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1. Introduction

This document provides a summary of the following email discussion for AI 8.5:

[108-e-R17-RRC-ePos] Email discussion on Rel-17 RRC parameters for positioning enhancement – Ren Da (CATT)

* 1st check point for first LS in [108-e-R17-RRC]: February 24
* Final check point for second LS in [108-e-R17-RRC] if necessary: March 3

The RRC parameters from the last meeting are included in R1-2110573[1].

The general recommendations from the R17-RRC-Moderator for RAN1 RRC parameter preparation are provided in *R1-2111193* [2]. Additional suggestion from the R17-RRC-Moderator includes:

* *use a different color (e.g. “blue”) than “black” for any change applied to a row that is currently “stable” with only-black color.*
* *do not change the content of “Status [106b-e]” and “Status [107bis-e]” columns.*
* *provide the status, i.e. “stable/unstable” for Column [108-e] for any row if the status is “unstable”, or the status is changed from “stable” to “unstable”.*
  + *If a row remains “stable”, or if a row hasn’t changed, no need to indicate the status. The previous status holds.*
* *Please continue considering the guidelines in R1-2111193 for RRC preparation.*

For Rel-17 ePOS most of the open issues are related to range values. Most of them are “FFS” and some of them are in the squared bracket []. In this meeting, we are targeting to complete the range values for all of the RRS parameters.

Note: We will need to remove the squared brackets “[]” for all agreeable range values, i.e., squared brackets will either be removed or replaced with round brackets “()” for all agreeable range values when submitting the RRC parameter list.

2. Accuracy improvements by mitigating UE Rx/Tx and/or gNB Rx/Tx timing delays

2.1 General Issues

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

­

* *Rows 2, 10: Change Value range FFS is changed to “[0, 1, …, 31]” based on Row 11*
* *Rows 4, 9: Change Value range FFS is changed to “[0, 1, …, 7]” based on Row 12.*
* *Row 5: Indicate srs-PosResourceSetId as “****removed”*** *in “Status [108-e]” based on the inputs from multiple companies to RAN2 LS*
* *Row 6: Remove the bracket for srs-PosResourceId*
* *Row 7: Change Value range FFS to N/A;*
* *Row 8: Change Value range FFS to “[0, 1., …, 255] based on previous agreement that the maximum number of Tx TEGs is 256*
* *Row 11: Correction. Change [8] to 32.*
* *Row 12: Change [8] to 8.*
* *Row 13, Change Value range FFS to [64], since the maximum number of SRS resource for positioning is 64. Change “unstable” to “new-stable”. And remove the bracket for the parameter name.*
* *Row 14, Change [256] to 256*
* *Rows 16, 17, 18, 19: Change Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” for these simple requests. RAN2/RAN3 may decide whether it is “Yes” only, or has both “Yes” and “No”.*
* *Row 23, change Value range FFS to “FFS for RAN2”. It is up to RAN2 to use an existing format of the timestamp or a new format.*
* *Row 27 : Change Value range FFS to [0, 1, …,7]*
* *Row 30 : a) Change Value range FFS to N/A;*
* *Row 31 : Change Value range FFS to [0, 1, …,255]*
* *Row 32 : Change Value range FFS to [0, 1, …,7]*
* *Row 33 : Change Value range FFS to [0, 1, …,31]*
* *Row 34 : srs-PosResourceSetId as* ***removed*** *in status [#108e]. It seems no need to have the parameter.*
* *Row 35 : Change Value range FFS to [0, 1, …,63]*
* *Row 37 : Remove the bracket of the parameter name and change the Value range FFS to 32*
* *Row 38 : Remove the bracket of the parameter name and change the Value range FFS to 8*
* *Row 39 : Remove the bracket of the parameter name and change the Value range FFS to 64, add “new-stable” to in status [#108e].*
* *Row 40 : Remove the bracket of the parameter name and change the Value range FFS to 256*
* *Row 41 : Change the parameter name and description to match the agreement*
* *Row 42 : Change the parameter name and description to match the agreement, and replace the “agreement”.*
* *Row 43 : Change the parameter name and description to match the agreement*
* *Row 44, 45, 46: Change FFS to “FFS BOOLEAN” for a simple request*
* *Row 47: Add “Removed” in status [#108e], because of the duplication with Row 41, 42, 43.*
* *Row 48: Suggest to let RAN3 to define the timestamp value*

*Changes in Column M:*

* *Rows 11, 12, 14: Removed the bracket of “[per UE]”*
* *Rows 16, 17, 18, 19: Remove “FFS”, since it may not be meaningful to define “per UE, ..” for these parameters*
* *Rows 20, 21, 22: Change “FFS” tp “[per band]”*
* *Row 23: Removed “FFS”. since it may not be meaningful to define “per UE, ..” for the parameter*
* *Row 37 to Row 43: Removed the bracket of “[per TRP]”*

(Round 1) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 20, 21, 22, changing it per band does not make much sense. We understand that the capabilities are per band, but in the actual request, LMF should signal a single value for a positioning method. Suggest to have “[per UE]”, or remove the content entirely.  Row 35, srs-PosResourceId should be srs-ResourceId or srs-PosResourceId according to agreement made in RAN1. TRP measurement should be not limited to positioning SRS.  Row 41, MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RTOA should not have “Pos” in the name.  Row 42, MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_gNBRxTx should not have “Pos” in the name.  Row 43, MeasPosSRSwithDiffRxTxTEGs\_Request\_gNBRxTx should not hve “Pos” in the name |
| ZTE | Row 20, 21, 22, we share the same view as Huawei  In (row 24, column J), the agreement seems not correctly pasted. The  The parameter is used by the LMF to request a TRP to optionally measure the same SRS resource of a UE with M different TRP Rx TEGs ~~with the same TRP Rx TEG~~ and report the corresponding multiple gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements. |
| **OPPO** | **Row 11:** As a first step, RAN1 needs to make some clarifications for RAN2. In RAN2, the parameter “maxNumOfUE-RxTEG” was used for differenent purposes in the current running CR (in fact, the name of maxNumOfRxTEGs is used in RAN2), e.g.,   * Max value of UE capability reporting: the value should be 8   Moderator: This is included the UE feature   * Max value of the configured Rx TEGs for reporting: the value should be 8 (The agreement as blew)   Moderator:  There is no need to define the maximum but the ranges of the values as in MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD   * Max value of the Rx TEG IDs: the value should be 32   Moderator: ueRxTEG-ID range is covered in Row 11.  Thus, RAN1 should explicitly clarify these different values/parameterns and indicate which of the above value(s) Row 11 belongs to. In our understanding, this parameter indicates the first two values, i.e., 8 for UE capability and configuration of Rx TEG number.   |  | | --- | | **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.   + - N=[2, 3, 4, 6, 8] ~~(FFS: other values),~~ 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   + The TRP can be either a “RSTD” reference TRP or a neighbour TRP   + FFS: details of the signalling, procedures, and UE capability   + The timestamps of the multiple RSTD measurements in the same measurement report can be the same or different.   + Note: All RSTD measurements are relative to a single reference timing |   **Row 14:** Simiar comments as Row 11 |
| **Moderator** | Summary of the changes based on the comments  For Huawie’s comments:   * Row 20, 21, 22: removed the “FFS” for Column M * Row 35, add SRS resource/SRS resource ID, based on the comment from Huawei * Row 41, 42, 43, “Pos” in the parameter names are removed. “   For ZTE’s comments:   * Row 42, Column J: delete “with the same TRP Rx TEG” |
|  | For OPPO’s comments:  Row 11, 12: add “per UE” to the description |

***Question 1****: The the “FFS: A triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}” in Row 7, different companies may have different understanding on whether the reporting of the triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}” is supported based on the existing RAN1 agreement. Companies are invited to provide their views in the following table on:*

* *OP1 (YES): support the reporting of a triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}*
* *OP2 (NO): not support the reporting of a triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}*

(Round 1) Comments for Q1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/NO** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | This was considered not needed based on RAN1 discussion. |
| ZTE | NO | The benefit is not justified. The same issue exists in row 30. |
| **OPPO** | No | This combination *{RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}* was discussed in several meetings. However, it was not agreed. |
| CATT | No | There is no need to introduce a triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} for ueRxTxTEG-ID-group. |
| Moderator |  | Row 7: Column J: remove “FFS: *triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}*  Row 30: Column J: remove “FFS: *triplet of TRP {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}* |

**Question 2**: *RAN2 (R1-2200878) LS asks whether Row 15 “numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource” is a duplication of Row 20 “MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD”. Based on the contributions [12-20], it seems companies have different views. Companies are invited to provide their views on whether Row 15 “numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource” can be removed due to the duplication with Row 20 “MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD”.*

* *OP1 (YES): “numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource” can be removed*
* *OP2 (NO): Both “numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource” and “MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD” need to be kept.*

(Round 1) Comments for Q2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **yes/NO** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, but | As in our paper R1-2202455, we think that the situation at TRP (subject to RAN3 to check) could be different from that at UE.  In summary, apart from the suggestion of removing “pos” from the parameter name (given that from TRP side, measuring the MIMO SRS and positioning SRS can be both possible as in the earlier form), we prefer to combine rows 41 and 42, and make it a single RxTEG request applicable to either RTOA or gNB Rx – Tx time difference.  Moderator: There is a discussion on RAN4’s LS on whether Rel-15 SRS can be used for UE/gNB Rx – Tx time difference measurements. Thus, the suggestion is to have separate parameters for now. |
| ZTE | YES | We don’t see why both of row 15 and 20 should be kept |
| **OPPO** | Yes | Duplicaed parameters |
| CATT | Yes | The parameter of ”numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource” can be removed. |
| **Moderator** |  | Row 15: added “Removed” in Column T for parameter of ”numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource”. |

(Round 2) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Qualcomm | **Q1:** OK to not include the triplet, however we were under the impression that this Agreement meant that the triplet is supported:  Agreements  For mitigating UE Tx/Rx timing errors for DL+UL positioning, a UE may support, up to UE capability, either one or **both** of the following options:  **• Option 1: Reporting of UE RxTx TEG ID**  **• Option 2: Reporting of UE Rx TEG ID and UE Tx TEG ID.**  **Q2:** Yes the parameter can be removed  **Row 5:** Even though we are OK to remove the SRS-resourceSet, we still think that there is ambiguity since a UE may be configured with SRS resources across multiple CCs, and the M-RTT report is a single report across all the CCs. For example, imagine the UE being configured with DL-PRS in 2 bands, and having SRS configured in each band. The UE can report UE Rx-Tx measurements in a single M-RTT report, which would also include the Tx TEG SRS Association report.  Note that in NRPPa signaling (TS 38.455), when the LMF requests specific SRS transmission characteristics, it can also request a specific ARFCN number with the following IE:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | SRS Frequency | O |  | INTEGER(0..3279165) | NR ARFCN  The carrier frequency of SRS transmission bandwidth. | YES | ignore |   So, even if we remove the SRSset, an additional indication is needed for the cases that the UE is configured with multiple PFLs & multiple SRS on different CCs. We suggest the UE to optionally report the NR ARFCN The carrier frequency of SRS transmission bandwidth. |
| Moderator | To Qualcomm:  **Q1:** I actually share the same understanding as Qualcomm for the agreement, i.e., both options are supported, it means the TEG IDs reported by both options are reported. However, it seems most other companies may have different understanding, i.e., the UE can have the capability to support both options, but not at the same time or no need to support at the same time.  **Q2:** Added a new Row 24 NR ARFCN for he carrier frequency of SRS transmission reported with UE Tx TEG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: on the agreement, our interpretation (at least the intention from our side at the time we made the agreement) is UE may indicate support of both options in the capability signaling, but only provide either one. Similar to loS-NLoS-Indicator capability.  Q2: We suggest to make it general in this case, e.g. cell information associated with SRS as proposed in our paper R1-2202455 in case we cannot decide it on the fly.  ***Proposal 3: RAN1 to confirm that the SRS resource set ID is not needed, but CC information may be required for the case of SRS resources from multiple CCs needs to be reported.***  The NR carrier frequency of SRS transmission bandwidth is a choice, but we are not certain whether UE should be able to acquire it. Is it the CD-SSB frequency, pointA frequency, or the channel raster? For SCell without CD-SSB, how to set the CD-SSB frequency? For pointA frequency, is it possible to have PCell and SCell sharing the same point A? For the channel raster, is UE able to determine the channel raster (according to RAN4, the center of the resource grid of at least one numerology should be mapped to the channel raster)?  For RRC, we should have serving cell ID, which is sufficient.  For LPP, it is possible to set any arbituary ARFCN value within the SRS bandwidth? |
| **Moderator** | To QC/HW:  For Q1: Let us follow the understading of the majority companies, and remove the reporting of triplet.  For Q2: It seems we need more discussion on the parameter related to the carrier frequency of SRS transmission. I will mark the new Row 24 as “unstable” for now for continue discussion. |
| **vivo** | 1. For the description of row 22, there is a typo for UE Rx-Tx measurements  The parameter is used by a LMF to request a UE to measure the same DL PRS with different UE RxTX TEGs with the same UE Tx TEG for UX Rx-Tx measurements  Moderator: Corrected  2. we wonder { RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID }can be removed since both options are supported based on the QC listing agreement. |

(Closed) Issue #2.1: Response to RAN2 LS (R1-2201317)

(Closed) Proposal 2.1:

Provide the following response to RAN2 LS (R1-2201317)

RAN1 would like to confirm the following:

* The parameter *numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource* is a duplication of *MeasPRSwithDiffRxTEGs\_Request\_RSTD.*
* The correct value range of *maxNumOfUE-RxTEG* is 32.
* The parameter *[srs-PosResourceSetId]* is not needed.

The *numOfUERxTEG-PerPRSResource* and *[srs-PosResourceSetId]* will be removed when RAN1 provides the updated RRC parameter list to RAN2.

Comments

Please provide the comments ONLY if you have any concern for above proposal.

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

Issue #2.2: Frequency information of SRS for positioning resources

Submitted Proposals:

* ***(Qualcomm, R1-2202140) 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.*
* ***(Huawei, R1-2202455)*** *Proposal 3: RAN1 to confirm that the SRS resource set ID is not needed, but CC information may be required for the case of SRS resources from multiple CCs needs to be reported.*
* *Also see the related discussion in (Round 2) Comments Table*

## Proposal 2.2:

* *If a UE is configured with SRS for positioning in multiple CCs, when the UE reports UE Tx TEG(s) for UL-TDOA or Multi-RTT, the frequency information of SRS for positioning resources should be included in the report;*
* *It is up to RAN2/RAN3 to decide how the the frequency information of SRS for positioning resources is included in the report of the UE Tx TEG(s)*
* *Send LS to RAN2/RAN3 for the signaling design*

Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| **vivo** | Yes |
| OPPO | If UE is configured with SRS for positioning only in one CC, the frequency information is not needed. Thus, we suggest to as a condition for the 1st bullet   * If a UE is configured with SRS for positioning in multiple CCs, when it reports UE Tx TEG(s) for UL-TDOA or Multi-RTT, the frequency information of SRS for positioning resources should be included in the report |
| **Moderator** | To OPPO’s comments: The proposal is modified as suggested. |

(Round 3) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | In previous round discussion, companies have different understanding on whether the reporting of the triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}” is supported based on the existing RAN1 agreement for Row 7 and Row 30. Some companies (e.g., Huawei, OPPO, ZTE, CATT) do not think it is supported, while some other companies (Qualcomm, vivo) have different views. It might be better to have a further discussion and also check other companies’ views to see if we need to add the support of the triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} based on the existing agreement. |
| Moderator | Row 39:   * Column G, remove the “[]”. |
| Qualcomm | As said before, we thought it was agreed, but we are OK to remove it |
| CATT | We still prefer no need to introduce a triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID}. |
| vivo | We don’t want to block the progress, but we think, based on the agreement, the triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} is supported |
| Moderator | To Qualcomm/vivo: Based on the feedbacks and undersatdning. From the feedback so far, it might be difficult to reach the consensus for the reporting of the triplet of UE {RxTx TEG ID, Rx TEG ID, Tx TEG ID} due to different understanding of the agreement. |

3. Accuracy improvements for UL-AoA positioning solutions

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

* *Row 57: Change value range FFS to N/A*
* *Row 58, 59, 60,61, 62, 63, 64: changes are made according to approved RAN3 CR (R3-220072), and change “new-stable” in status [#108e]*
* *Row 65: Change “FFS” to “N/A”*
* *Row 66: Change the value FFS to “Defined in 9.2.38, TS 38.455”*
* *Row 69: Change the value rage to INTEGER(0..63) according to TS 38.455*
* *Row 70: Change the value rage to INTEGER(0..63) according to TS 38.455*

(Round 1) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 58 and 59, no need to have value 1 and [0, 1]. Leaving it blank would suffice.  Row 72, TS 38.456 should be changed TS 38.455. |
| Moderator | For Huawei’s comments:   * Row 58 and 59: just remove “FFS” and leave blank in column * Row 72: correct the typo |
|  |  |
|  |  |

(Round 2) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For Row 21 and Row 22, the related agreements should be exchanged.  For Row 22, change the column J as ‘The parameter is used by a LMF to request a UE to measure the same DL PRS with different UE RxTX TEGs with the same UE Tx TEG for UX Rx-Tx measurements’.  For Row 43, similar to Row 22, change the column J as ‘The parameter is used by the LMF to request a TRP to optionally measure the same SRS resource of a UE with M different TRP RxTx TEGs with the same TRP Tx TEG and report the corresponding multiple gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurements.’  For Row 50 and 54, a typo in column J, ‘The maximum number of reported …’. |
| Moderator: | To vivo’s comments:   * Make the corrections as suggested. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

(Round 3) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | Suggested Changes for comments:  Row 73:   * Column K: change “FFS” to “Ref. Table 13.3.1-1 of TS 38.133 for the reporting of the absolute values; FFS: for the reporting of relative values. * Column P: Add the following agreement of 1st path RSRPP reporting   Agreement  The gNB can be requested to measure and report to the LMF the UL SRS-RSRPP of the first path using at least the following option:  • Option 1: if the UL SRS-RSRPP is reported only for the first path (and UL SRS-RSRP is not reported), then the UL SRS-RSRPP of the first path is reported using the absolute reporting as defined in the mapping Table 13.3.1-1 of TS 38.133 for SRS-RSRP. |

4. Accuracy improvements for DL-AoD positioning solutions

(1st Round) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in Excel Sheet ePOS#v000)

* *Row 76: Change Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” for the simple request. RAN2/3 may decide whether it is “Yes” only, or has both “Yes” and “No”.*
* *Row 77: Change FFS to N/A. No value range for an IE structure.*
* *Row 78: Change Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” for the simple request. RAN2/3 may decide whether it is “Yes” only, or has both “Yes” and “No”.*
* *Row 79: Remove FFS. No value range for an IE structure. Also Remove FFS: The details of TRP beam/antenna information, since the details of trpBeamAntennaInformation are defined in Row 95 to 98,*
* *Row 80: Add the value range of PRS Resource ID based on the current range value defined e.g., in TS 38.355/455.*
* *Row 81: Add a new row for missing PRS Resource Set ID.*
* *Row 82, 83: The value ranges can be decided based on exiting range defined TS 38.455*
* *Row 85: Change Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” for the simple request. RAN2/3 may decide whether it is “Yes” only, or has both “Yes” and “No”.*
* *Row 86: Change “FFS” to [Ref. TS38.133] and add RAN4 LS R4-2202780 “• PRS-RSRPP may be reported by reusing absolute and differential PRS-RSRP measurement report mapping tables in TS38.133 clause 10.1.24.3.1 and 10.1.24.3.2 respectively” in the comment column.*
* *Rows 90: Change “FFS” to “N/A”*
* *Rows 91: Change “FFS” to BOOLEAN*
* *Rows 92: Change “FFS” to BOOLEAN*
* *Rows 93 to 96: Suggest the values related to the expected DL-AOA values are defined in a similar way as expected UL-AOA values*
* *Rows 97 to 103: Making similar changes as Rows 90 to 96*
* *Row 104: Change “FFS” to “N/A”*
* *Row 105: Change FFS to INTEGER(0..63)*
* *Row 106: Change “FFS” to “N/A”*
* *Row 107, 108: Change FFS to the value range based on 38.455.*

(Round 1) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 91, 92, 98 and 99, no need to have “BOOLEAN”, since they are the parent IE/fields. |
| ZTE | Row 78: It seems we haven’t changed Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN”  Row 102, Column G and J, we think they should be for AoD rather than AoA.  Expected DL Zenith AoD~~A~~ Value Expected DL Zenith AoD~~A~~ Value |
| **Moderator** | For Huawei’s comments:   * Row 91, 92, 98 and 99: leave blank in Column Kand all other   For ZTE’s comments:   * Row 78: changed Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” (To all: the parameter was not agreed) * Row 102, Column G and J: corrected |
|  |  |

(Round 2) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For Row 88, column K, for the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP measurements per TRP, the values can be one of [16, 24];  For Row 89, column K, for the maximum number of DL Path PRS RSRPP measurements per TRP, the values can be one of [2,4,8,16,24]. |
| Moderator | To vivo:  The maximum number in TS DL PRS RSRP for UE capability can be multiple values which will be captured in UE feature. The maximum number for Row 88 and 89 for measurement report in 37.355 |
| vivo | For row 105, the maximum number of PRS subset is INTEGER(0..63), the value is weird for us, firstly, the subset is defined for the adjacent beam, we don’t think the maximum number can be 64, in addition, we don’t think the value has been discussed in RAN1, So we prefer to modify as FFS |
| **Moderator** | Row 105 is for the DL PRS rerouce IDs included in the DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset. The value range of DL PRS rerouce ID should be INTEGER(0..63). I assume vivo’s comment may be related to the maximum number of DL PRS rerouces in the DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset, which I think we may need to to add a new parameter to define, e.g., “maximum number of DL PRS rerouce IDs is a DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset”.  DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset := {  1st DL PRS rerouce ID,  2nd DL PRS rerouce ID, …,  N-th DL PRS rerouce ID}  N <= “maximum number of DL PRS rerouce IDs”. |

(Round 3) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Nokia | * Row 86:   + The current parameter name “firstPathRSRP” needs to be changed to “firstPathRSRPP”, and the description on this parameter should be also RSRPP (not RSRP) * Row 89: Same comment. It should be maxNumPathRSRPPperTRP * Row 104 and row 105: reoruce needs to be chanced as resource   Moderator: Corrected |
| **Moderator** | In Row 79, Colum P, add the following new agreement:  Agreement  In the beam antenna Assistance data element, support signaling enabling to refer the beam information of a TRP with another TRP with the same beam information in Local Coordinate System (LCS).  In Row 90 and Row 97: Column P: Add the new agreement:  **Agreement**  Only GCS is supported for reference angle for expected angle and uncertainty of DL-AoD positioning. |
| **vivo** | Sorry we can not accept without modification of Row 105  We try to understand the interpretation of FL, but we think our view is different. Based on the following TP, we think the “each resource” can be INTEGER(0..63). But the maximum resource N in DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset shouldn’t be INTEGER(0..63). The intention of the resource within the subset is for adjacent beam, and the maximum reporting resource is 24, we don’t think 64 is right.  From our view, N can be {2,4,8,16,24}, similar to the maximum number of reporting RSRP or RSRPP  DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset := {  1st DL PRS resource ID,  2nd DL PRS resource ID, …,  N-th DL PRS rerouce ID}    The TP below for TS 38.214 section 5.1.6.5 is endorsed  ----------------Start of TP for TS38.214---------------------  **5.1.6.5      PRS reception procedure**  ……  For each PRS resource, the UE may be configured, subject to UE capability, with [*DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset*] that is associated with this PRS resource, where the subset of PRS resources associated with the PRS resource can be in the same or different PRS resource set than the PRS resource. The UE may include UE measurements for the subset of PRS resources in [*NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement]* if the UE measurements of the associated PRS resource are reported, where the UE measurement can be DL PRS-RSRP and/or DL PRS-RSRPP. The UE may report DL PRS-RSRP and/or DL PRS-RSRPP measurements only for the subset of PRS resources. Subject to UE capability, the UE may be configured with higher layer parameter [DL-AOD Boresight direction] for each PRS resource.  ----------------End of TP for TS38.214--------------------- |
| **Moderator** | To vivo’s comments:  Row 105 is not about the value of N, but the DL PRS resource ID for each element included in the DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset. Maybe we need to consider adding another parameter for the maximum number of the DL PRS resources in DL-AOD-PRS resource-Subset, which may need to be discussed in AI 8.5.3.  I will check with FL for AI 8.5.3 to see if the issue should be discussed under AI 8.5.3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon 0301 | To moderator/vivo, the number of resources in the list can be directly discussed by RAN2. The maximum value considered can be set to 24. |
| FL | To Huawei: FL for AI 8.5.3 has taken over the issue for further discussion under AI 8.5.3. |

5. Latency improvements for both DL and DL+UL positioning

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

* *Row 112: It seems the value range of a simple request can simply be a Boolean value decided by RAN2*
* *Row 118, It seems the value range of preconfigMG\_ID can be decided by RAN2*
* *Row 119: It seems the value range of a simple request can simply be a Boolean value decided by RAN2*
* *Row 120: Change the value range from FFS to [0, 1, 2] to represent the three options in the agreement*
* *Row 121: The value range should be “N/A”*
* *Row 122, 123: Change the value range from FFS to “[Ref. NR-DL-PRS-Periodicity-and-ResourceSetSlotOffset in TS 37.355”*
* *Row 124:*
* *Row 125: Change the value range from FFS to “[Ref. NR-PhysCellID and nr-CellGlobalID In TS 37.355”*
* *Row 126: Change the value range from FFS for [15, 30, 60, 120] kHz*
* *Row 127: The value of the request can simply be a Boolean value decided by RAN3.*

(Round 1) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 112, we do not think BOOLEAN is correct. RAN3 agreed to have a UE associated class 2 NRPPa message for it. Suggest to just remove FFS.  **Support the MG activation request by the LMF.**  **The signaling procedure of the MG activation request uses an UE-associated class 2 signaling procedure. FFS on whether to use new defined or existing signaling procedure?**  Row 118, we think this can be decided by RAN1. We have two proposals handled under 8.5.4 to discuss the maximum number of preconfigured MGs (8 or 16).  Row 125 and 126, with regards to cell information and SCS information, we will have some discussion whether the PRS processing window is per UE or per BWP (based on RAN2 agreement). Maybe we can leave FFS for both rows, and try to settle it in 8.5.4.  Row 127, we do not think BOOLEAN is correct. RAN3 agreed to have a single message for MG activation request and PPW activation request.  **For activation request procedure initiated by non-LMF, an unified signaling procedure over NRPPa can be adopted for the delivery of pre-configured MG and PRS processing Window configuration information.** |
| ZTE | We have agreed a UE capability for lower Rx beam sweeping factor in FR2, the corresponding higher layer parameter should be supported in LPPa signaling as well. |
| **Moderator** | For Huawei’s comments:   * Row 112: It might better to change “FFS” to “FFS RAN3” . * Row 118, then let us keep it as “FFS”, and then make the update based on the discussion results of this meeting * Row 125 and 126, Okay. Let up keep and then make the updates based on the discussion results of this meeting * Row 127, change “FFS” to “FFS RAN3”.   For ZTE’s comments:   * The parameters related to UE capability, which only has impact of the signaling of UE capability, are included in UE feature list.   To All: I   * Row 111: “FFS: others” is cahnegd to “FFS RAN2”, since it is unclear what “others” means |
| Samsung | For Row120,  We think the value is different for different opions, e.g., state 2 means differently for option 1, 2;  {state 1, state 2} for option 1;  {state 2, state 3} for option 2;  Default value is state 1;  Because a UE could only implemented option 1, such UE without URLLC feature, it cannot tell state 3 meaning. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have concern over the change by SS.  If state 1 is the default state, why do need state 1 for option 1? It also appears that option 1/2 is also part of the signaling, but option 3 is omitted.  Providing state 1 as the default state would simply convert a mandatory field in ASN.1 to an optional field with Need S code, which can be considered directly by RAN2.  The agreement in the “comment column” is sufficient to RAN2 work on ASN.1 signaling design and field description. |

(Round 2) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | * Regarding Row 110/column K, in addition to the value of 1 and 4, other values cannot be excluded, since RAN4 is discussing the reduced value of M. RAN4 may introduce M=2, of which 1 sample is used for AGC. Please add ‘other values: FFS RAN4’ in clolumn K.      * We find that ‘MG activation request’ is captured in the list marked by yellow, similarly, should the parameter like ‘preconfiguration MG request’ also be captured based on RAN3 conclusion?   A UE-associated class 1 procedure is used to provide a full PRS configuration to gNB as assistance information of the pre-configuration of MG (FFS on procedure details) |
| Moderator | To vivo’s comment: Okay. Change to “FFS: others RAN4” |
| Samsung | For Row120,  We think the value is different for different opions, e.g., state 2 means differently for option 1, 2;  {state 1, state 2} for option 1;  {state 2, state 3} for option 2;  Default value is state 1;  Because a UE could only implemented option 1, such UE without URLLC feature, it cannot tell state 3 meaning. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have concern over the change by SS.  If state 1 is the default state, why do need state 1 for option 1? It also appears that option 1/2 is also part of the signaling, but option 3 is omitted.  Providing state 1 as the default state would simply convert a mandatory field in ASN.1 to an optional field with Need S code, which can be considered directly by RAN2.  The agreement in the “comment column” is sufficient to RAN2 work on ASN.1 signaling design and field description. |
| **Moderator** | To Samsung/Huawei discussion:  Since both UE and the network know which Option the UE supports, I think there is no ambiguity. |

## (Round 3) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | In previous round discussion, companies have different opinions for the Values for PRS priority indicator (Row 120). (Huawei, Nokia, and consider the values should be {State1, State 2, State 3}, while Samsung has different view. We may need to have a further discussion on whether there is a need to change these values. |
| Moderator | Row 118,   * Column K, change “FFS” to “INTEGER(0, 1, …,15)” * Column P, add the following agreement   **Agreement**  The maximum number of preconfigured MGs is 16.  **Agreement**  The maximum number of MGs per activation/deactivation is 1.  Row 121, Column P, add the following new agreement:  **Agreement**   * The PRS processing window is configured per DL BWP. * Processing type, to be selected from 1A, 1B and 2, will be provided associated with the PRS processing window if and only if multiple processing types per band in the UE capability signaling is supported. * No need to provide band ID and CC ID associated with the PRS processing window. * A single priority indicator is provided for a PRS processing window, which applies to all PRS within the PRS processing window for the corresponding DL BWP. * The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows per DL BWP is 1. * The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows across all active DL BWPs is 4.   + The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows overlapping in time across all active DL BWPs is 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 119, this row is still unstable, and we think it could be changed to stable, because there was no comment of concern received. From our side, we believe that a general principle of network control over what UE may send should be useful to avoid inter-operability issue.  Row 120: The value range in RRC configuration should not be dependent on another RRC message, e.g. the UE capability, which is a general principle of ASN.1.  Row 121: For column M, we can have “BWP”  Row 124: On column K we can simply say 1 – 160 slots for all numerologies (which converts to 20ms even for 120kHz SCS).  Row 125/126, I guess we do not need them given that we already agreed that PPW is per BWP. The agreement of Cell/SCS information is anyway needed, but perhaps it may not be explicit.  **Agreement**  At least the following parameters for PRS processing window from the gNB to the UE are supported.   * + Starting slot   + Periodicity   + Duration/length   + Cell and SCS information associated with the above parameters |
| Samsung | Per discussion and comments in email. I guess if we cannot reach concesus on how it works. We are fine to keep it FFS and RAN2 to decide. However, we need to remind that UE only supports one option per band, and not all option needs RRC signlaing.  Paste the comments from email:  To HW, I think you highlighted the part we have different understanding. As we checked, for a UE did not support such RRC signaling (which per our RAN1 agreement, the RRC signaling is only supported for options with multiple states), like UE reports option 3 only.  UE should be able to, for example declare RLF if it does not comply the signalling (e.g., find the size of the signaling is not right). a UE is not required to be able to "*decode the ASN.1 that may indicate the priority states that UE does not support*".  Thus, following the same logic, for option 1 and option2, given that fact UE only report one option for a given band, then UE only expects to decode the ASN.1 code per its supported option.      To CATT, we are fine to keep it in FFS, and given the RAN2 expertise on ASN.1 signaling, we can let them decide. But we need to remind them not all UE support every option, and per option indication is more cleaner design. |
| Moderator | To Huawei’s comments:  Row 119: it is changed to “[Stable]”. The bracket wil be removed if there is no concern.  Row 121: For column M, add per “BWP”  Row 124: On column K, change FFS to “1 – 160 slots” for all numerologies.  Row 125/126, Collumn T, add “Removed” |
| Moderator | To Huawei and Samsung’s comments on Row 120:  Will it work by adding the following in the Column J of Row 120:  A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 1, supports {State 1, State 2}  A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 2, supports {State 1, State 2, State 3}  A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 3, supports {State 1} only |
| vivo | For Row 119, we think the issue is related to gNB capability, and it doesn’t be discussed in the main session, we prefer not to introduce the row in the RRC parameter directly. |
| Moderator | To vivo/Huawei comments on Row 119: It seems we could not change Row 119 to “stable” now. I will remove the “stable” from Column T for now.  I will check with FL for AI 8.5.4 to see if the issue should be discussed under AI 8.5.4. |
| Moderator | For Row 120:  Suggestion made during email discussion among Huawei, Samsung and Modertor in the reflector under the same email thread:   * A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 1, supports {State 1, State 2} * A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 2, supports {State 1, State 2, State 3} * A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 3, supports {State 1} only * Note: the contents for each states are refered to the agreement for each option |
| Huawei, HiSilicon 0301 | Another comment from my side is we agree the following, I would suggest to add processing type in the PRS processing window configuration. Something like this.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NR\_pos\_enh | Latency improvements |  |  |  |  | Type |  |  | PRS processing window type | Type-1A, Type-1B, Type-2 |  | in "PRSProcessingWindow" |   **Agreement**   * The PRS processing window is configured per DL BWP. * Processing type, to be selected from 1A, 1B and 2, will be provided associated with the PRS processing window if and only if multiple processing types per band in the UE capability signaling is supported. * No need to provide band ID and CC ID associated with the PRS processing window. * A single priority indicator is provided for a PRS processing window, which applies to all PRS within the PRS processing window for the corresponding DL BWP. * The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows per DL BWP is 1. * The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows across all active DL BWPs is 4.   + The maximum number of activated PRS processing windows overlapping in time across all active DL BWPs is 1   **Agreement**  UE may indicate support of more than one processing types and corresponding capability on a band on which it supports PRS processing outside the MG inside the PRS processing window.   * It is up to the gNB to decide which processing type to use |
| FL | To Huawei and all:  Row 108 is added based on Huawei’s comment. |
| FL | To following is copied from email discussion in the email thread [108-e-R17-RRC-NR-ePos]  Samsung:  to save time, if following is acceptable? We prefer to give clear information on our outcome to RAN2 rather than hiding it with risk of being ignored.   ·         A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 1, supports {State 1, State 2}   ·         A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 2, supports {State 1, State 2, State 3}   ·         A UE, which has the capability of supporting Option 3, supports {State 1} only~~and not support RRC indication of priority state indication.~~   ·         Note1: the contents for each states are refered to the agreement for each option.   ·         ~~The priority of PRS for UE supporting two priority states and three priority states can at least be indicated in RRC.~~Note2: A UE supports option 1 or option 2 is required to support RRC indication of priority state but a UE supporting option 3 only is not required to support RRC indication of priority state.  Moderator:  In my view the “Note 2” suggested by Samsung is based on the interpretation of the agreement. It is unclear on whether all companies hold the same view. I am not sure if this needs to be discussed under AI 8.5.4.  Huawei (FL for AI 8.5.4)  From my perspective, I do not think that is possible to say that a Rel-17 UE will not support a part of Rel-17 signaling (introduced in ASN.1 freeze). It is not the case like a Rel-16 UE does need to understand the Rel-17 signaling, or like a Rel-17 UE implementing v17.1.0 ASN.1 does not need to understand later Rel-17 signalings in e.g. v17.2.0 via non-critical extension.  With the above said, if this would stop the discussion, we would be fine to let it go. |

6. Potential enhancements of information reporting from UE and gNB for multipath/NLOS mitigation

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

* *Row 130: Added the agreements related to the reporting of the losNlosIndicator from UE*
* *Row 131: Added the agreements related to the reporting of the losNlosIndicator from TRP*
* *Row 132: Change FFS to the same value as row 131*
* *Row 135: Change the value range of FFS to [4, 8]*
* *Rows 137 to 143: Change Value range “FFS” to “~~FFS~~ BOOLEAN” for these simple requests. RAN2/RAN3 may decide whether it is “Yes” only, or has both “Yes” and “No”.*

(Round 1) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Row 135, we wonder why 1 and 2 are not added to the list? |
| Moderator | To Huawei’s comments:   * Row 135: added the values 1 and 2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

(Round 2) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| vivo | For Row 134, column K, we doubt the value of 4, there is no agreement capturing it. Even if in UE feature list, the candidate values are marked by yellow in FG-27-14.  Component 1 candidate values: [{4, 6, 8}] |
| Qualcomm | For Row 134, column K, we are also supportive to add 6 in addition to 4 and 8. |
| Moderator | To vivo/QC’s comments:   * Value 6 is added for further comment. |
|  |  |

## (Round 3) Comments

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

7. On-demand transmission and reception of DL PR

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

* *Row 146: Change “FFS” to “[Ref. TS 37.355]”, assume all existing PRS periodicities are supported*
* *Row 168: Change “FFS” to “BOOLEAN” since the parameter is an ON/OFF indicator*

(Round 1) Comments:

None

(Round 2) Comments

None

## (Round 3) Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Moderator | Row 146: Column K, remove the bracket “[]”  Row 155: Column K, change “FFS” to “INTEGER(1, 2, 3, 4)”  Row 158: Column K, change “FFS” to “Ref. TS 37.355”.  Row 167: Column K, change “FFS” to “INTEGER(1, 2, 3, 4)”  Rows 150, 151, 162, 163, change “FFS” to “FFS RAN2” |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

8. Support of positioning for UEs in RRC\_ INACTIVE state

(Round 1) Moderator Proposed Changes (marked in red in data Sheet “Positioning (Round 1)”)

* *Row 175: Change “FFS” to “[Ref. TS 37.355]” based on RAN1’s agreement that “SRS for positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state is configured using the SRS-PosResourceSet IE”.*

(Round 1) Comments:

None

(Round 2) Comments

None

## (Round 3) Comments

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

9. Summary

TBD
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