whether the LMF determined new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements need to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation* and whether and which "PRU antenna orientation information" can be provided to an LMF.

### (Closed) Question 4-1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on whether RAN1 needs to define new "correction information" to be determined by the LMF from PRU measurements and provide the "correction information" for UE-based positioning in Rel-17.*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | This can be done by the existing RTD info. |
| CATT |  | No | Given that the ePos WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, the support of providing "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation will be considered in a future release, but not in Rel-17. |
| vivo | √ |  | We think the enhancement should be applicable for both UE-based and UE-assist modes, not just one of them |
| OPPO | Yes |  | It would be helfull for UE-based positioning. This is not to introduce a new feature, but just to finish the details for the supported feature (PRU), which can be done in the maintanence stage. |
| ZTE |  | No | The NR-RTD-Info can already include the synchronization information between TRPs, which can serve as the “ correction information”. |
| CMCC | Yes |  | This feature should be applicable for both UE-assisted and UE-based positioning. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | We support to discuss the details. Measurements returned by the PRU can be used by the LMF to derive correction information. We believe the correction information is associated with TEG such that the UE can use the provided corection information for enhancing accuracy during UE-based positioning. |
| Ericsson |  | No | It should be noted that RAN1 so far has not discussed nor agreed any details related to “correction in formation” in Rel-17. Since ePos rel-17 WI is closed and we are in maintenance phase, we should not discuss enhancements for “correction information” now in maintenance phase. So, we suggest that any enhancements related to “correction information” is not supported in Rel-17. |
| LGE | O |  | We think providng “correction information” is the motivation of introducing the PRU. So, it should be considered and it also needs to be provided for UE-assisted too.  We are also supportive of PRU. But, we think that the dicssuion on PRU totally needs to be postponed in accordance with the absence of SA2 (based on LS (S2-2109104, from SA2 to RAN2). Consdidering that SA2 has finished R-17 and this issue cannot be dealt in SA2, it seems appropriate reply LS for RAN2 about our consideration and RAN1 needs to discuss the issue in further release than Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  | We prefer to consider PRU functionality to benefit both UE-assisted and UE-based positioning methods. Provision of correction information was sent by RAN2 at the latter stages of the WI and still remains an open issue. Since RAN1 triggered the issue of PRU with other WGs, it is up to RAN1 to close this isse by providing the requested information. |
| Intel | Yes |  | The “correction information” should be supported for UE-based positioning |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | While we agree that correction information can be helpful for UE-based positioning we are okay to prioritize UE-assited for Rel-17. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  | PRU discussion seems to be postponed in RAN2 & SA2; however, we are supportive of the feature. In this release, we could discuss/agree on new AD for UE-based, but from our understanding, there will not be a relation/procedure on how this new AD is being derived since PRUs. |

### (Closed) Question 4-2

*If you consider RAN1 needs to define new "correction information" to be determined by the LMF from PRU measurements for UE-based positioning, please indicates which of the following can be the "correction information":*

* *TRP Tx timing error*
* *TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
* *Correction of TOA measurement*
* *Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
* *TRP synchronization information (in addition to the existing NR-RTD-Info)*
* *Differenial correction information*
* *…*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No | Resource specific RTD was discussed, but not agreed. |
| CATT |  | No | Given that the ePos WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective, the support of providing "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation will be considered in a future release, but not in Rel-17. |
| vivo | √ |  | Bullet 4 is preferred. Based on TS37.355, the RTK correct information has been supported and includes the *CarrierPhaseCorrectionDifference*. With the introduction of PRU, which not only corrects for synchronization, TEG errors but also RSTD measurement errors. |
| OPPO | Yes |  | Bullet 2 and 4 can be considered |
| ZTe |  | No | The NR-RTD-Info can already include the synchronization information between TRPs, which can serve as the “ correction information”. |
| CMCC | Yes |  | 2nd or 4th bullets should be supported. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | Bullet #1-#4 can be discussed. |
| Ericsson |  | No | It should be noted that RAN1 so far has not discussed nor agreed any details related to “correction in formation” in Rel-17. Since ePos rel-17 WI is closed and we are in maintenance phase, we should not discuss enhancements for “correction information” now in maintenance phase. So, we suggest that any enhancements related to “correction information” is not supported in Rel-17. |
| LGE |  |  | We are also supportive of PRU. But, we think that the dicssuion on PRU totally needs to be postponed in accordance with the absence of SA2 (based on LS (S2-2109104, from SA2 to RAN2). Consdidering that SA2 has finished R-17 and this issue cannot be dealt in SA2, it seems appropriate reply LS for RAN2 about our consideration and RAN1 needs to discuss the issue in further release than Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  | We also consider the RSTD measurements to be part of the differential correction information. The pseudo-reange errors computed by the LMF need to also be accounted for by the UE. |
| Intel | Yes |  | Bullet #2 and bullet #4  For bullet #4 PRU coordinate needs to be reported to UE |
| Nokia/NSB |  | No | While we agree that correction information can be helpful for UE-based positioning we are okay to prioritize UE-assited for Rel-17. |
| Qualcomm |  |  | Bullet #4 & Resource specific RTD would always be good to be added (related to bullet 5) |

### (Closed) Question 4-3

*Companies are invited to provide their views on following on whether PRU needs to provide “PRU antenna orientation information” to LMF when the PRU is a TRP, and if yes, provide your views on which of following defines the “PRU antenna orientation information”:*

* *Option 1: The translation information of a Local Coordinate System (LCS) of the PRU antenna to a Global Coordinate System (GCS) as defined in TR 38.901, including the angles α (bearing angle), β (downtilt angle) and γ (slant angle) (see e.g.,* LCS-GCS-TranslationParameter-r16 in 38.355)
* *Option 2: The boresight of direction information of the transmitted/received signals, including the azimuth and elevation angles in LCS or in GCS (see e.g., DL-PRS-BeamInfoElement in TS 37.355)*
* *Option 1 and Option 2 (LCS)*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | We are fine not to support antenna orientation information, and we do not support PRU being a TRP. |
| CATT | Yes |  | We support Option1. |
| vivo |  |  | Based on the RAN2 agreement, PRU as UE is supported, we would like to confirm whether PRU as TRP has been supported? If it is not, we prefer not to support PRU being a TRP in Rel-17.  Agreements:  Proposal 1 (modified): For purposes of RAN2 discussion, the PRU functionality as described in the RAN1 LS can be considered as UE with known location (to some degree of accuracy) at least (16/17).  PRU modelled as a gNB can be discussed in RAN3 (no RAN2 action). |
| OPPO |  |  | If PRU is a TRP, it would be ok. However, RAN2 has agreed that PRU is regarded as UE. |
| ZTE |  |  | Prefer to treat PRU as a UE agreed by RAN2. |
| InterDigital |  |  | Our understanding is that PRU is a UE, as agreed in RAN2#115e. We should not spend time to disucss this proposal. |
| Ericsson |  | No | @vivo/ZTE: In our understanding, PRU as UE is not supported in RAN2 either. The above agreement you quote only says consider for discussion purposes, and does not say it is supported. The latest agreement from RAN2 is as follows:  Agreement:  RAN2 will not discuss PRUs further without further guidance from RAN1 (LS or feature list).  Given RAN1 has not discussed details of above “PRU antenna orientation information” in Rel-17. Since ePos rel-17 WI is closed and we are in maintenance phase, we should not discuss enhancements for “antenna orientation information” now in maintenance phase. So, we suggest that any enhancements related to “antenna orientation information” is not supported in Rel-17. |
| LGE |  |  | We prefer to that RAN1 firstly needs to discuss the PRU as UE not a TRP.  We are also supportive of PRU. But, we think that the dicssuion on PRU totally needs to be postponed in accordance with the absence of SA2 (based on LS (S2-2109104, from SA2 to RAN2). Consdidering that SA2 has finished R-17 and this issue cannot be dealt in SA2, it seems appropriate reply LS for RAN2 about our consideration and RAN1 needs to discuss the issue in further release than Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  |  | No strong view, but in line with the other companies, the PRU as a UE should be first priority.  @Ericsson, RAN2 had already supported PRU as a UE via the following agreements:  Agreements:  Proposal 1 (modified): For purposes of RAN2 discussion, the PRU functionality as described in the RAN1 LS can be considered as UE with known location (to some degree of accuracy) at least (16/17).  PRU modelled as a gNB can be discussed in RAN3 (no RAN2 action).  Agreement:  RAN2 confirm that the PRU considered as a UE supports the normal LPP procedures for assistance data transfer and location information transfer  The latest agreements by RAN2 are a trigger to RAN1 to provide feedback. |
| Intel | Yes |  | In general we are supporting of Option 1, but we think that TRP as PRU is not decided by SA/RAN3 |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | We agree with Intel. For UE as PRU it should be option 1. RAN1 should prioritize sending an LS back to RAN2 which clarifies this point and that PRU (at least UE type) is beneficial and feasible. |

### (Closed) Question 4-4

*Companies are invited to provide their views on following on whether PRU needs to provide “PRU antenna orientation information” to LMF when the PRU is a UE, and if yes, provide your views on which of following defines the “PRU antenna orientation information”:*

* *Option 1: The translation information of a Local Coordinate System (LCS) of the PRU antenna to a Global Coordinate System (GCS) as defined in TR 38.901, including the angles α (bearing angle), β (downtilt angle) and γ (slant angle) (see e.g.,* LCS-GCS-TranslationParameter-r16 in 38.355)
* *Option 2: The boresight of direction information of the transmitted/received signals, including the azimuth and elevation angles in LCS or in GCS (see e.g., DL-PRS-BeamInfoElement in TS 37.355)*
* *Option 1 and Option 2 (LCS)*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |  | We are fine not to support antenna orientation information. |
| CATT |  |  | When the PRU is a UE, we prefer not to support the “PRU antenna orientation information”. |
| vivo |  |  | If a PRU is a UE, it may be difficult to obtain the antenna orientation information as the UE moves or flips. But if antenna orientation information can be reported by some UEs (e.g. fixed UEs), so, only the boresight information of PRU in GCS is supported, otherwise, not supported. |
| OPPO |  |  | RAN2 has agreed that PRU is regarded as UE. We cannot get such kind information for a UE |
| ZTE |  |  | OK for further discuss the use cases for this. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  | We don’t understand the usecases where a PRU which serves as a reference point moves or rotates unpredictably. Our understanding is that these PRUs are nearly static such that the network can use them for calibration purpose. PRU can be a refernece point set up by a surveyor. It is possible to obtain antenna orientation information for a such usecase. We are ok with the options mentioned by the FL as the starting point. |
| Ericsson |  | No | If PRU is considered a UE, the UE orientation will change time to time. Hence, it is hard to obtain orientation information. We do not support ‘PRU antenna orientation information’. |
| LGE |  |  | We are also supportive of PRU. But, we think that the dicssuion on PRU totally needs to be postponed in accordance with the absence of SA2 (based on LS (S2-2109104, from SA2 to RAN2). Consdidering that SA2 has finished R-17 and this issue cannot be dealt in SA2, it seems appropriate reply LS for RAN2 about our consideration and RAN1 needs to discuss the issue in further release than Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  |  | No strong view, but also ok to further discuss the feasibility and need for providing antenna orientation information. |
| Intel | Yes |  | Option 1, known antenna orientation of static PRU can be used for calibration |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | We agree with Intel. For UE as PRU it should be option 1. RAN1 should prioritize sending an LS back to RAN2 which clarifies this point and that PRU (at least UE type) is beneficial and feasible. |

FL Comments

From the feebbacks of Question 4-1, 8 companies (*vivo, OPPO, CMCC, IDC, LGE, Lenovo, Intel, Qualcomm*) support defining new "correction information", while 4 companies (*Huawei, CATT, ZTE, Ericsson, Nokia*) does not support it. One company (LGE) considers the PRU discussion needs to be postponed according the SA2 LS.

From the feebbacks of Question 4-2, among the companies that support the new “correction information”, most of them (*vivo, OPPO, CMCC, IDC, LGE, Lenovo, Intel*) support “correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs”, some of them (*OPPO, CMCC, IDC)* support “TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs”.

In FL’s view, there is a need to have a discussion on the common understanding of the *NR-RTD-Info,* which is already supported in Rel-16 before we further discuss whether to support new “correction information”. In FL’s understanding, the *NR-RTD-Info* to provide time synchronization information between a reference TRP and a list of neighbour TRPs, which should be interprested as the “TRP Tx timing difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs” at the transmitting antenna, but not the timing difference between the internal clocks of the reference TRP and neighboring TRPs.

For the reporting of the *PRU antenna orientation information,* it seems most companies do not support providing the information, given that TRP as PRU is not suppprted.

Proposal 4-1

Provide the following responses to RAN2’s LS on PRU:

*About “whether the LMF determined ‘correction information’ obtained from PRU measurements needs to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation”, provide one of the following options as the response:*

* *Option 1: In Rel-17, there is no need to support the LMF to provide new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide the following new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation:*
  + *Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*

*About “the details of the "PRU antenna orientation information", provide one of the following options as the response:*

* *Option 1: When a PRU is a UE, there is no need to support PRU to provide the antenna orientation information to LMF in Rel-17.*
* *Option 2: The PRU antenna orientation information is defined as follows:*
  + *The translation information of a Local Coordinate System (LCS) of the PRU antenna to a Global Coordinate System (GCS) as defined in TR 38.901, including the angles α (bearing angle), β (downtilt angle) and γ (slant angle) (see e.g., LCS-GCS-TranslationParameter-r16 in 38.355)*

(Round 2) Proposal 4-1 (H)

Provide the following responses to RAN2’s LS on PRU:

*About “whether the LMF determined ‘correction information’ obtained from PRU measurements needs to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation”, provide the response with one of the following options:*

* *Option 1: In Rel-17, there is no need to support the LMF to provide new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide the following new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation:*
  + *Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*

*About “the details of the "PRU antenna orientation information", provide the response with one of the following options:*

* *Option 1: The PRU antenna orientation information is defined as follows:*
  + *The translation information of a Local Coordinate System (LCS) of the PRU antenna to a Global Coordinate System (GCS) as defined in TR 38.901, including the angles α (bearing angle), β (downtilt angle) and γ (slant angle) (see e.g., LCS-GCS-TranslationParameter-r16 in 38.355)*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, when a UE is PRU, it does not support providing the antenna orientation information to LMF.*
* *Option 3:* 
  + *Option 1 + Option 2*

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For ‘*correction information*’, support Option 2.  For ‘*PRU antenna orientation information*’, support Option 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For correction information, option 2 was originally discussed in RAN1#104-e, but in the end we only agreed to adopt Option 2 for UE-based positioning. We do not think it is good to reopen this discussion.   * Option 2:   + Support LMF to provide the association information of DL PRS resources with Tx TEGs to UE for UE-based positioning * Option 9:   + Support LMF to provide the Tx timing error differences between Tx TEGs of a TRP to a UE for UE-based positioning   For antenna orientation information, we support Option 2. Not clear what the usage of Option 3. |
| ZTE | Option 1 for the first proposal.  As commented by some companies in GTW that the PRU can be static for calibration purpose. Therefore, it maybe possible for PRU to get its orientation information. However, only provide the direction of PRU antenna is not enough (assuming the PRU is a UE). PRU has also to report the boresight direction when transmitting/receiving reference signals. With both direction of PRU antenna and boresight direction, LMF can reconstruct AoA/AoD of the PRU for better positioning.  If Option 1+ boresight direction cannot be supported, we can accept Option 2 for progress. |
| CATT | For ‘correction information’, we support Option 1. Such enhancements can be considered in a future release, but not in Rel-17.  For ‘PRU antenna orientation information’, support Option 3, i.e., when the PRU is a TRP, support providing the antenna orientation information to LMF. But when the PRU is a UE, does not support providing the antenna orientation information to LMF. |
| InterDigital | For correction information we support Option 2 for the reasons stated in the first round.  For PRU antenna orientation information, we support Option 1 (for the reasons we expressed online) but we can accept Option 2 for progress. Since we are not considering PRU as a TRP, we do not support Option 3. |
| OPPO | 1. Option 2  2. Option 2  If CATT’s understanding for Option 3 is correct, the wording of Option 3 should be revised accordingly to capture the exact intension |

FL Comments

During the meeting, RAN1 received RAN2 LS [R1-2202620] with the following information related to PRU:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PRU** | RAN2 has agreed that RAN2 will not discuss PRUs further without further guidance from RAN1 (LS or feature list). | **RAN1 to decide whether PRU is supported in Rel-17;** |

With above information and consideration that the WI was already closed from RAN1’s perspective, FL would like to add an additional option for RAN1 to discuss whether to support PRU in future release instead of Rel-17.

(Round 3) Proposal 4-1 (H)

Provide the following response to RAN2 LSs [R1-2200857] and [R1-2202620]:

***Alt. 1:***

* *Response to R1-2202620:*
  + *RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not supported in Rel-17*
* *Response to R1-2200857:*
  + *Given that RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not supported in Rel-17 in the response to RAN2 LS R1-2202620, RAN1 considers that it is no longer necessary for RAN1 to provide the answers on questions raised in RAN2 LS in Rel-17.*

***Alt. 2:***

* *Response to R1-2202620:*
  + *RAN1 has made the decision that PRU supported in Rel-17 only when the PRU is a UE.*
* *Response to R1-2200857:*

*About “whether the LMF determined ‘correction information’ obtained from PRU measurements needs to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation”, provide the response with one of the following options:*

* *Option 1: In Rel-17, there is no need to support the LMF to provide new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide the following new "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation:*
  + *Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*

*About “the details of the "PRU antenna orientation information", provide the response with one of the following options:*

* *Option 1: If PRU antenna orientation information is provided, it should be defined as follows:*
  + *The translation information of a Local Coordinate System (LCS) of the PRU antenna to a Global Coordinate System (GCS) as defined in TR 38.901, including the angles α (bearing angle), β (downtilt angle) and γ (slant angle) (see e.g., LCS-GCS-TranslationParameter-r16 in 38.355)*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, it does not support PRU providing the antenna orientation information to LMF.*
* *Option 3:* 
  + *Option 1 + Option 2*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt. 1**  **(YES)** | **Alt. 2 (YES)**  **(OP1, OP2, OP3)** | **Additional comments** |
| InterDigital |  |  | We are not sure if this is an efficient way to proceed. First we should finish the discussion in (Round 2) Proposal 4-1 (H). If Option 1 is supported for correction information and Option 2 is supported for antenna orientation information in Round 2, it will naturally lead us to conclude “RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not supported in Rel-17”. RAN1 should answer the questions listed in R1-2200857 (i.e., create RAN1 response based on the agreed option in Round 2). |
| OPPO |  |  | If CATT’s understanding for Option 3 is correct, the wording of Option 3 should be revised accordingly to capture the exact intension. Moreover, for the current version of Alt.2, is Option 3 still needed? There is only UE-like PRU according to the first part of Alt.2  We are fine with Alt1.  For Alt.2, we think RAN2 has make a conclusion about the type of PRU. RAN1 don’t need to duplicate the similar conclusion. For the questions, we support the following options  1. Option 2  2. Option 2 (Assume it is a UE based on RAN2 agreement) |
| Qualcomm |  |  | Even though we support to specify the feature across RAn1/RAN2/RAn3/SA2 specifications, we think it is late for this release, so we prefer to go to combination of Alt. 1 & Alt. 2, since sending answers to the R1-2200857 may still be iseful for future discussins.  The fact that there might not be specification support in NR Rel-17 for PRUs, it doesn’t mean that we should preclude assistance data enhancements for UE-based positioning, under the assumption that it is up to LMF implementation in this release how the LMF derives these new AD.  ***Alt. 3:***   * *Response to R1-2202620:*   + *RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not ~~supported~~ specified in Rel-17.* * *Response to R1-2200857:*   *An LMF can provide to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, one of the following options:*   * + *Option 1: No additional UE-based AD are specified in NR Rel-17.*   + *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation:*     - *Option 2A: Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*     - *Option 2B: TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*     - *Option 2C: TRP synchronization information (in addition to the existing NR-RTD-Info)*   *About “the details of the "PRU antenna orientation information", provide the response with one of the following options:*   * + *Option 2: In Rel-17, since there is no PRU specified, the specification does not need to support providing the antenna orientation information to LMF.* |
| Ericsson | YES |  | Given the latest LS [R1-2202620] from RAN2 PRU, Alt 1 is the reasonable way to move forward.  Recall that earlier RAN1 agreed there is no RAN1 specification impact. Given RAN1 has not discussed the PRU topic for a while, it is not likely that specifications of this feature will be completed in time for Rel-17. |
| vivo |  |  | We can compromise with Alt3 by QC. |
| ZTE | YES |  | Given that SA2 have already frozen and the functionality of PRU can be done via implementation, we’re fine to close this issue. |
| Intel |  | YES | We support Alt 2.  For question 1 (“correction information”) we support Option 2.  Note, that if we support Option 1, then the WI objective for UE-based solution will not be accomplished.  For question 2 (“antenna orientation information”) we support Option 1.  First, RAN1 made an angreement on the PRU antenna information as below:  Agreement:   * Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3 (cc SA2), including the following content:   + RAN1 has evaluated the use of positioning reference units (PRUs) with known locations for positioning and observes improvements in using PRUs for enhancing the positioning performance. But, RAN1 has not identified specification enhancements needed in RAN1 specifications. RAN1 kindly requests RAN2/RAN3 (cc SA2) to determine if and what specification enhancements are adopted for PRUs for positioning.   + Notes:     - The term “positioning reference unit (PRU)” is only used as a terminology in this discussion. PRU does not necessarily mean an introduction of a new network node.     - PRU may support, at least, some of the Rel-16 positioning functionalities of UE, if agreed, which is up to RAN2. The positioning functionalities may include, but not limited to, the following:       * Provide the positioning measurements (e.g., RSTD, RSRP, Rx-Tx time differences)       * Transmit the UL SRS signals for positioning     - PRU may be requested by the LMF to provide its own known location coordinate information to the LMF. If the antenna orientation information of the PRU is known, the information may also be requested by the LMF.   Second, RAN2 in R1-2200857, does not ask RAN1 should it be supported or not, but rather asks about clarification on the “antenna orientation information”.  RAN2 also kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the "PRU antenna orientation information" which should be provided to an LMF.  Assuming that there is a simple and clear solution for “PRU antenna orientation information” reporting by reusing the LCS-GCS translation function, RAN1 can provide this information to RAN2.  Finally, RAN2 can decide its own should it be supported in Rel.17 or not. |
| Nokia/NSB |  | Yes | RAN1 already agreed that the PRU feature had benefits and had no RAN1 specification impact. RAN2 has also agreed that PRU as UE could be supported. We don’t understand why RAN1 can’t reply that PRU should be supported and answer RAN2’s questions. They have not finished the WI yet and can do the specification work.  Okay with option 1 and option 2 for the reply on correction information and antenna orientation. Okay with the Intel comments above. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Yes | We are supportive first bullet of Alt. 2 to conclude on the support of the basic functionalites of a PRU as a UE in Rel.17. Furthermore, we are supportive of Option 2 of bullet 2 to provide a reply to RAN2 regarding the correction information for the UE-based solution and share Intel’s concern that omitting this aspect may not fully align with the WI objective. On the 3rd bullet, we have no strong views and ok with either options. RAN2 has determined the potential spec impact of PRU as a UE and it would be beneficial if RAN1 could provide further guidance to RAN2 to complete the feature given that RAN1 triggered the discussion in the first place.  Furthermore, as part of the correction information, we also think that a validity time would also be beneficial to indicate how long the correction information would be valid for the correction of RSTD measurement/Tx timing error difference for the UE-based scenario. |
| CATT |  | Yes | We support Alt.2, for the response to R1-2200857:  For Q1: prefer Option1.  For Q2: prefer Option 3. |

FL Comments

My understanding from RAN2’s latest LS (R1-2202620) is that RAN2 wants RAN1 to make the decision on whether PRU is supported in Rel-17. Unless RAN1 makes the decision to support it in Rel-17, RAN2 will not process with the work of PRU in Rel-17. Thus, RAN1 needs to first make whether to support PRU in Rel-17. If RAN1 cannot make the decision to support, there is no urgency to make the response to RAN2’s LS [R1-2200857] in this meeting. So, I would suggest we first focus on the response to RAN2’s LS (R1-2202620).

(Closed) (Round 4) Proposal 4-1a (H)

Adopt one of following options as the response to RAN2 LSs [R1-2202620] related to PRU:

* + *Option 1: RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is supported in Rel-17.*
  + *Option 2: RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not specified in Rel-17.*
  + *Option 3: In RAN1 LS (R1-2106326), it says “RAN1 has not identified specification enhancements needed in RAN1 specifications. RAN1 kindly requests RAN2/RAN3 (cc SA2) to determine if and what specification enhancements are adopted for PRUs for positioning”. Thus,* *RAN1 would still suggest RAN2/RAN3 to make the decision on whether to support PRU in Rel-17.*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **OP1** | **OP2** | **OP3** | **Additional comments** |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |  | We support Option 2 in Proposal 4-1b. Correction information can be derived based on PRU measurements. Thus, PRU should be supported in Rel. 17. |
| OPPO |  | Yes |  |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |  | We support option 1 but okay with the FL proposal to just reply to the questions from RAN2 if it is controversial. |
| Ericsson |  | Yes |  |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |  | Support Option 1, but we prefer not to introduce a lot of spec impacts to RAN1, since the ePos WI was closed from RAN1’s perspective. |
| ZTE |  | Yes |  |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |  | We think such function is useful. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |  | Even though from SA2 perspective, they will specify PRU in Rel-18, but as RAN2 already discussed, PRU can be supported without change of SA2/CT specification, e.g. via MO-LR request by the PRU itself.  We should respect all the work that is done, and claim that PRU support in RAN should still target Rel-17.. |
| vivo |  |  |  | Option 1 or Option 2 |
| Intel | Yes |  |  |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |  | Prefer Option 1, but Option 3 is also acceptable, although Option 3 is more of a ping pong approach between WGs. |
| **FL** |  |  |  | It seems the issue cannot be resolved through email discussion. Suggest discuss it in online meeting. |
| Qualcomm |  | Yes |  | We don’t think that RAN2/SA2 have time to finish the feature in Rel-17. Saying that RAn1 has made decision to support the feature, what does it mean, if there is no specification changes for RAN1?  Also, we are worried that the feature will not be specified, as it is supposed to. See for example, the next question, where some proponents suggest this feature to be mainly for UE-assisted. |
| CMCC |  | Yes |  | We clearly remembered that companies expressed that this feature is beneficial to mitigate the timing errors, however, since no RAN1 specification impact was identified in RAN1, it was asked RAN2/SA2 for further decision. From RAN1 perspective, we are supportive of Option 2. |
| LGE | Yes |  |  | We are supportive of option 1. But, we are okay with option 2 and 3 in consideration of limited time to discuss it in detail. |

(Round 4) Proposal 4-1b (H)

About RAN2’s question: “whether the LMF determined “correction information” obtained from PRU measurements need to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the specific “correction information” which need to be provided to target UEs” in RAN2 LSs [R1-*2200857*]:

Adopt one of the following options as the response for above question:

* *Option 1: In Rel-17, no new “correction information” will be specified for UE-based positioning*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide the following “correction information” for UE-based positioning:*
  + *Option 2A: Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *Option 2B: TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *Option 2C: TRP synchronization information (in addition to the existing NR-RTD-Info)*

(Round 4) Proposal 4-1c (H)

About RAN2’s question: “RAN1 to provide further details on the “***PRU antenna orientation information***” which should be provided to an LMF” in [R1-*2200857*], adopt one of the following options as the response:

* *In Rel-17, there is no need to support PRU to provide the antenna orientation information to LMF, and thus no need to specify the PRU antenna orientation information.*

Comments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **OP1** | **OP2** | **Additional comments** |
| InterDigital |  | Yes | We upport Option 2 for Proposal 4-1b. We can accept the FL’s Proposal 4-1c for progress. |
| OPPO |  |  | Support Proppsal 4-1c  For Poposal 4-1b, depends on the output of Propsal 4-1a   * If Option 1 (support PRU) is agreed for Proposal 4-1a, we prefer Option 2 * If Option 2 (NOT support PRU) is agreed for Proposal 4-1a, Option 1 is the natural choice |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | We are okay with option 2A under proposal 4-1b as well. We support proposal 4-1c for progress. |
| CATT | Yes |  | Support Option 1 for Proposal 4-1b. And we can live with Proposal 4-1c. |
| Ericsson |  |  | Ok with Proposal 4-1c.  (Round 4) Proposal 4-1b (H) depends on the outcome of (Round 4) Proposal 4-1a (H). |
| Samsung |  | Yes | We support option 2A. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | For proposal 4-1b, it should be useful that the existing NR-RTD-Info can be used to convey the correction data.  For proposal 4-1c, we are OK. |
| vivo |  |  | Ok with Proposal 4-1c.  For option 1, can we modify it as:  "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements is not provided to UEs for UE-based in Rel-17 since the RAN2 question is as follows.  Question:  "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements need to be ***provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation***, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to ***provide further details on the specific "correction information"*** which need to be provided to target UEs.  Otherwise, there may be ambiguity for “new “correction information”” , that is whether the existing NR-RTD-Info can be used to convey the correction data is unclear.  FL: Okay. "correction information" obtained from PRU measurements is not supported for UE-based in Rel-17 |
| Intel |  | Yes | We support Option 2 in (Round 4) Proposal 4-1b (H).  Do not support the Proposal 4-1c. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Yes | Support Option 2A and/or 2B of P4-1b, Ok with P4-1c. |
| **FL** |  |  | For Proposal 4-1b (H), it seems we will need to have further discussion based on the decision on Proposal 4-1a.  For Proposal 4-1c (H), it seems most feedbacks are fine with it except one company. |

(Round 5) Proposal 4-1b (H)

**RAN2’s question**: “*whether the LMF determined “correction information” obtained from PRU measurements need to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the specific “correction information” which need to be provided to target UEs” in RAN2 LSs [R1-2200857]:*

Adopt one of the following options as the response for above question:

* *Option 1: In Rel-17, providing “correction information” obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based positioning is not supported*
* *Option 2: In Rel-17, support the LMF to provide the following “correction information” for UE-based positioning:*
  + *Option 2A: Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *Option 2B: TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *Option 2C: TRP synchronization information (in addition to the existing NR-RTD-Info)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **OP1** | **OP2** | **Additional comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  | Our preference is to focus on UE-assisted. We are okay with option 2A if majority of companies also prefer that. |
| CATT | Yes |  |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |  |
| InterDigital |  | Yes | Support Option 2A and 2B |
| Qualcomm |  | Yes | We don’t agree having the feature limited to UE-assisted. So, we either fully specify it, for both UE-Based and UE-assisted, or we just wait for a future release to do a good job.  2A and 2C |
| CMCC |  | Yes | 2A or 2B.  Regarding 2C, we believe that it can also be solved by using PRU, however, as we had reached consensus that NW sync error will not be specificed in R17 WI, we can just go with 2A/2B |
| OPPO |  | Yes | 2A and 2B |
| ZTE | Yes |  | We can also fine with Option 2 from (Round 4) Proposal 4-1a (H)   * + *Option 2: RAN1 has made the decision that PRU is not specified in Rel-17.* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Yes | Support Options 2A and 2B |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |  |
| Intel |  | Yes | Options 2A and/or 2B |
| LGE |  | Yes | 2A and/or 2B. |
| Qualcomm2 |  |  | To the proponets of 2B: Can you clarify with a specific example what information this is? From the replies above, it is not trying to capture any sync aspect across TRPs, however, 2B has in its description the “timing error difference between 2 TRPs”. Do we just want to say the Timing margin associated with the TxTEGs for each TRP?  If yes, then we also support 2B. |
| Nokia/NSB\_2 | Yes |  | To clarify our earlier comments. While we prefer to focuse on UE-assisted (the original agreement on PRU says nothing about UE-based)We are okay with UE-based if we go with option 2A. The gains of 2B and 2C are not clear to us. |
| **FL** |  |  | It seems it is unlikely for us to a consensus on whether to support LMF to provide the provide the “correction information” for UE-based positioning. I am wondering if we can have a compromise for RAN1 to provide the potential “correction information” for UE-based positioning, and let RAN2 to decide whether to support them, e.g.,   * *Option 3:* |

FL Comments

It seems it is unlikely for us to a consensus to support either Option 1 or Option 2. For the response to RAN2, I am wondering if we can simply provide the current status, and see if RAN2 needs any further assistance from RAN1.

### (Round 6) Proposal 4-1b (H)

**RAN2’s question**: “*whether the LMF determined “correction information” obtained from PRU measurements need to be provided to target UEs for UE-based mode of operation, and if so, kindly asks RAN1 to provide further details on the specific “correction information” which need to be provided to target UEs” in RAN2 LSs [R1-2200857]:*

Providing the following response to RAN2:

* *RAN1 has discussed the issue of whether to provide “correction information” obtained from PRU measurements from LMF to target UEs for UE-based positioning, including the following candidate “correction information”:*
  + *Correction of RSTD measurement between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *TRP Tx timing error difference between reference TRP and neighboring TRPs*
  + *TRP synchronization information (in addition to the existing NR-RTD-Info)*
* *RAN1 cannot conclude whether to support LMF to provide any of these “correction information” to target UEs for UE-based positioning in Rel-17.*
* *RAN1 has decided no more discussion on the issue in Rel-17 unless RAN1 receives a further request from RAN2.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **YES** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### (Round 5) Proposal 4-1c (H)

**RAN2’s question**: “RAN1 to provide further details on the “***PRU antenna orientation information***” which should be provided to an LMF” in *RAN2 LSs [R1-2200857]:*

Provide the following response:

* *In Rel-17, there is no need to support PRU to provide the antenna orientation information to LMF, and thus no need to specify the PRU antenna orientation information.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are fine to accept the majority view |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| Intel | No | We have already corresponding agreement, where PRU antenna information reporting is supported.  FL: Here my undersatdning. When RAN1 made the agreement, RAN1 has considered both gNB and UE can be the PRU. When gNB is the PRU, providing PRU antenna information reporting is not an issue, since it is already supported in Rel-16. When UE is the PRU, which is the case for Rel-17 as discussed in RAN2, there is currently no support for a UE to report the UE antenna information to the LMF. If we want to support the reporting of UE PRU antenna information to the LMF, RAN1 needs to further discuss whether and how the UE is able to obtain the UE PRU antenna orientation information, whether the UE antenna orientation information is reliable for the purpose of PRU, and whether it has any impact on the physical layer, etc. These issues were not discussed during RAN1 WI for Rel-17. Thus, it seems too late to consider the support in Rel-17. |
| LGE | Yes |  |

# RAN4 LS on SRS for multi-RTT positioning

Background

|  |
| --- |
| RAN4 LS (R1-2200900):  *RAN4 discussed whether Rel-15 SRS is applicable for multi-RTT positioning, i.e. whether it can be used in UE Rx-Tx time difference and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements.*  *The UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement requirements in clause 9.9.4, TS 38.133 and gNB Rx-Tx time difference accuracy requirements in clause 10.1.25, TS 38.133 are applicable provided that the UE is configured with SRS.*  *RAN4 has observed that some legacy gNB may not support Rel-16 positioning SRS. Furthermore, same gNB may be configured to perform gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement and UL RTOA for the same UE.*  *RAN4 kindly requests RAN1 to confirm whether Rel-15 SRS is applicable for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement, and if so, from which release.* |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement(RAN1#99):  Support reuse of Rel-15 SRS resource set for NR UL RTOA, AoA and gNB RSRP measurements for positioning in NR.   * Note: There is no impact to specifications managed by RAN1 * Note: There is no impact to specifications managed by RAN4 for UE requirements * Note: No new UE behaviour is expected   Agreement (RAN1#98):   * gNB Rx-Tx time difference is defined with respect to the subframe timing associated with the UE * Multiple SRS resources for positioning purposes can be used to determine the received UL subframe timing of the first arrival path of the UE. * FFS: The resource ID(s) or resource set ID(s) used for determining the timing of the UE and possibly the Rx beam used at the gNB in the gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements can be requested for reporting in the measurement report. |

|  |
| --- |
| TS 38.214 Section 5.1.6.2  The UE may be configured to measure and report, subject to UE capability, up to 4 UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements corresponding to a single configured SRS resource or resource set for positioning. Each measurement corresponds to a single received DL PRS resource or resource set which can be in different positioning frequency layers. |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement (RAN1 #106-e):  Reporting of one gNB Rx-Tx time difference and multiple UL-AOAs measurements for the first arrival path per SRS resource for positioning in a single gNB report to LMF is supported   * The above measurements are associated with SRS resource ID which is also reported to LMF * FFS: Reporting of RSRP for the first arrival path   Agreement:  NR supports gNB reporting of the first arrival path UL-AOA/ZOA measurement per SRS for positioning resource and SRS for MIMO resource  Note: The use of SRS for MIMO resource is transparent to the UE  Agreement:   * For the first arrival path measurements ~~on SRS for positioning resource,~~   + gNB can report to LMF the following set of measurements {one SRS-RSRP, multiple UL-AOAs (AoA/ZoA pairs), one UL-RTOA}   + gNB can report to LMF the following set of measurements {one SRS-RSRP, multiple UL-AOAs (AoA/ZoA pairs), one-gNB Rx-Tx time difference}   + FFS additional option: gNB can report to LMF the following set of measurements {multiple SRS-RSRP, multiple UL-AOAs (AoA/ZoA pairs), one UL-RTOA, one-gNB Rx-Tx time difference}   + All gNB measurements above are associated with SRS resource ID and timestamp, which are also reported to LMF * For the first arrival path measurements on SRS for MIMO resource,   + gNB can report to LMF the following set of measurements {one SRS-RSRP, multiple UL-AOAs (AoA/ZoA pairs), one UL-RTOA}   + FFS: gNB can report to LMF the following set of measurements {multiple SRS-RSRP, multiple UL-AOAs (AoA/ZoA pairs), one UL-RTOA}   + All gNB measurements above are associated with SRS resource ID and timestamp, which are also reported to LMF   + Note: The operation of SRS for MIMO is transparent to the UE |

**PDC agreements for URLLC:**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  For RTT-based PDC, existing definitions of UE Rx – Tx time difference (i.e. section 5.1.30 in TS 38.215) and gNB Rx – Tx time difference (i.e. section 5.2.3 in TS 38.215) are reused, with updates at least to reflect the single pair of TRS/PRS and SRS configured for RTT-based PDC.  Agreement  For RTT-based propagation delay compensation, the Rx-Tx time difference is reported via RRC signalling. |

TS 38.215 V17.0.0 [6]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Definition** | The gNB Rx – Tx time difference is defined as TgNB-RX –TgNB-TX  Where:  TgNB-RX is the Transmission and Reception Point (TRP) [18] received timing of uplink subframe #*i* containing SRS associated with UE, defined by the first detected path in time.  TgNB-TX is the TRP transmit timing of downlink subframe #*j* that is closest in time to the subframe #*i* received from the UE.  Multiple SRS resources can be used to determine the start of one subframe containing SRS.  The reference point for TgNB-RX shall be:  - for type 1-C base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Rx antenna connector,  - for type 1-O or 2-O base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Rx antenna (i.e. the centre location of the radiating region of the Rx antenna),  - for type 1-H base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Rx Transceiver Array Boundary connector.  The reference point for TgNB-TX shall be:  - for type 1-C base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Tx antenna connector,  - for type 1-O or 2-O base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Tx antenna (i.e. the centre location of the radiating region of the Tx antenna),  - for type 1-H base station TS 38.104 [9]: the Tx Transceiver Array Boundary connector. |

*Submitted Proposals*

* ***(Huawei, R1-2201010, R1-2202457):***
  + *The use of MIMO SRS by the UE for UE Rx - Tx time difference measurement is not specified in Rel-16.*
  + *The use of MIMO SRS by the UE for UE Rx - Tx time difference measurement is already supported in Rel-17.*
  + *The use of MIMO SRS by the gNB for gNB Rx - Tx time difference measurement is up to gNB implementation.*
* ***(vivo, R1-2201053):***
  + *RAN1 would like to confirm, in release 17 and previous releases, RAN1 has not supported the use of Rel-15 SRS for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement.*
  + *The use of SRS for MIMO resource is transparent to the UE*
  + *RAN1 also concluded that Tx TEG enhancement is only for Rel-16 SRS and not applicable for Rel-16 SRS for UL TDOA positioning and Multi-RTT Positioning.*
  + *RAN1 has finished Rel-17 work on NR\_pos\_enh, therefore, it may not be possible to study this topic, at leat in this release.*
* ***(ZTE, R1-2201210)***
  + *From RAN1 perspective, only SRS configured for positioning (introduced from Rel-16) is applicable for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement. Hence, Rel-15 SRS is not applicable for multi-RTT positioning.*
* ***(OPPO, R1-2201248)***
  + *According to RAN1 agreement made in RAN1#99, Rel-15 SRS is NOT applicable for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement.*
* ***(CATT, R1-2201309, R1-2201310)***
  + *Rel-15 SRS is not applicable for both UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement.*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202104)***
  + *Rel-15 SRS is not applicable for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement in neither NR Rel-16 release, nor NR Rel-17 release.*
* ***(Ericsson, R1-2202400)***
  + *Support reuse of Rel-15 SRS resource set for gNB Rx-Tx and UE Rx-Tx measurements for rel16 NR positioning.*

*FL Comments*

Based on the contributions from the companies (Huawei, vivo, ZTE, OPPO, CATT, Qualcomm), it seems we have the following common understanding:

* *The use of MIMO SRS for UE/gNB Rx - Tx time difference measurements is not specified in Rel-16.*
* *The use of MIMO SRS for UE/gNB Rx - Tx time difference measurement for the purpose of positioning is not specified in Rel-17.*
* *MIMO SRS can be used for gNB Rx - Tx time difference measurement for RTT-based PDC in Rel-17.*

Then, it seems what we need is to discuss whether MIMO SRS can be used for both UE and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements for the purpose of positioning in Rel-17.

Another issue we may want to consider is that for *RTT-based PDC* the SRS is used to obtain the gNB Rx-Tx time difference from the serving cell only. For multi-RTT positioning, there is a need for the nighboring cells to measure the UE SRS in order to obtain the gNB Rx-Tx time differences from multiple TRPs.

By the way, it is unclear to me why RAN4 LS ask RAN1 to conform whether Rel-15 SRS is applicable for UE Rx-Tx time difference. In my understanding, UE Rx-Tx time difference is obtained by measuring the DL signals (e.g., PRS), but not the UL SRS signals.

### (Closed) Question 5-1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following questions:*

*Q1: Do you agree that the use of Rel-15 SRS for Multi-RTT is not specified in Rel-16?*

*Q2: Do you agree that the use of Rel-15 SRS for Multi-RTT is not specified in Rel-17 for the purpose of positioning?*

*Q3: Do you agree that the use of Rel-15 SRS for Multi-RTT is already specified in Rel-17 for the purposes other than positioning?*

*Q4: Do you support the reuse of Rel-15 SRS for Multi-RTT for the purpose of positioning in Rel-17?*

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: Multi-RTT should be changed to UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement, and Yes.  Q2: Multi-RTT should be changed to UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement, and Yes.  Q3: Multi-RTT should be changed to UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement, and Yes.  Q4: Multi-RTT should be changed to UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement, and Yes.  For UE already supporting RTT-based PDC, phy performs action based on indication from higher layers, regardless of whether the indication comes from RRC or NAS/LPP, and we can hardly find justification that UE already supporting RTT based PDC, cannot support use of MIMO SRS for UE Rx – Tx time difference measurement reported in NAS/LPP.  With regards to the use of MIMO SRS for gNB Rx – Tx time difference measurement, we believe it is up to gNB implementation, regardless of whether UE supports it. |
| CATT | Q1: Yes.  Q2: Yes.  Q3: Yes.  Q4: No. |
| vivo | Q1: Yes.  Q2: Yes.  Q3: No. The use of Rel-15 SRS was agreed in gNB Rx-Tx measurements for RTT-based PDC, which is applicable for single-RTT not multi-RTT. It cannot be inferred from RTT-based PDC agreement that R15 SRS is applicable for Multi-RTT positioning.  Q4: No. From the perspective of positioning, all relevant conclusions of R16/17 show that the use of R15 is transparent to the UE. Considering that RAN1 has finished Rel-17 work on NR\_pos\_enh, therefore, the same principle should be maintained at least in this release. |
| OPPO | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes  Q3: No  Q4: No |
| ZTE | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes  Q3: As mention by some companies, Rel-15 SRS can be used to determine gNB Rx-Tx time difference for serving gNB in URLLC agenda. The intention is not for positioning purpose. So the gNB Rx-Tx time difference cannot be provided to LMF via NRPPa.  Q4: We prefer not to introduce this new feature at maintenance phase. |
| CMCC | Q1: Yes;  Q2: Yes;  Q3: No;  Q4: No |
| Ericsson | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes  Q3: Yes  Q4: Yes |
| Intel | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes;  Q3: No;  Q4: No; |
| Nokia/NSB | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes  Q3: Maybe, other WIs may use it.  Q4: No, too late in the release for this type of agreement. |
| Qualcomm | Q1: Yes  Q2: Yes  Q3: No - The SRS for PDC is a new type of SRS, since there is a explicit new usage entry.So, it is not the Rel-15 SRS that is being used for gNB Rx-Tx, rather a new SRS, configured with the RRC IE SRS-ResourceSet.  **Agreement**  Add new “*usage-pdc-r17*” field to *SRS-ResourceSet* to indicate that this ResourceSet is used for PDC purpose, meanwhile also indicate that this ResourceSet is used for other purpose by *usage*.  Q4: We could accept it assuming: Separate per-band UE capability is introduced & RRC-indication to the UE that a specific SRS is being used for M-RTT measurement (aka, it should not be transparent to the UE). We cannot accept if this is transparent to the UE. |

FL Comments

Based on the feedbacks, it is clear that we have the consensus the use of Rel-15 SRS for UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements are not supported for the purpose of the positioning in the specs. The use of Rel-15 SRS for gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements is defined for determining the gNB Rx-Tx time difference for serving gNB for URLLC, but it is not for positioning purpose. The issue is whether we want to support the use of Rel-15 SRS for UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements for positioning purpose in Rel-17. Based on the response from the companies, 2 companies support the reuse of Rel-15 SRS for UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements for positioning purpose in Rel-17 assuming for the serving cell only, while 5 companies do not support it.

### (Closed) Proposal 5-1

Provide the following responses to RAN4’s LS on Rel-15 SR for UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement:

* *The use of Rel-15 SRS for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and/or gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement for the purpose of positioning is currently not supported.*
* *RAN1 has discussed the use of Rel-15 SRS for UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement and gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement for the purpose of positioning in Rel-17, but has not made the decision to support it.*

# TPs

## Multiple measurement instances

Background

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement (RAN1#104e)  Support enabling   * A UE to report one or more measurement instances (of RSTD, DL RSRP, and/or UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements) in a single measurement report to LMF for UE-assisted positioning, and * A TRP to report one or more measurement instances (of RTOA, UL RSRP, and/or gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements) in a single measurement report to LMF measurements) in a single measurement report to LMF, and * Each measurement instance is reported with its own timestamp |

Submitted Proposals

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 1:*** *Adopt the following TP (TP1) to avoid the potential ambiguity on whether a report can contain different types of measurement results. (The modifications are highlighted by YELLOW).*

|  |
| --- |
| TP1 (based on Draft CR R1-2112953)  The UE may be configured to report one or more measurement instances, each with its own timestamp, on DL RSTD~~,~~ and optionally DL PRS-RSRP~~, and/or UE Rx-Tx time difference~~ measurements, in a single measurement report.  The UE may be configured to report one or more measurement instances, each with its own timestamp, on UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements, in a single measurement report. |

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 2:*** *In order to avoid additional definition of the association information and align RAN1 and RAN2 spec, adopt the following the change for draft CR.*
  + *the association information of DL RSTD measurement(s) with UE Rx TEG(s) via higher layer parameter [ueRxTEG-ID] when the UE reports the DL RSTD measurement(s). -> the ~~association information of~~ DL RSTD measurement(s) with associated UE Rx TEG(s) via higher layer parameter [ueRxTEG-ID] ~~when the UE reports the DL RSTD measurement(s)~~.*
  + *the association information of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement(s) with UE RxTx TEG(s) via higher layer parameter [ueRxTxTEG-ID] -> the ~~association information of~~ UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement(s) with associated UE RxTx TEG(s) via higher layer parameter [ueRxTxTEG-ID].*
  + *the association information of UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement(s) with the UE Rx TEG(s) and UE Tx TEG(s) via the higher layer parameters of [ueRxTEG-ID], and [ueTxTEG-ID] -> the ~~association information of~~ UE Rx-Tx time difference measurement(s) with ~~the~~ associated UE Rx TEG(s) and associated UE Tx TEG(s) via the higher layer parameters of [ueRxTEG-ID], and [ueTxTEG-ID]*
* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 3:*** *In order to avoid additional definition of the association information and align RAN1 and RAN2 spec, adopt the following the change for draft CR*
  + *where the DL RSTD can be DL RSTD measurement in NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement -> where the DL RSTD can be DL RSTD measurement in NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement and/or NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement*
* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 4:*** *Move the definition of “UE Tx TEG” to Section 5.1.6.5 of TS 38.214*
* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 5****: Adopt the following TP (TP2) for the draft CR. (The modifications are highlighted by YELLOW)*

### Question 6.1-1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal:*

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 1***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Not required, as long as there is no conflict between 214 and LPP. |
| CATT | No | It seems that the TP is not needed. |
| vivo |  | We agree to separate different positioning methods into different paragraphs to resolve ambiguity.  In addition to the CR above, a single paragraph for PRS-RSRP measurement in DL-AOD should also be added. |
| OPPO | Yes | Reply to HW/CATT: The current spec may lead to the misunderstanding that UE can report both DL RSTD and UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements in a single report. The proposal TP is to avoid such kind of potential ambiguity |
| ZTE |  | This proposal can be further discussed after we have a conclusion on proposal 3.3. |
| Ericsson |  | Ok to further discuss TP. |
| **FL** |  | It seems there is no offline consensus for the proposed TP. Further discussion is needed. |

### Question 6.1-2

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal:*

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 2***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | OK, but do not see a big problem of using association information though. |
| CATT | Yes | Support. |
| vivo | No |  |
| OPPO | Yes | It is better aligned with RAN2 siganling |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | This is not a critical change. No need to discuss. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| **FL** |  | It seems there is no offline consensus for the proposed TP. Maybe further discussion is needed. |

### (Closed) Question 6.1-3

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal:*

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 3***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | OK. |
| CATT | Yes | Support. |
| vivo |  | OK |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson |  | Ok |
| LGE | Yes |  |

FL Comments

From the feedback, it seems we have the offline consensus to support the proposed TP.

(Closed) Proposal 6.1-3 (H)

Propose endorsing the following TP for TS 38.214

|  |
| --- |
| TS 38.214 5.1.6.5 PRS reception procedure <Unchanged parts are omitted>  The UE may report a UE Rx TEG ID via higher layer parameter [*ueRxTEG-ID*] for a RSTD reference time *dl-PRS-ReferenceInfo* and a UE Rx TEG ID for each DL RSTD measurement, where the DL RSTD can be DL RSTD measurement in *NR-DL-TDOA-MeasElement* and/or *NR-DL-TDOA-AdditionalMeasurementElement*.  <Unchanged parts are omitted> |

Comments

*Companies are invited to provide their views if they have any concerns on above TP.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |

### (Closed) Question 6.1-4

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal:*

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 4***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| CATT | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| OPPO | Yes | If this proposal is not adopt, UE Tx TEG will be used before it is defined. If TEG is defined in other spec, this proposal is not needed |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| LGE | No |  |
| FL |  | It seems most companies do not support the proposal. Suggest clocing the discussion in this meeting. |

### (Closed) Question 6.1-5

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal:*

* ***(OPPO, R1-2201239[4]) Proposal 5***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/no** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Do not support the Tx TEG part. The TP was not written in a way it should have been with changes on changes, and was not based on the latest version of specification. |
| CATT | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| OPPO |  | We will provide the corresponding TP next time based on a clear version of the spec. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with earlier comments that TP should be provided on the latest rel-17 specifications. May be it is not urgent to treat this TP in this meeting. |
| LGE | No |  |
| FL |  | It seems most companies do not support the TP. Suggest clocing the discussion in this meeting. |

## Definitions of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing errors and Timing Error Groups

Submitted Proposals

* ***(Fraunhofer, R1-2202366[14]) Proposal 2:*** *To avoid duplication, ueRxTxTEG and ueRxTEG definitions are removed from TS38.214 if captured in LPP****.***

FL comments

The above proposal may be discussed after *ueRxTxTEG and ueRxTEG definitions* are captured in LPP in RAN2. It has no impact on high-layer. Thus, FL suggests no further discussion of above proposal in this meeting.

### (Closed) Question 6.2-1

*Companies are invited to provide their views on the following proposal in the following table*

* + *(Fraunhofer, R1-2202366[14]) Proposal 2*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes** | **NO** | **Additional comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  | It is good to avoid duplication. RAN1 could decide whether to keep in only RAN1 specification or RAN2 specification. |
| CATT |  | No | We prefer to keep the ueRxTxTEG and ueRxTEG definitions in both 38.214 and LPP specs. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |  |
| OPPO |  |  | TEG should be defined only in one spec to avoid duplication. We have a slight preference to keep it only in RAN1 spec |
| Ericsson |  |  | Not critical for this meeting. we can revisit this once LPP specs are stabilized. |
| **FL** |  |  | It seems no urgency to discuss the proposal in this meeting. |

# RRC Parameters

## (Closed) RAN2 LS (R2-2201776)

Submitted Proposals

* ***(CATT, R1-2201361[5]) Proposal 4:*** *The following two duplicated parameters should be deleted in the RAN1 parameter table*
  + *numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource*
  + *numOfTRPRxTEG-PerPRSResource\_RTOA*
* ***(CATT, R1-2201361[5]) Proposal 5****: The value range of maxNumOfUE-RxTEG should be 32, rather than as 8.*
* ***(CATT, R1-2201361[5]) Proposal 6****: There is no need to include the positioning SRS resource set ID in ueTxTEG and trpRxTEG association report.*
* ***(CATT, R1-2201361[5]) Proposal 7****: There is no need to introduce a triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} for ueRxTxTEG-ID-group or a triplet of TRP {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} for trpRxTxTEG-ID-group.*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8])******Proposal 4****: Prepare reply to LS for RAN WG2 on the duplicated parameters issue (R1-2200878) clarifying the following:*
  + *The parameters MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD and numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource do not duplicate each other, and both need to be captured in the higher layer parameter list*
  + *The parameter MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD defines the total maximum number of different UE RxTEGs that can be measured for the same DL PRS*
  + *The parameter numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource defines the maximum number of different UE RxTEGs that can be measured simultaneously in time for the same DL PRS resource*
  + *Enhance the description of the corresponding parameters in the higher layer parameters list in R1-2112976 clarifying the difference*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8])******Proposal 5****: Discuss in RAN WG1 the following modifications for the parameters MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request and numOfTRPRxTEG-PerPRSResource\_RTOA:*
  + *Rename the parameter "MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request" to "MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RTOA"*
  + *Clarify that this parameter defines the total maximum number of different TRP RxTEGs that can be measured for the same UL SRS*
  + *Rename the parameter "numOfTRPRxTEG-PerPRSResource\_RTOA" to "numOfTRPRxTEG-PerSRSResource"*
  + *Clarify that this parameter defines the maximum number of different TRP RxTEGs that can be measured simultaneously in time for the same UL SRS resource*
  + *Enhance the description of the corresponding parameters in the higher layer parameters list in R1-2112976 clarifying the difference*
  + *Send the reply to LS for RAN WG2 on the duplicated parameters issue (R1-2200878) clarifying the changes above*
* ***(Intel, R1-2201697[8]) Proposal 6****: Clarify the correct number for the maxNumOfUE-RxTEG parameter, i.e. [8] or [32] should be used*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12]) Observation 1****: According to the previous agreement, a UE may support reporting both {Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} and {RxTx TEG ID}.*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12]) Observation 2****: There is no need to include the SRS-PosResourceSetId in the Tx TEG SRS association.*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12]) Proposal 2:*** *Proposal 2: An M-RTT report is across all the bands that the UE has been configured with DL-PRS and SRS. The Tx TEG SRS Association report should include the option of optionally reporting an association of the SRS resource IDs to an SRS Frequency (NR ARFCN: The carrier frequency of SRS Transmission Bandwiwdth) to avoid any ambiguities if the same SRS resource ID is being used across multiple CCs.*
* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140[12]) Proposal 3:*** *With regards to the Tx TEG SRS Association inside an M-RTT report, support a maximum of 1024 Tx TEG SRS associations (up to 8 Tx TEG per band \* Up to 4 bands \* Up to 32 timestamps).*

FL comments

Above proposals related to RAN2 LS (R2-2201776) on RRC parameters will be discussed in Section 8.5.

# TEG in RAN2 LS (R1-2202620)

Background

RAN2 LS (R1-2202620) includes the following open issues related Mitigation of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing delays requiring RAN1 input:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Issue** | **Required RAN1 work** |
| **Mitigation of UE/TRP Rx/Tx timing delays** | **The definition of TEG is captured in the running CR of TS38.305 as**  ***UE Rx Timing Error Group (UE Rx TEG)****: A UE Rx TEG is associated with one or more DL timing measurements, which have the Rx timing error difference within a certain margin.*  ***UE RxTx Timing Error Group (UE RxTx TEG):*** *A UE RxTx TEG is associated with one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the ‘Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors’ difference within a certain margin.*  ***UE Tx Timing Error Group (UE Tx TEG)****: A UE Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of one or more UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose, which have the Tx timing error difference within a certain margin.*  ***TRP Rx Timing Error Group (TRP Rx TEG):*** *A TRP Rx TEG is associated with one or more UL timing measurements, which have the Rx timing error difference within a certain margin.*  ***TRP RxTx Timing Error Group (TRP RxTx TEG):*** *A TRP RxTx TEG is associated with one or more gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the ‘Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors’ difference within a certain margin.*  ***TRP Tx Timing Error Group (TRP Tx TEG):*** *A TRP Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of one or more DL PRS resources, which have the Tx timing error difference within a certain margin.*  **Issue:** companies in RAN2 commented that the definitions for the different TEG are unclear. The emphasis seems to be about the association with certain measurement but still does not explain the relation to the resources involved and what reference is for the “error difference”. It is also not intuitive what the “group” in TEG refers to;  RAN2 plan to use RAN1 agreements as baseline for the definition of TEGs, i.e.  **Tx timing error**: Result of Tx time delay (defined below) involved in the transmission of a signal. It is the uncalibrated Tx time delay, or the remaining delay after the TRP/UE internal calibration/compensation of the Tx time delay, involved in the transmission of the DL PRS/UL SRS signals. The calibration/compensation may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same TRP/UE and may also possibly consider the offset of the Tx antenna phase centre to the physical antenna centre  **Tx time delay**: From a signal transmission perspective, the time delay from the time when the digital signal is generated at baseband to the time when the RF signal is transmitted from the Tx antenna  **Rx timing error**: Result of Rx time delay (defined below) involved in the reception of a signal before reporting measurements that are obtained from the signal. It is the uncalibrated Rx time delay, or the remaining delay after the UE/TRP internal calibration/compensation of the Rx time delay, involved in the reception of the DL PRS/UL SRS signals. The calibration/compensation may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same UE/TRP and may also possibly consider the offset of the Rx antenna phase centre to the physical antenna centre  **Rx time delay**: From a signal reception perspective, there will be a time delay from the time when the RF signal arrives at the Rx antenna to the time when the signal is digitized and time-stamped at the baseband  **UE Tx ‘timing error group’ (UE Tx TEG)**: Tx timing errors, associated with UE transmissions on one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are within a certain margin  **UE Rx ‘timing error group’ (UE Rx TEG)**: Rx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more DL measurements (RSTD), that are within a certain margin  **UE RxTx ‘timing error group’ (UE RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements and one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are within a certain margin  **TRP Tx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Tx TEG)**: Tx timing errors, associated with TRP transmissions on one or more DL PRS resources, that are within a certain margin  **TRP Rx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Rx TEG)**: Rx timing errors, associated with TRP reporting of one or more UL measurements, that are within a certain margin  **TRP RxTx ‘timing error group’ (TRP RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with TRP reporting of one or more gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements and one or more DL PRS resources, that are within a certain margin | **RAN1 provides further clarifications and confirmation on the definition;** |
| **Periodic Tx TEG reporting/TEG change procedure**  According to RAN1 LS in R2-2200092: For UL-TDOA, "   * + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period*      - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*     - *It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed*   + *The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2*   ". what is needed seems an a-periodic report (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed).  **Issue:** RAN1 already agreed that periodic reporting for UL-TDOA should be supported, what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information? Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)? | **RAN1 provides further clarifications on the issue;** |

## TEG Definitions

FL Comments

RAN1 has discussed the TEG definitions in the previous meeting w/o conclusion. The main reason was that it was not considered as critical for RAN1 at that time. The following proposal is made based on the latest proposal (Proposal 2.2) in RAN1#107e with the consideration the comments to Proposal 2.2:

Proposal 8.1 (H)

*Replace the definitions of timing error groups agreed in RAN1#104e with the following modified definitions and adopt them in the specifications and send to RAN2:*

* + ***Tx timing error:*** *From a signal transmission perspective, there will be a time delay from the time when the digital signal is generated at the baseband to the time when the RF signal is transmitted from the Tx antenna. For supporting positioning, the UE/TRP may implement an internal calibration/compensation of the Tx time delay for the transmission of the DL PRS/UL SRS signals, which may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same TRP/UE. The compensation may also possibly consider the offset of the Tx antenna phase center to the physical antenna center. However, the calibration may not be perfect. The remaining Tx time delay after the calibration, or the uncalibrated Tx time delay is defined as Tx timing error.*
  + ***Rx timing error:*** *From a signal reception perspective, there will be a time delay from the time when the RF signal arrives at the Rx antenna to the time when the signal is digitized and time-stamped at the baseband. For supporting positioning, the UE/TRP may implement an internal calibration/compensation of the Rx time delay before it reports the measurements that are obtained from the DL PRS/UL SRS signals, which may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same TRP/UE. The compensation may also possibly consider the offset of the Rx antenna phase center to the physical antenna center. However, the calibration may not be perfect. The remaining Rx time delay after the calibration, or the uncalibrated Rx time delay is defined as Rx timing error.*
  + ***UE Tx ‘timing error group’ (UE Tx TEG):*** *A UE Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of one or more UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose~~, which have the Tx timing errors within a certain margin~~. The differences between UE TX timing errors of any two UL SRS resources associated with the same UE Tx TEG are within a certain margin.*
  + ***TRP Tx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Tx TEG):*** *A TRP Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of one or more DL PRS resources~~, which have the Tx timing errors within a certain margin~~ The differences between TRP TX timing errors of any two DL PRS resources associated with the same TRP Tx TEG is within a certain margin.*
  + ***UE Rx ‘timing error group’ (UE Rx TEG):*** *A UE Rx TEG is associated with one or more DL measurements~~, which have the Rx timing errors within a certain margin~~ The differences of UE Rx timing errors between any two DL measurements associated with the same UE Rx TEG are within a certain margin.*
  + ***TRP Rx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Rx TEG):*** *A TRP Rx TEG is associated with one or more UL measurements~~, which have the Rx timing errors within a margin~~. The differences of TRP Rx timing errors between any two UL measurements associated with the same TRP Rx TEG are within a certain margin.*
  + ***UE RxTx ‘timing error group’ (UE RxTx TEG):*** *A UE RxTx TEG is associated with one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements~~, and one or more UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose, which have the ‘Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors’ within a certain margin.~~ The differences of “Rx timing errors + Tx timing errors” between any two UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements associated with the same UE RxTx TEG are within a certain margin.*
  + ***TRP RxTx ‘timing error group’ (TRP RxTx TEG):*** *A TRP RxTx TEG is associated with one or more gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements ~~and one or more DL PRS resources, which have the ‘Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors’ within a certain margin~~. The differences of TRP “Rx timing errors + Tx timing errors” between any two gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements associated with the same TRP RxTx TEG are within a certain margin.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Fraunhofer | Regarding the above propsoal, we believe the following modification helps to clarify the “error difference” and “group” pointed out in the RAN2 LS.   * + ***UE Tx ‘timing error group’ (UE Tx TEG):*** *A UE Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of a group of UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose~~.~~ The differences between UE TX timing errors of the UL SRS resources associated with the same UE Tx TEG are within a certain margin.*   Generally, we think this shall be aligned with RAN4 as well. If RAN4 introduces a definition for the error margin value, one way to calrify the margin will be something like   * UE Tx ‘timing error group’ (UE Tx TEG): A UE Tx TEG is associated with the transmissions of one or more UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose, which have the Tx timing errors within a certain margin [*Tx ErrorMargin, TS38.133*] . |
| OPPO | We understand the intention. However, we don’t support to refine the definition/agreement at the maintanence stage.  1. For the purpose of reply LS, the above proposal is NOT aligned with current RAN1 spec  2. In order to avoid further modification, our preference is to revise the spec by TP/CR (if necessary) when RAN4 has the final decision how TEG is measuredt/specificed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We also do not support further modifying agreement. We can address the questions/issues raised by RAN2.  **Issue:** companies in RAN2 commented that the definitions for the different TEG are unclear. The emphasis seems to be about the association with certain measurement but still does not explain the relation to the resources involved and what reference is for the “error difference”. It is also not intuitive what the “group” in TEG refers to;  Answer: The emphasis of Rx TEG is indeed associated with a measurement, which can be derived based on one or multiple received RS resource. The emphasis of Tx TEG is associated with RS transmission, i.e. SRS for UE and PRS for TRP, because transmission of an RS may have the RS-specific timing error.  The “error difference” is between two unknown group delay errors. In particular, for two DL measurements associated with the same Rx TEGs, the error difference is between the unknown Rx group delay errors embedded in the two DL measurements, while two SRS resources associated with the same Tx TEGs, the error difference is between the unknown Tx group delays embedded in the two SRS resources.  The “group” means that for a set of multiple DL measuremetns or a set of multiple SRS resources, if the error difference between any pair within the set is within the margin, the set is intuitively considered as timing error group, and is associated with TEG ID. |
| vivo | We believe the simplest way is to reuse the definition in RAN1 spec TS38.214 v17.0.0. For TRP TEG, we can use similar definition as UE side.  Timing Error Group(s) (TEG(s)) at UE side are defined:  *- ueRxTEG* is associated with one or more DL measurements, which have the Rx timing error difference within a certain margin.  *- ueRxTxTEG* is associated with one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the 'Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors' difference within a certain margin.  The UE may be configured, subject to UE capability, to report UE TEGs (Timing Error Group), where the TEGs are:  *- ueTxTEG* which is associated with the transmissions of one or more UL SRS resources for the positioning purpose, which have the Tx timing error difference within a certain margin.  In addition, for the first two bullets, it can be described as ”From the RAN1 perspective, the Tx timing error and Rx timing error can be defined as following and the definition can be checked by RAN4 ” |
| **ZTE** | Regarding the definition, RAN1 has updated the CR in 38.214 at UE side. From our perspective, there is no ambiguity to understand TEG. We can simply inform RAN2 the descriptions below, so RAN2 can also implement CR at TRP side.  Timing Error Group(s) (TEG(s)) at UE side are defined:  *- ueRxTEG* is associated with one or more DL measurements, which have the Rx timing error difference within a certain margin.  *- ueRxTxTEG* is associated with one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the 'Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors' difference within a certain margin. |
| CATT | In fact, RAN2 had noticed the current descpritons about TEG in 38.214, e.g., RAN2 had mentioned the following definition of UE Rx TEG in the RAN2 LS (R2-2202620), so we have to do more thing to solve the issue proposed by RAN2. We are fine with change the definitions of timing error groups agreed in RAN1#104e and send to RAN2 as FL proposal, or we also can try to explain the issues and provide the answers to RAN2 as Huawei’s comments.  ***UE Rx Timing Error Group (UE Rx TEG)****: A UE Rx TEG is associated with one or more DL timing measurements, which have the Rx timing error difference within a certain margin.* |
| Nokia/NSB | We support to reply to RAN2 that the following definitions are correct (from R2-2203462):  **Tx timing error**: Result of Tx time delay (defined below) involved in the transmission of a signal. It is the uncalibrated Tx time delay, or the remaining delay after the TRP/UE internal calibration/compensation of the Tx time delay, involved in the transmission of the DL PRS/UL SRS signals. The calibration/compensation may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same TRP/UE and may also possibly consider the offset of the Tx antenna phase centre to the physical antenna centre  **Tx time delay**: From a signal transmission perspective, the time delay from the time when the digital signal is generated at baseband to the time when the RF signal is transmitted from the Tx antenna  **Rx timing error**: Result of Rx time delay (defined below) involved in the reception of a signal before reporting measurements that are obtained from the signal. It is the uncalibrated Rx time delay, or the remaining delay after the UE/TRP internal calibration/compensation of the Rx time delay, involved in the reception of the DL PRS/UL SRS signals. The calibration/compensation may also include the calibration/compensation of the relative time delay between different RF chains in the same UE/TRP and may also possibly consider the offset of the Rx antenna phase centre to the physical antenna centre  **Rx time delay**: From a signal reception perspective, there will be a time delay from the time when the RF signal arrives at the Rx antenna to the time when the signal is digitized and time-stamped at the baseband  **UE Tx ‘timing error group’ (UE Tx TEG)**: Tx timing errors, associated with UE transmissions on one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are within a certain margin  **UE Rx ‘timing error group’ (UE Rx TEG)**: Rx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more DL measurements (RSTD), that are within a certain margin  **UE RxTx ‘timing error group’ (UE RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements and one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are within a certain margin  **TRP Tx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Tx TEG)**: Tx timing errors, associated with TRP transmissions on one or more DL PRS resources, that are within a certain margin  **TRP Rx ‘timing error group’ (TRP Rx TEG)**: Rx timing errors, associated with TRP reporting of one or more UL measurements, that are within a certain margin  **TRP RxTx ‘timing error group’ (TRP RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with TRP reporting of one or more gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements and one or more DL PRS resources, that are within a certain margin |

FL Comments

It seems we all have the same understanding on the definitions of the TEGs. My understanding for RAN2’s running CR for TS 38.305 is that it is based on TS 38.214. The main reason for RAN2 sends the LS is that they may miss some background information related to *Rx/Tx timing errors* and *Rx/Tx delays, which is not captured in TS 38.214..* Thus, I am thinking we could only provide the explantion to the issues asked in RAN2’s LS and then up to RAN2 to make the decision on whether to include the definitions of *Rx/Tx timing errors* and *Rx/Tx delays.*

*Rx/Tx timing errors* and *Rx/Tx delays*

**Issue:** companies in RAN2 commented that the definitions for the different TEG are unclear. The emphasis seems to be about the association with certain measurement but still does not explain the relation to the resources involved and what reference is for the “error difference”. It is also not intuitive what the “group” in TEG refers to;

(Round 2) Proposal 8.1 (H)

*Provide the following response to RAN2 LS*:

* A “Rx TEG” is associated with one or more measurements obtained from one or multiple received RS resources. The Rx timing error differences between any pair of the measurements belonging to the same Rx TEG are within a certain margin.
* A “Tx TEG” is associated with one or more transmitted RS resources. The Tx timing error differences between any pair of the RS resources belonging to the same Tx TEG are within a certain margin.
* The “group” means that for a set of multiple measuremetns or a set of multiple RS resources, if the error difference between any pair within the set is within the margin, the set is intuitively considered as timing error group, and is associated with a TEG ID.
* The definitions of the *Tx/Rx timing delays/errors* and *Rx/Tx/RxTx TEGs* in RAN2’s LS are correct. It is up to RAN2 to decide whether and how to capture them into RAN2’s specification.

FL Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Isn’t it enough to simply tell RAN2 that the definitions they plan to use as baseline are correct?  FL: While I share the similar view as Nokia, it might be helpful to provide some additional information to address the issues mentioned in their LS. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Ericsson | Please see some suggested corrections below:   * A “Rx TEG” is associated with one or more measurements obtained from one or multiple received RS resources. The Rx timing error differences between measurements belonging to the same Rx TEG are within a certain margin. * A “Tx TEG” is associated with one or more transmitted reference signals (e.g., DL PRS, UL SRS). The Tx timing error differences between measurements belonging to the same Tx TEG are within a certain margin. * The “group” means that for a set of multiple DL measuremetns or a set of multiple SRS transmissions, if the error difference between any pair of DL measurements or SRS transmissions within the set is within the margin, the set is intuitively considered as timing error group, and is associated with a TEG ID. * The definitions of the *Tx/Rx timing delays/errors* and *Rx/Tx/RxTx TEGs* in RAN2’s LS are correct. It is up to RAN2 to decide whether to capture them into RAN2’s specification.   FL: Ericsson’s suggestion seems fine to me. |
| ZTE | We assume this is to clarify the background of TEG. As we have agreed the definition of TEG is for discussion purpose. It’s still up to RAN2 to decide whether/how to capture them.  FL: Yes. The last bullet says it is up to It is up to RAN2 to decide whether to capture them into RAN2’s specification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Ericsson’s reply, it is not clear what the measurements belonging to the same Tx TEG. It should be clear that Tx timing error different between the Tx of two reference signals is within a certain margin. For the group, why the RS is changed to SRS? |
| vivo | Sorry, we don’t think the following definition in LS is right, based on the long discussion in RAN1, RxTx TEG and SRS are decoupled, so, the definition of *ueRxTxTEG* in RAN1 spec TS38.214 v17.0.0 should be provide to RAN2 .  **UE RxTx ‘timing error group’ (UE RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements and one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are within a certain margin  TS38.214 v17.0.0  *- ueRxTxTEG* is associated with one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the 'Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors' difference within a certain margin. |

(Closed) (Round 3) Proposal 8.1 (H)

*Provide the following response to RAN2 LS*:

* A “Rx TEG” is associated with one or more measurements obtained from one or multiple received RS resources. The Rx timing error differences between any pair of the measurements belonging to the same Rx TEG are within a certain margin.
* A “Tx TEG” is associated with one or more transmitted RS resources. The Tx timing error differences between any pair of the RS resources belonging to the same Tx TEG are within a certain margin.
* The “group” means that for a set of multiple measurements or a set of multiple RS resources, if the error difference between any pair within the set is within the margin, the set is intuitively considered as timing error group, and is associated with a TEG ID.
* The definitions of the *Tx/Rx timing delays/errors* and *Rx/Tx/RxTx TEGs* in RAN2’s LS are correct with the following changes.
  + **UE RxTx ‘timing error group’ (UE RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with UE reporting of one or more UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements , which have the 'Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors' differences ~~and one or more UL SRS resources for positioning purpose, that are~~ within a certain margin
  + **TRP RxTx ‘timing error group’ (TRP RxTx TEG)**: Rx timing errors and Tx timing errors, associated with TRP reporting of one or more gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements, which have the 'Rx timing errors+Tx timing errors' differences ~~and one or more DL PRS resources, that are~~ within a certain margin
* It is up to RAN2 to decide how to capture these definitions into RAN2’s specification.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For proposal 8.1, we think a similar modification for TRP RxTx TEG is needed. |
| **FL** | To vivo’s comments: Add the proposed changes for TRP RxTx TEG |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| CATT | Support |
| Huawei, HISilicon | Support. A typo in the third bullet “measuremetns” should be changed to “measurements”. Sorry for having introduced this typo in the first place.  FL: Corrected |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| OPPO | For the last bullet “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to capture these definitions into RAN2’s specification”, we suggest to change it as below in order to keep the same descritpions among RAN2/RAN1 specs.   * RAN2 is encouraged to use the same definitions specified in TS 38.214   Ran1 can also copy the corresponding part of RAN1 spec in the LS for the reference.  FL: My understanding is that RAN2 has indeed taken a look at the definitions in TS 38.214. The main reason for them to send the LS is that they don’t think the definition in TS 38.214 is enough for them. We could consider adding the following:   * RAN2 is also encouraged to consider the definitions of UE Rx/Tx/RxTx TEGs specified in TS 38.214. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support. |
| LGE | Agree. |

## Changes of the Tx TEG association

RAN2 LS (R1-2202620)

|  |
| --- |
| **Periodic Tx TEG reporting/TEG change procedure**  According to RAN1 LS in R2-2200092: For UL-TDOA, "   * + *Based on a configured periodicity, a UE may report the UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning that have already been transmitted during the configured period*      - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*     - *It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed*   + *The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2*   ". what is needed seems an a-periodic report (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed).  **Issue:** RAN1 already agreed that periodic reporting for UL-TDOA should be supported, what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information? Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)? |

FL Comments

In previous meetings, RAN1 has spent a lot of time to discuss the options for the Tx TEG reporting. The number of the companies that supported periodic reporting and the number of the companies supported the reporting only when the Tx TEG association change were basically the same. There was also the proposal to send LS to let RAN2 to decide, but was nt agreed, The above RAN1’s agreement was made at near the end of the meeting. At this moment, FL would suggest not opening up the discussion on the reporting only when the Tx TEG association change, but simply telling RAN2 that although periodic reporting may not be optimal from the signalling efficiency point of view, it may be a simple way for the LMF to obtain the UE Tx TEG information. RAN2 may work on signalling optimization if needed.

Proposal 8.2 (H)

Providing the following response to RAN2 LS*:*

*RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. RAN1 had also discussed the proposal that UE only reports the Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning when the UE Tx TEG association changes for signalling efficiency, but the proposal was not agreed. Instead, in RAN1’s agreement, it says “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)” and “The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2”, which allows RAN2 to further optimize the higher singling efficiency, e.g., UE may simply report an indication that Tx TEG association is unchanged to avoid reporting the whole UE Tx TEG association information again. In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization is up to RAN2 if it is necessary.*

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest the following modification.  *RAN1’s decision to support periodic reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity.*  FL: In FL’s understanding, RAN2 likes RAN1 to explain “what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information? Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)?”. For the questions on first part, we may say “mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity”, but it does not address RAN2’s question “Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)”. Thus, it may be good to explain to RAN2 that RAN1 has considered the same approach as mentioned in RAN2’s LS.  The understanding from our side is that the “Triggered reporting” requires clearly defining TEG association change, and there is no clear definition of TEG association change.  FL: In RAN1’s agreement, it has “RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed”, which should apply for for periodic reporting and “triggered reporting”. |
| vivo | We prefer FL’s description, at least, the implication of “triggered reporting” by “the change of Tx TEG association and configured period” in the previous agreement should be clarified to RAN2 especially considering RAN2 have asked “(i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)”   * + - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*     - *It is up to RAN4 to decide when the Tx TEG association is changed* |
| ZTE | Regarding the change of the Tx TEG association, we can give some examples to RAN2 to further clarify the scenarios in RAN1’s understanding. It’s still up to RAN2 to decide how to specify it. Let’s assume a TEG report for a periodical SRS resource. UE may transmit the SRS resource in multiple instances before a periodic TEG report. During the transmission, UE may change its TEG association. So, in a TEG report, UE may report the TEG association of the SRS resource for each instance, where each instance is associated with a time stamp and a TEG ID.  FL: My understanding is that RAN2’s question is why UE keeps reporting the same information if there is no change. It does not ask how to handle the case when Tx TEG changes. Thus, it seems no need for RAN1 to provide the explanation to them.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SRS resource#1 | Time stamp#1 | Time stamp#2 | ... | | UE Tx TEG#1 | UE Tx TEG#0 | ... | |
| **CATT** | We support FL’s response. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the update from Huawei. We should just make it clear to RAN2 that RAN1 intentionally introduced periodic reporting. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL Comments

Maybe we can provide a simpler response back to RAN2.

(Round 2) Proposal 8.2 (H)

Providing the following response to RAN2 LS*:*

*RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. In RAN1’s agreement, it includes “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)” and “The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2”, which may allow a further optimization of the higher singling. In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization, e.g., how to avoid reporting the same information repeatly, is up to RAN2.*

FL Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We feel the first sentence is all that is needed. We should just make it clear to RAN2 that RAN1 intentionally introduced periodic reporting.  FL: It would be great if all companies feel the first sentence is good enough. My thinking we may need to say something to their question on why “what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information”. |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Okay with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not feel the need to re-iterate the same content in two LSs, and prefer only keep the first sentence.  FL: RAN2 may not fully understand what it means. Repeating it again may help to explain the situation. |
| vivo | We share the same understanding with FL. For us, it is weird for us, if RAN2 asks two questions (ie,“what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information？” and“Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)?”) , but we only answer the part of the question |
| **FL** | Based on the comments, I would suggest keeping the rest of the lines in the response. |

(Round 3) Proposal 8.2 (H)

Providing the following response to RAN2 LS*:*

*RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. In RAN1’s agreement, it includes “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)” and “The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2”, which may allow a further optimization of the higher singling. In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization, e.g., how to avoid reporting the same information repeatly, is up to RAN2.*

FL Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We still prefer only the first sentence. |
| vivo | Support FL proposal and we think only the first sentence can not reply to all the questions from RAN2 |
| CATT | Support the above version. We prefer to give more information and explanation to RAN, just as the proposal above. Only one sentence is not enough for the response to RAN2. |
| Huawei, HISilicon | We would accept the first sentence. Others are already sent to RAN2 in the previous LS.  The example in the last sentence is new, but “how to avoid reporting the same information repeatedly” is misleading, which was not agreed, and we are heading in a wrong direction.  Note that we already agreed that in the UE feature if the TEG ID is not reported associated with an SRS resource, network does not make any assumption on the SRS-TEG association. If any of proponents think that omitting some reports saves overhead, we would like to note that this will cause confusion if the UE true intention is to inform gNB that it is not able to determine the association.  If the latst sentence is indeed necessary, we prefer the following change.  *RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. ~~In RAN1’s agreement, it includes “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)” and “The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2”, which may allow a further optimization of the higher singling.~~ In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization, e.g., how to avoid reporting the same information repeatly, without mixing up with the case when UE does not provide the SRS-TEG association because UE does not expect the network to make any assumption on the TEG association for the already transmitted SRS according to the description in FG 27-1-2, is up to RAN2.*  *FL: RAN2’s question is why repeat the same information is not the same as the case of “when UE does not provide the SRS-TEG association because UE does not expect the network to make any assumption on the TEG association for the already transmitted”. If UE had sent the SRS-TEG association previously, and then UE does not want the network to make any assumption on the TEG association for the already transmitted, then the SRS-TEG association has changed. The UE needs to inform the network that for some or all TEG IDs, there is no more SRS-TEG association.* |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal. Since RAN2 asks “Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)?”, we can give them background information and ask RAN2 to decide on the details. |
| vivo 2 | Support FL proposal  We would like to further explain our previous agreement bullet as follows. We believe there may be multiple SRS periodicities within a configured period, and the SRS-TEG association may be changed for different SRS periodicities(e.g TEG changes caused by flipped terminals), and then the error may be introduced.  So, for this case, the change of TEG-SRS association should be reported, and how to report is up to RAN2, but if RAN2 ask about our intention and motivation, if we don’t reply it, it is weird and wrong for us  *“It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)”*  For Huawei’s comment, we think the case may not occur, the issue is about how to report the SRS-TEG when the SRS-TEG association is changed in an MR. So, at least, one SRS-TEG association for each SRS should be reported, but if no change occurs, the additional SRS-TEG association may not be reported for the other periodicity during the configured period. But if it changes, multiple SRS-TEG associations for each SRS corresponding to different timestamps is needed to be reported |
| OPPO | Not sure what’s the value to repeat the same sentences/information that was included in the previous LS. |
| ZTE | We think Huawei and vivo are talking about different things.  When we try to avoid reporting the same information repeatedly, as mentioned by vivo, for a periodical SRS transmission, UE may not change its TEG association in two consecutive instances. Therefore, UE doesn’t have to report the same information for two consecutive instances.  However, Huawei’s view is to allow UE to give up reporting some SRS resources in first place so that network doesn’t make any assumption on the TEG association.  We can make some modifications on the last sentence  *how to avoid reporting the same information repeatedly when there is no change of the Tx TEG association in consecutive instances of a periodical SRS resource.*  FL: ZTE’s suggestion seems clearer. |

FL Comments

I think we need at least information RAN2 that RAN1 was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity, and RAN2 is allowed to do something more for improving signalling efficiency.

(Round 4) Proposal 8.2 (H)

Providing the following response to RAN2 LS*:*

*RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. ~~In RAN1’s agreement, it includes “It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)” and “The values of the configurable periodicities are up to RAN2”, which may allow a further optimization of the higher singling.~~ In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization, e.g., how to avoid reporting the same information repeatly when there is no change of the UE Tx TEG association during the periodicity reporting, is up to RAN2.*

FL Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| LGE | We are generally fine with current version of FL’s proposal. |
| vivo | We support the FL version  **Issue:** RAN1 already agreed that periodic reporting for UL-TDOA should be supported, what is the purpose of periodically reporting the same information? Or only a-periodic report is required (i.e., a report when the TEG association has changed)?  We would like to ask the objector we have to answer any question from RAN2 if the only first sentence is replied.  In addition, based on the following bullet in agreement, whether the majority have acknowledged the SRS-TEG association may be changed during the configured period.   * + - *It is up to RAN2 to decide how to indicate the change of the Tx TEG association during the configured period (e.g., using the timestamps)*   If it is, if the change occurs or does not occur, how to indicate it to the network. If it does not indicate to the network, how to use the measurement when the measured SRS is corresponding to different timestamps with TEG-SRS association. For example, if TEG-SRS association for each SRS only associated one timestamp during the configured period , how to make sure the SRS that associated the timestamp has been measured and reported, and how to understand the measurement result based on 4 sample? |
|  |  |

FL Comments

Maybe we can make the acknowledgement to RAN2 that there is no special purpose or intention for RAN1 to request UE to periodically reporting the same information.

### (Round 5) Proposal 8.2 (H)

Providing the following response to RAN2 LS*:*

*RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization is up to RAN2.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| InterDigital | It looks like RAN2 made the following agreement in the positioning session so the mechanism to indicate the change in the association in TEG is clear. We don’t understand the meaning or intention of the sentence in red fonts and it may be removed for clarity. We don’t think RAN1’s inputs will have an impact on RAN2 discussion at this point, give that RAN2 made the following agreement.  Proposal 5 (modified): Each of association information of UL SRS resources with timestamp indicating the change of the Tx TEG association (8/12) and agree the TP of UE-TxTEG-Report-v17xy-IEs via RRC in the annex.  So we propose the following LS reply.  *RAN1’s decision to support periodicity reporting of UE Tx TEG association for the SRS resources for positioning was made mainly based on the consideration of the signalling simplicity. ~~There is no specialy purpose for the UE to periodically reporting the same information, which could be caused by the periodicity reporting.~~ In RAN1’s view, further signalling optimization is up to RAN2.*  FL: Thanks for the information. |
| Nokia/NSB | No needed for the 2nd sentence. |
| FL | Given that RAN2 has made the agreement on the configurable interval, my undertsading is that RAN1 could provide a simpler answer, as suggested by InterDigital and Nokia. |
| ZTE | Given that RAN2 has made the agreement about TEG change, we’re fine with InterDigital’s suggestion. |
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