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1. Introduction

This FL summary documents the proposals and discussions for agenda item 8.5.3, based on the following chairman decision:

[105-e-NR-ePos-03] Email discussion/approval on accuracy improvements for DL-AoD positioning solutions with checkpoints for agreements on May 25, May 27 – Florent (Ericsson)

The FL proposals are based on submission to AI 8.5.3 [1-22] and treat the following aspects:

* Aspect #1 reporting of first path RSRP
* Aspect #2 extension of number of reported RSRP measurements
* Aspect #3 Adjacent beam identification in AD and reporting by the UE
* Aspect #4 Support of additional gnodeB beam information signalling
* Aspect #5 AoD uncertainty window

1. Aspects for discussion

## Main discussion topics

### Aspect #1 reporting of first arrival path

#### Summary and FL proposal

During RAN1#104e, an agreement was reached listing several options for reporting of the first arrival path and additional path:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD study the following enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-assisted) information related to the first arriving path   + Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path   + Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of departure of the first arriving path   + Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path   + Option 4: Information corresponds to phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path   + Option 5: Information corresponds to received signal value (amplitude and phase of the channel estimated from the first path which can be achieved as a combination of option 1 and option 4) of the first arriving path * FFS: Reporting of additional path to the first arriving path. * FFS: Measurement definition details * FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements * FFS: how the “first path” is selected among PRS resources in a PRS resource set * Note 1: Supporting multiple options as well as none of the options above is not precluded. |

The discussion continued in RAN1#104b-e, but did not result in any new agreement.

In [1][2][3][4][5][6][7][8][9][12][13][14][15][17][18][20][22] companies gave their preferred options and provided further details:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1] | ***Proposal 1:*** ***In DL-AoD measurement report, support the UE to report the information corresponds to PRS-RSRP and arrival time of the first arriving path.*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 3: Support the following Options for enhancing DL-AoD.***   * ***Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path.*** * ***Option 4: Information corresponds to phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path.***   + ***This should target multiple PRS resources transmitted on consecutive symbols within a slot.*** * ***Note: Option 3 (Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path) can be discussed in the multi-path enhancements.*** * ***Note: Option 2 (Information corresponds to the angle of departure of the first arriving path) can be treated with lower priority and discussed along with DL-AOD angle calculation enhancement.***   ***Proposal 4: Introduce a common path power measurement window across multiple PRS resources for a TRP, where the PRS-RSRP per path is evaluated based on the CIR within the window.***   * ***The window is centered on the peak of the first path, and the window size can be set to include the main lobe and optionally the sidelobes of the first path.*** |
| [3] | **Proposal 10**   * ***Option 3 should be discussed after option 1 is being agreed upon.***   + ***Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path***   + ***Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path*** * ***The benefit of reporting timing information needs to be further clarified.***   **Proposal 11**   * ***The performance benefits of Option 2, option 4, and option 5 should be evaluated first especially in phase inconsistency cases.***   + ***Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of departure of the first arriving path***   + ***Option 4: Information corresponds to phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path***   + ***Option 5: Information corresponds to received signal value (amplitude and phase of the channel estimated from the first path which can be achieved as a combination of option 1 and option 4) of the first arriving path***   **Proposal 12**   * ***The angle-based AoD positioning or phase-based AoD positioning are postponed to the future release.*** |
| [4] | ***Proposal 2: UE could be configured to report the PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path in addition to the PRS RSRP already supported in Rel-16, if the definition of per-path RSRP is introduced.*** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 1:*** *In addition to RSRP measurement for UE-assisted DL-AOD, Rel-17 UE should be able to report information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path, which includes,*   * *Time of arrival( i.e. TOA) for at least one reference signal per TRP* * *Arrival time differences among reference signals from the same TRP (i.e. Intra-TRP TDOA)*   ***Proposal 2:*** *UE can report an indicator for each reported reference signal (or each DL PRS-RSRP value) to indicate that the sequence of arrival time of the first path for difference reference signals.* |
| [6] | Proposal 1: For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the PRS RSRP of the first path.   * + FFS: how the “first path” is selected or indicated among PRS resources in a PRS resource set |
| [7] | ***Proposal 4: Support enhancing the UE-A/UE-B DL-AoD method with UE measurements that provide phase-difference and Angle of Departure information related to the first arrival path (Option 2 & 4):***   * ***Assistance Data Enhancement:***    + ***gNBs’ antenna Configuration, PMI Codebook configuration & their association to the transmitted PRS resources, PMI to DL-AoD Mapping Table (for UE-B).*** * ***UE Measurement Enhancement:***   + ***Support a UE measuring multiple single-port PRS resources, sweeping a PMI codebook across the measured ports and determining the PMI index that maximizes the power associated with the earliest arriving path.*** |
| [8] | Proposal 5: In DL-AoD measurement report, support the UE to report:   * the RSRP measurement of first arrival path of each PRS resource (i.e, Option 1) * the relative time-of-arrival of those reported PRS resources of each TRP. (i.e., Option 3). |
| [9] | ***Proposal 1: Enable the UE to measure and report PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path to avoid the problem of angle estimation may be biased.*** |
| [12] | **Proposal 2**   * **Support the network-based DL-AOD solution, where the gNB/TRP beam/antenna assistance information is shared with the LMF, including the following steps, measurements, and reporting (option #1 in Table 1):**   + **UE receives DL-PRS resources, performs phase/amplitude measurements for the first arrival path per DL PRS resource**   + **UE reports phase/amplitude measurements to LMF (Proposal 1.2 d/e in the FL’s summary)**   + **LMF computes the coordinates**   **Proposal 3**   * **Support the network-based DL-AOD solution, where the gNB/TRP beam/antenna assistance information is shared with the UE, including the following steps, measurements, and reporting (option #2 in Table 1):**   + **UE receives DL-PRS resources, performs DL-AOD estimation for the first arrival path per DL PRS resource**   + **UE reports DL-AOD to LMF (Proposal 1.2 b in the FL’s summary)**   + **LMF computes the coordinates** |
| [13] | **Proposal 2**: For DL-AoD technique, support PRS-RSRP measurement within a configured time window wherein the power of paths out of the window, if any, does not contribute in PRS-RSRP.   * Alternatively, or additionally, for DL-AoD technique, support PRS-RSRP for the first arrival path only that is measured within a configured time window. |
| [14] | **Proposal 1:** **For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, support UE to measure and report (for UE-assisted) information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path.**  **Proposal 2: Time window for PRS-RSRP and selection of the first path are UE implementation aspect.**  **Proposal 3: Support assistance information from LMF to UE in order to assist UE in selecting the first path.** |
| [15] | ***Proposal 1: The DL PLRS-RSRP can be reported for the aggregate of all paths (as defined in Rel-16) or for the first arrival path only. An indicator of whether the report includes all paths or first arrival path only is supported.***  ***Proposal 4: When multiple PRS resources in a PRS resource set are received, the UE can report the measurements associated one single PRS resource ID corresponding to the identified first arrival path*** |
| [17] | **Proposal 3**: Support “Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path” as one candidate enhancement for DL-AoD.  **Proposal 4**: For DL-AoD support reporting of multiple PRS resources per PRS resource set, with each resource being associated with time of arrival information. |
| [18] | *Proposal 1: Report DL TDoA together with DL PRS-RSRP for DL AoD.*  *Proposal 2: To indicate the first arrival path by reporting the arrival time of each beam in beam measurement report.*  *Proposal 3: Prefer Option 1 and Option 3 on information related to the first arriving path.* |
| [20] | **Proposal 1: To improve the DL-AoD accuracy in UE-assisted mode, support enhanced UE measurements and reporting by considering the following:**   * **The UE estimates the delay of the first arriving path of several PRS resources per TRP** * **The UE may select a common ToA per TRP for the first arriving path** * **For the CIR value related to the common ToA, the UE shall report the relative phase (or the magnitude and phase or the I/Q component of the first arriving path. This combines Options 1, 3 and 4 (or Options 3 and 5)** |
| [22] | 1. Define a DL PRS path power ratio (DL PRS-PPR) measurement for the relative power of a specific path in the channel impulse response. 2. Include DL PRS-PPR of the first path in NR DL-AoD Location Information alongside the existing DL PRS RSRP measurement. 3. Include DL PRS-PPR of the first path in the NR DL-TDOA Location Information and in NR multi-RTT Location Information alongside the existing DL PRS RSRP measurement. 4. The UE shall report DL PRS-PPR of additional paths in i) NR DL-AoD Location Information, ii) NR DL-TDOA Location Information and in iii) NR multi-RTT Location Information. 5. The UE shall report the strongest detected paths as additional paths (i.e. in addition to the first path). |

Support of first-path or per-path RSRP measurement was proposed in [1][2][3][4][6][8][9][13][14][15][17][18][22] In [22] a proposal for a definition of per-path RSRP is introduced. In [15] it is proposed to have an indicator in the report to signal that one or all paths are used to compute the RSRP. In [22] it is proposed to extend the applicability of per-path PRS RSRP to other DL and DL+UL positioning method.

Based on the proposals on per-path RSRP, the following is proposed for discussion:

**Proposal 1.1:**

For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the PRS RSRP of the first path

* + FFS: Reporting of additional path to the first arriving path.
  + FFS: how the “first path” is selected or indicated among PRS resources in a PRS resource set (e.g. use of a time window )
  + FFS: additional assistance data
  + FFS: definition of per-path RSRP

In [2][7][12][20] it is proposed to report the phase of the CIR for the first arriving path and / or additional paths. [2] also discuss the conditions to maintain coherence and propose to have the measurement limited to consecutive symbols within a slot. In [3], the contribution comments that phase-based measurements should be evaluated first against phase inconsistency cases.

Based on the proposals on phase reporting, the following is proposed for discussion:

Proposal 1.2:

For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path

* + FFS: Measurement definition details
  + FFS: Reporting of additional path to the first arriving path.
  + FFS: how the “first path” is selected or indicated among PRS resources in a PRS resource set
  + FFS: additional assistance data

Regarding Time of arrival reporting, [5][8][17][18][20] propose to consider TOA or intra TRP TDOA. In [3], it is proposed to discuss the report the arrival time of the first path if path RSRP reporting is agreed. In[2], the option of reporting TOA per path is suggested to be discussed in the NLOS identification agenda.

Based on the proposals on TOA reporting, the following is proposed for discussion:

Proposal 1.3

For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the arrival time of the first path

* + FFS: Measurement definition details
  + FFS: Reporting of additional path to the first arriving path.
  + FFS: how the “first path” is selected or indicated among PRS resources in a PRS resource set
  + FFS: additional assistance data

In[7] it is propose to support AoD reporting by adding antenna configuration, PMI codebook configuration and their PRS association to the assistance data. [12] also propose to support UE reporting of DL AoD. In[2], the option of reporting AoD is suggested to be discussed as part of aspect #5.

Based on the proposals on AoD reporting, the following is proposed for discussion:

Proposal 1.4:

For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the angle of departure of the first arriving path

* + FFS: Measurement definition details
  + FFS: Reporting of additional path to the first arriving path.
  + FFS: how the “first path” is selected or indicated among PRS resources in a PRS resource set
  + FFS: additional assistance data

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the tables below.

**Proposal 1.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | What’s the definition of RSRP of first arriving path needs to be clarified first. We may need to consult RAN4 whether UE can be sensitive enough to measure path-RSRP. |
| CATT | Support.  In our opinion, the measurement of the received power (PRS-RSRP) of the first arriving path is in general more stable than other measurements of the first arriving path, such as signal amplitude and phase, since RSRP is a time-accumulation quantity instead of an instantaneous quantity. And we also support to discuss how to define PRS-RSRP. RAN4 may need to be involved in the per-path RSRP definition. |
| OPPO | Support in principle  We also think the definition of RSRP of 1st path shall be dicussed by RAN4 |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| SONY | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support, it is benifit to report the PRS-RSRP of the first arrival path for improving accuracy. |
| Samsung | support |
| Vivo | Same views with ZTE, the definition for path-RSRP is unclear to us. Different companies have different views. For example, some companies think it is power of the first path, some companies think it is power in a measurement window. And even though we reach a consensus that is power of the first path, there are also two options that it is defined as the linear average power of RE in first path direction or the power value of CIR at first path timing. |
| LG | Support |
| China Telecom | Support |

**Proposal 1.2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Not support. The phase is so easier to be affected by impairments than power and delay. |
| CATT | Not support, since the signal phase is very sensitive to RF impairments, the benefits are not clear. |
| OPPO | Not support. The phase measuremed at the UE side contains many factors inlucluding hardware impairements and it does not give us meaningful information. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. We think it is important to restrict those PRS resources transmitted from consecutive symbols within a slot to maintain phase continuity. |
| Nokia/NSB | Don’t support. |
| Qualcomm | Support. We are OK with the restriction that Huawei is referring to. This is for us common understanding, but its OK to clarify.  To ZTE/CATT/OPPO:   * Earliest RSRP also is affected by impairments, whether something is „easier“ or not, depends on deployments and gNB implementations.   Bluetooth transmitters and receives have very sucessfuly implemented this method. Why would NR-based receivers find this so difficult that „no meaningful information“ will be provided? |
| SONY | Support |
| CMCC | It seems that restrictions such as phase inconsistency will deteriorate the performance. |
| Samsung | Support.  It seems there is no proposal 1.5 (to support the received value of first arrival path), we could assume RSRP in 1.1 and phase in this 1.2 could be used for that purpose. |
| Vivo | We acknowledge the point that RSRP and phase are easily affected by environment or RF, this is why we are hesitant about proposal 1.1 and 1.2.  In addition, we would like to understand whether the restriction proposed by Huawei means that only R17 PRS or on-demand PRS support the feature ? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To vivo, if Rel-16 PRS can also be fit in such condition, it is still OK. It means that the same Rel-16 PRS pattern, when combined with Rel-17 enhancement on coherent DL-AoD, requires gNB to ensure the phase continuity. It is not necessarily tied with „Rel-17 PRS“ or „on-demand PRS“. |
| LG | Not support. |
| Intel | Support. We think that this technology is feasible, especially as QC mentioned other implementations available in the market, specifically Bluetooth devices.  This method exhibits much better accuracy than the RSRP-based methods.  We are OK to discuss potential restriction to the same time slot as mentioned by HW. |
| China Telecom | Support. |

**Proposal 1.3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Support. It’s a important feature to identify which DL PRS-RSRP is based on a LOS link. We propose to support TOA and intra-TDOA within a TRP. |
| CATT | Not support. It is not clear on the motivation of measurement and reporting (for UE-assisted) for the arrival time of the first path for the angle-based DL-AoD method. |
| OPPO | Support  The combination of RSRP and time-of-arrviabla of one PRS shall be considered. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still think that it should be discussed in multi-path enhancements for DL-AOD. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support, okay with Huawei’s suggestion to discussing in 8.5.5. |
| Qualcomm | Do not support.  Already intra-TRP RSTD is supported in DL-TDOA: UE reports 2 RSTDs: T2-T1 and T3-T1, where T2,T3 are from the same TRP. The LMF can subtract the 2 RSTDs and get T2-T3; in other words, the intra-TRP RSTD).  If we are talking about Time of arrival of multipath components (that is for a SINGLE PRS resource), then this is part of the other subagenda. We are supportive of multipath reporting (which is a per-PRS-resource reporting). |
| SONY | Do not support. We have similar view as CATT. |
| Xiaomi | Support, it is benifit to indicate the first arrival path for improving accuracy. |
| Samsung | The arrival time seems not enough to determine whether the measurement is LOS or not. FFS for now. |
| Vivo | Do not support |
| LG | Support. |
| Intel | Do not support. The motivation of this report is not clear in application to the DL-AOD positioning method. |
| China Telecom | If the motivation of this porposal is for NLOS/multipath detection, we support this proposal, then we share the similar as HW that this may be better discussed in 8.5.5. |
| Apple | Do not support (we share similar view as QC) |

**Proposal 1.4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Not support.   1. Current DL PRS only support one port, it’s impossible for UE to find a PMI matrix based on a resource. 2. As mentioned by other companies, if the search of PMI matrix is based on multiple resources, in which the phase consistency should be kept among different resources.In addition, this changes the current design since different resources in a DL PRS resource set are normally transmitted with different beams.   We propose to postpone this discussion in future release. |
| CATT | Support to FFS this issue. |
| OPPO | Not support  The UE is not able to measure the angle of departure. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This can be discussed with angle calculation enhancement, if we agree port-selection codebook based PRS transmission there. And the PRS resource should be transmitted on consecutive symbols in a slot. |
| Nokia/NSB | Don’t support. |
| Qualcomm | The UE CAN map the Phase-Differnce to a DL-AoD, depending on what we are going to agree as beam information, as HW is also pointing out. |
| SONY | Do not support. |
| CMCC | It seems that restrictions such as phase inconsistency will deteriorate the performance. |
| Xiaomi | We are wondering how can UE measure the angle of departure of the first arriving path? |
| Samsung | FFS. |
| Vivo | Do not support |
| LG | Not support. |
| Intel | Support. The DL-AOD can be computed using the antenna information shared by gNB/LMF with the UE. The antenna information may include the number of elements and the distance spacings over orthogonal dimensions in case of the planar rectangular antenna array (as it is discussed in Option 1 in other AI). |
| China Telecom | Not support |
| Apple | Do not support, requirements is not well justified. |

**Proposal 1.5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | It looks like there is no Proposal 1.5. |
| Samsung | We assume the 1.5 is to support to report the received value, thus we support this. Otherwise, wait the further clarify from FL. |
| FL | There is indeed no proposal 1.5. apologies for the confusion! |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The opinions are similar to RAN1#104b:

* the proposal for per-path RSRP (1.1) is supported by a majority of companies
  + 2 companies would like to first define PRS-RSRP per path.

For the sake of compromise and making progress, it would be good to agree and proceed to clarify the different options to calculate PRS RSRP per path.

* The proposal 1.2 for phase reporting is split between companies supporting and opposing.
* The proposal 1.3 for seem to be difficult to converge. One way forward is to discuss it in the NLOS agenda.

As a way forward, it is proposed to discuss the enhancement in the NLOS agenda (8.5.5).

Proposal 1.3-b measuring and reporting of the path arrival time for DL AOD can be discussed in agenda item 8.5.5

* Proposal 1.4 also has companies split beween support and not support. We propose to wait to see if the discussion on enhanced antenna information reporting can progress, and then revisit the proposal.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to continue the discussion and comment on the proposals in the tables below.

* ~~Regarding proposal 1.1, companies are requested to provide their view on a possible compromise to discuss the exact definition of per-path RSRP (which is FFS in the proposal) once the proposal is agreed.~~
* Regarding proposal 1.2, the discussion can continue as we have not converged.
* Regarding proposal 1.3, companies are requested to provide their view on proposal 1.3b, i.e. whether it can be moved to the NLOS agenda item (8.5.5)
* Regarding proposal 1.4, it is proposed to wait until the discussion on antenna information has progressed.

Update post first GTW:

Proposal 1.1 was captured as an agreement in the first GTW session:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD, the UE can be requested subject to UE capability to measure and report (for UE-assisted) the PRS RSRP of the first path   * FFS: Details of measurement and reporting of PRS RSRP of the first path |

Proposal 1.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Not support. |
| vivo | Not support since there seems no significant benefit between phase-based positioning and R17 path-RSRP AoD positioning based on the evaluation result from QC and vivo. |
| LG | Not support. |
| CATT | Not support. |
| Qualcomm | To vivo: 0.5 degree of error is many meters when it comes to Positioning. So the gain that you see in the tail is signficant.  We are supportive of the enhancement.  We think that NR Angle-based Location services, especially for indoor, will miss out over other competing technologies without this feature. |
| Ericsson | We think it can be considered. Moreover, even if the gains could be not very significant with one path reporting, we think there is potential if a more complete CIR is reported to support NLOS detection. |
| OPPO | Not support |
| vivo 2 | To QC: Maybe we have some differences for the evaluation. But at least, I observed in your results that the AoD error is basically the same for 80 percent of the 5 best links across all UE. We are not sure whether it is needed to maintain all 5 best links across all UE to ensure accuracy since 3 accurate links is enough for AoD calculation and positioning calculation also can relieve the error. Maybe the answer is the same as our evaluation result that there is no significant benefit in the final positioning results  To Ericsson: At least, we think the issue is for accuracy, if the intention is for NLOS detection, maybe it needed to be discussed in AI 8.5.5. Given the NLOS feature is unclear for us, we prefer not to mix the two issues together to make the issue more complicated |
| Xiaomi | Not support |
| Sony | Support |
| Intel | Support.  We see significant gains compared to the RSRP-based approach.  For example, see simulation results in R1-2103037.  We agree with QC, that the other technologies have this feature implemented. |

Proposal 1.3b

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support to discuss this in 8.5.5. |
| ZTE | Support. OK to discuss in AI 8.5.5. |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay to discuss in AI 8.5.5 |
| LG | We have same view. |
| CATT | OK to discuss this issue in 8.5.5. |
| Ericsson | OK to discuss this issue in 8.5.5. |
| Xiaomi | OK to discuss this issue in 8.5.5 |
| SONY | OK to discuss this issue in AI 8.5.5 |
| CEWiT | Support. Ok to discuss the issue in 8.5.5. |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments before GTW#2

Regarding proposal #1.2, both supporting and opposing companies motivated their reasoning with simulations. Given the lack of convergence, it is proposed to continue the discussion with the time left to try and align the understanding of the simulation results.

#### third round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Okay with discuss in next meeting |
| CATT | We prefer to treat proposal 1.2 as low priority in this meeting. |
| ZTE | We prefer to close the discussion as AI 8.5.5 is discussing the same issue. If it is agreed to further study in AI 8.5.5, companies can bring their evaluations in next meeting. |
| SONY | We support proposal 1.2. We observed QC’s simulation results indicate a substantial gain is obtained at 90% of UE. |
| Intel | Support the proposal.  We do not see a need to move this discussion to AI 8.5.5, since this is for the first arrival path and AI 8.5.5 focuses on the NLOS/multi-path. |
| LG | Same view with ZTE. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority to be dsicussed again GTW ginven the Aspect #4, #5 are still open. We think the online discussion should focus on those first. |

### Aspect #2 extension of number of reported RSRP measurements

#### Summary and FL proposal

During RAN1#104e, it was agreed to select from 3 options regarding the number of RSRP measurements:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE-assisted DL AOD, select one of the following options for reporting of RSRP measurements per TRP   * Option 1: Up to 8 measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16) * Option 2: Up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, for the same Rx beam index * Option 3: Up to N>=8 measurements   + Note: Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be  reported for a given PRS resource.   + FFS: value for N. |

The issue was discussed in RAN1#104b-e, but did not converge. The following proposals [3][4][6][7][8][9][13][16][17][21][22] have been made

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [3] | ***Proposal 13***   * ***To improve the accuracy of DL-AoD and to avoid the impact of Rx beam, choose one of option 2 and option 3.***    + ***Option 2: Up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, for the same Rx beam index***   + ***Option 3: Up to N>=8 measurements***     - ***Note: Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS resource.***     - ***FFS: value for N.*** |
| [4] | ***Proposal 1: For UE-assisted DL-AoD, the maximum number of RSRP measurements per TRP should be increased from 8 to [16]. Whether to support reporting more than 8 RSRP measurements per TRP can be subject to UE capability.*** |
| [6] | **Proposal 2: For UE-assisted DL AOD, support up to N>=8 measurements for reporting of RSRP measurements per TRP.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 7: For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 RSRP measurements per TRP.***   * ***Note: Multiple RSRPs corresponding to same or different Rx Beam index should be able to be reported for a given PRS resource for different timestamps.*** * ***FFS: Value for N*** |
| [8] | Proposal 4: For UE-assisted DL AoD, support Option1, up to 8 RSRP measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16). |
| [9] | ***Proposal 3: Up to N>=8 measurements in a measurement report for reporting of RSRP measurement per TRP.*** |
| [13] | **Proposal 1**: For reporting of RSRP measurements per TRP, subject to UE capability, support Option 1, i.e. up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, as in release 16. |
| [16] | ***Proposal 3:***   * A further restriction would be required so that the UE uses a reception beam to avoid worst case of the reception beam selection, even if the UE can ignore QCL type-D configuration of the PRS resources to use a fixed reception beam for DL-AoD technique.   ***Proposal 4:***   * Need discussions on how to utilize the reception beam index for the accuracy improvements of DL-AoD based positioning, such as finding UE’s location when the UE is located between the transmission beams. |
| [17] | **Proposal 5**: Support “Option 3: Up to N>8 measurements” as candidate enhancement. FFS value of N. |
| [21] | ***Proposal 2: Enhance the assistance data to proactively allow the LMF to explicitly configure DL-PRS RSRP measurements to be reported with the same Rx beam.*** |
| [22] | 1. The network can signal in the assistance data that it is interested in receiving RSRP/peak-RSRP measurement reports on more than one Rx beam. |

From the contributions, there is a majority of companies supporting the extension of the number of measurements beyond eight [3][4][6][7][9][17]. [8][13] support to keep the current limit. [16] [21][22] propose to signal to the UE to use a fixed Rx beam.

Based on the proposals from companies, the following is submitted for discussion

**Proposal 2.1**

**For UE-assisted DL AOD, support up to N>=8 measurements for reporting of RSRP measurements per TRP.**

* **FFS: value of N**
* **For the capable UE, The LMF can request that all measurements in a report correspond to the same Rx beam. The choice of Rx beam is left to the UE.**

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Prefer not to extend the current limit. We think it’s enough to support 8 measurements per TRP. Although UE can use different Rx beams to receive signals, it’s up to UE to select some of measurements that are measured with high quality. |
| CATT | Support. For UE-assisted DL-AoD, the maximum number of RSRP measurements per TRP should be increased from 8 to [16]. Whether to support reporting more than 8 RSRP measurements per TRP can be subject to UE capability. |
| OPPO | Not support  There is no justification to extend the number of RSRP measurements. |
| Fraunhofer | Support.  N =16 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Qualcomm | low priority; we are generally OK to increase the number further, even though we also dont think that there are significant gains to be had. The subbulet is not needed though. |
| SONY | Do not support or at least low priority. We are still not sure the additional gain can justify the required additional overhead by increasing the number of measurements. |
| CMCC | Support. In our view, this enhancement allows the UE to be requested and measure finer beams under a wider beam direction in an on-demand way, which benefits the positioning accuracy. |
| Xiaomi | Need further justification on the additional gain by increasing the number. |
| Samsung | Fine but we consider it as low priority. |
| Vivo | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Intel | Low priority |
| China Telecom | Support. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The companies are still split on the issue and has been so also in RAN1#104b-e. we can continue the discussion.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| LG | We support previous FL‘s Proposal 2.1. |
| CATT | Support. In our point of view, for UE-assisted DL-AoD, the maximum number of RSRP measurements per TRP should be increased from 8 to [16]. Whether to support reporting more than 8 RSRP measurements per TRP can be subject to UE capability.  The motivations of extension of number of reported RSRP measurements are shown as follows,  In Rel-16, for each TRP, the maximum number of Rx beams is 8 and the maximum number of RSRP measurements on different PRS resources is also limited to 8. With this limitation, for a UE with 8 Rx beams, only one RSRP can be reported for each PRS resource for a TRP, if RSRPs correspond to all the Rx beams are reported. In addition, according to the spec, only those RSRPs from different PRS resources measured by the same Rx beam are associated with a Rx beam index in the measurement report. So, no Rx beam index would be reported in this case. As a result, LMF could not choose those RSRPs associated with the same beam for DL-AoD calculation. |
| Qualcomm | Low priority. We prefer to focus on other topics |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| OPPO | Need further study to find the justification for increasing the number.  Regarding the PRS resource measurement, in pratical, the UE should only report a few best Tx-Rx beam pair, instead of reporting PRS resorce measurement for all the Rx beams. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| SONY | Low priority |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| ZTE | Do not support or at least low priority. |
| Intel | Low priority |
| CEWiT | Low priority. |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments before GTW#2

Given that the discussion has not been brought up in online discussion before, we could try clarifying the motivation of the proponents and the opponents of the issue during the GTW if time allows.

### Aspect #3 adjacent beam reporting (closed)

#### Summary and FL proposal

During RAN1#104b-e, the following agreement was made:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Support the following enhancements under UE capability for both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD positioning method   * Enhancing the signaling to UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and (for UE-A) report   + FFS: The detailed signaling (e.g, the boresight direction for UE-A DL-AoD, further spatial information of PRS resources, processing prioritization of PRS resources). * FFS: The following options   + Option 1: Enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent beams PRS resources that related with each other indicated by the assistance data.   + Option 2: UE can be requested to measure and report on specific PRS resources. |

The following proposals [1][2][3][4][7][8][9][11][15][17][18][20][21][22]

have been made in response to the agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1] | ***Proposal 2: Support Option 1: Enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent beams PRS resources that related with each other indicated by the assistance data.*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 2: Define PRS resource-level priority for the purpose of e.g. utilization of adjacent beams.***   * ***Note: This is also applicable to DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT positioning methods.*** |
| [3] | **Proposal 8**   * ***Support to provide the boresight direction of PRS resource to UE for UE-A DL-AoD.***   **Proposal 9**   * ***DL-AoD measurement with the adjacent beams can be requested when the requirement of latency and power consumption is tight.*** |
| [4] | ***Proposal 3: Signaling to UE for the purpose of PRS measurement and report may include either an ordered PRS resource ID list, or the boresight directions of the PRS resources.***  ***Proposal 4: Both of the following options should be supported in NR Rel-17:***   * ***Option 1: Enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent PRS resources that are related to each other indicated by the assistance data.*** * ***Option 2: UE can be requested to measure and report on specific PRS resources*** |
| [6] | **Proposal 3: For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, support the LMF to provide the assistance data where the DL PRS resources in a resource set are listed in an adjacent manner, to implicitly indicate the adjacent beam information to the UE.**  **Proposal 4: For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, support enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent beams.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 6: With regards to PRS resource Prioritization for DL-AoD measurements, support LMF providing in the assistance data support both of the following options:***   * ***Opt. 1: Boresight direction of each PRS resource (already supported for UE-B, but not for UE-A)*** * ***Opt. 2: Prioritization information (e.g. prioritization based on the ordering in the PRS resource set as was discussed during NR Rel-16).*** |
| [8] | Proposal 2: For DL-AoD positioning method, support the following assistance data and reporting:   * In the assistance data of PRS configuration, the UE is provided with configuration information that indicates which PRS resources are associated with each other in spatial domain. * In measurement report, if the UE reports RSRP of one PRS resource, the UE also reports the RSRP of PRS resources that are associated with that PRS resource. |
| [9] | ***Proposal 2: For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enable the UE to measure/report a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement/report, UE can be requested to measure and report on specific PRS resources.*** |
| [11] | **Proposal 3 : For UE-A positioning, boresight direction for DL-AoD is provided by the LMF to the UE** |
| [15] | ***Proposal 5: For DL-AoD, LMF can request UE to measure and report on specific PRS resources***   * ***FFS: by implicit rules and/or explicit signaling*** |
| [17] | **Proposal 9**: Do not support any enhancements for adjacent beam reporting (i.e., do not support option 1-2 in the FFS of the prior agreement). |
| [20] | **Proposal 2: Support providing the UE with AD for the purpose of PRS measurements and reports by:**   * **providing information on the associated PRS resources within one or more subsets, or** * **indicating to the UE which PRS resources belong to a subset**   **For DL-AoD, a PRS resource subset may include to a group of adjacent beams.** |
| [21] | ***Proposal 1: Extend current framework of providing boresight information in the UE-based method to the UE-assisted DL-AoD method.*** |
| [18] | *Proposal 4: Adjacent PRS resources can be predefined by resource index.* |
| [22] | Proposal 8 When the beam directions vary in only one dimension, use the DL-PRS Resource IDs as beam structure order numbers by assigning them in a way such that they increase or decrease by one for each beam along the one spatial dimension.  Proposal 9 The ordering of the beams in two dimensions is supplied to the UE as assistance information in one of the following formats: (1) For each DL PRS Resource, one list of neighbors in dimension 1 and another list of neighbors in dimension 2. (2) One adjacency matrix for neighbors in dimension 1 and another adjacency matrix for neighbors in dimension 2. (3) For each DL PRS Resource, one list of general neighbors. (4) One adjacency matrix for general neighbors.  If the beam structure information is specified for each dimension separately (either in 1D or 2D), we propose the following selection procedure in two steps (for a 1D beam structure) or three steps (for a 2D beam structure):   1. 1. Select the DL PRS Resource corresponding to the highest measured RSRP/ first peak-RSRP. We call this the strongest resource. 2. Select the DL PRS Resource with the highest RSRP/first peak-RSRP measurement among the DL PRS Resources which are neighbors to the strongest resource in dimension 1. We call this the strongest dimension 1 neighbor resource. 3. If applicable, select the DL PRS Resource with the highest RSRP/first peak-RSRP measurement among the DL PRS Resources which are neighbors to the strongest resource in dimension 2. We call this the strongest dimension 2 neighbor resource.   In 2D, if the beam structure is given as general neighbors, we propose the following selection procedure:   1. 1. Select the DL PRS Resource with the highest RSRP/first peak-RSRP measurement. We call this the strongest resource. 2. Select the DL PRS Resource with the highest RSRP/first peak-RSRP measurement among the DL PRS Resources which are general neighbors of the strongest resource. We call this the first neighbor resource.  3. Select the DL PRS Resource with the highest RSRP/first peak-RSRP measurement among the DL PRS Resources which are general neighbors of both the strongest resource and the first neighbor resource. We call this the second neighbor resource. |

From the proposals in the contributions, the following can be summarized regarding the signalling of adjacent beams:

* 7 companies [1][3][6][8][20][18][22] support the signalling of a list of adjacent beams
* 3 companies [2][4][7] prefer signalling a priority for the purpose of identifying adjacent beams
* 3 companies [4][9][15] support the request of specific PRS resources to be measured and reported
* 3 companies [7][11][21] support the signalling of the boresight direction for each resource also for UE-A

Since there does not seem to be a clear preference, it is proposed to continue the discussion based on the last agreement, and hopefully select one option to identify the adjacent beams. for option 1 below, it is the feature lead intention that it includes the solution related to indicating to the UE the resources to measure as well as signalling of a list of adjacent beams, and the selection of the solution is FFS. Regarding the FFS on reporting with option 1 and 2 captured in RAN1#104b-e, it is proposed to postpone the discussion to allow the design of the assistance data to be more stable.

Proposal 3.1:

For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE:

* Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the AD
* Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority for the UE measurements.
* Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data.
* FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure
* FFS: How to define adjacent beams

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | We support Option 3. Boresight direction of each PRS resource will assist the UE to determine an optimum RX beam for UE-assisted DL-AoD. |
| ZTE | Not support. We are open to further discuss Option 3 in Proposal 5.1. This is related to how UE can understand expected AOD/ZOD for UE-A based DL-AOD. |
| CATT | Support both Option 2 and Option 3. |
| OPPO | Support both option 1. And do not support Option 2 and 3.  Re option 2: it does not make sense to ask the LMF give priority of PRS for the UE to measure because the LMF does not know which beam is „good“ for one particular UE and which is not. Only the UE knows which beam/PRS is good after UE measure them.  Re Option 3: the boresight direction of each PRS resource is not feasible for UE becuase that direction is from the perspective of TRP. For UE-assisted method, the UE does not know the location of TRP. |
| Fraunhofer | Proposal 3.1 does not capture our views:  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, select one or more of the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE:  …   * Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indication subset of adjacent PRS resources of for the UE measurements.   Option1 works only in unicast and since also the UE posiitoning is changing and the indicated AD may not be always applicable at time of measurement.  On Option3:  introduces unnecessary complexity on the UE-A mode. Which will generate issues with overlapping beams and sidelobe information. For UE-A, the UE should be configured with the minimum set of configuration: the information shall cover overlapping beams as well: The differential RSRP between the wide and narrow beam is relevant for a AoD determination. If the UE has the whole information then it can simply compute the AoD as in UE-B!  To clarify option4: The LMF can sort the resources according to priority such as {1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9}. In addition, the LMF provide the UE with information that {1,3,4,5,6} belong to a subset and {2,7,8,9} belong to subset. The subset indication allows the UE to identify the right subset (for exampling by measuring PRS\_1 and PRS\_2).  cid:image003.png@01D74CC7.E98C7C20  We support options 2 and 4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Currently we support Option 2 if we define PRS resource level priority. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support FL’s proposal and clarify that we support Option 2 and 3. Option 1 can be supported if the LMF implicitly/explicitly configure specific PRS resources in the AD as group to be measured (whether they are adjacent or not) using same Rx beam. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Option 3 now. We are open to studying other options further. |
| Qualcomm | Since we are discussing the UE to have expected-DL-AoD also, we have preference for Option 3: Minimal spec impact, and allows the UE to do the PRS resource prioriritization by knowing what is the expetedDL-AoD and what are the boresight directions of each PRS resource  We could be OK to support both Option 2 in addition to Option 3 (e.g. sending the boresight directiosn may be an overhead, and some LMF may prefer to just rank the PRS resources within a set, rather than providing the additional information). |
| SONY | We prefer support Option 1. |
| CMCC | In our view, since the gNB is specified to report the azimuth and elevation information of the DL PRS beams, the LMF should be able to identify the adjacent beams. However, the thing is that the LMF may not know the “strongest beam” of a UE, therefore, it would be impossible to explicitly indicate the adjacent information to a specific beam to a UE in the assistance data. One potential way is to implicitly list the DL PRS resources in a resource set in an adjacent manner.  As responded by FL that Option 1 captures the intention of providing the AD in a list of adjacent beams, it seems to align with our preference. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to indicate adjacent PRS resource by resource index implicitly. |
| Samsung | If LMF has the rough location information of UE, and also the beam angle information from TRP, it is possible for LMF to do this indicaiton. Otherwise, it will be quite chanallenging for the actual usage of this function.  The previous agreement includes the possiblity that UE could report the adject beam based on it’s more measurment of the strongest beam, which may not be known by LMF at the time. LMF could just request UE to report the adjact beam of the strongest beam, but LMF doesn’t need to pre-know what the beams will be.  It seems the structure of previous agreements seems more suitable to proceed. With current proposal, we hesitate to pick the solution now. |
| vivo | Support Option 3 and we have similar view with QC  To Fraunhofer, the intention of option 3 is to give UE some opportunities so that UE can reduce the number of PRS measurement and reporting and choose more suitable PRS to measure. We believe UE selection has better flexibility and adaptability than LMF configuration especially for UE with mobility.  To oppo, we would like to note the direction is a GCS angle and has been transmitted in UE-B. 9.2.58 NR-PRS Beam Information This IE contains spatial direction information of the DL-PRS Resources.   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | IE/Group Name | Presence | Range | IE type and reference | Semantics description | | **NR-PRS Beam Information** |  | *1 .. <* *maxPRS-ResourceSets >* |  |  | | >PRS Resource Set ID | M |  | INTEGER (0..7) | The resource set in which the resources are associated with the angle. | | **>PRS Angle Item** |  | *1..<* *maxPRS-ResourcesPerSet >* |  |  | | >>NR PRS Azimuth | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  | | >>NR PRS Azimuth fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles | | >>NR PRS Elevation | O |  | INTEGER (0..180) |  | | >>NR PRS Elevation fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles | | **LCS to GCS Translation** |  | *0 .. <maxnolcs-gcs-translation>* |  | If absent, the azimuth and elevation are provided in GCS. | | >Alpha | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  | | >Alpha-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles | | >Beta | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  | | >Beta-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles | | >Gamma | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  | | >Gamma-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |   To ZTE, we would like to noted the information also is helpful for positioning even though without expected AOD. And we also okay to support expected AOD. So, we don’t want to get into the chicken-egg problem here. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To vivo:  The argument „the intention of option 3 is to give UE some opportunities so that UE can reduce the number of PRS measurement and reporting and choose more suitable PRS to measure.” Is NOT correct in our understanding.  In order to get the beam-aligned PRS (or the highest PRS-RSRP), UE needs to measure ALL PRS first, which means that   * UE PRS resource capability should support such amount of PRS resources to process * UE PRS measurement requirement (defined by RAN4) on ALL PRS to measure should be met, including the core requirement and performance requirement (given the side condition met)   There is no way that UE can opportunistically reduce the PRS measurement effort because UE may fail the RAN4 test, unless a new PRS measurement requirement is defined, which seem unlikely.  In summary, if you want to reduce the PRS measurement effort, either UE report a small number of PRS resource processing capability or network configures a reduced version of assistance data. I would interpret Option 3 as the way to optimize the report by selecting “adjacent beams” if provided with the boresight information, but measurement effort should not be the case. |
| ZTE | To Huawei,  We think Option 3 can help UE to interpret expected AOD/ZOD for UE-A based DL-AOD. In addition, UE may also prioritize the measurement and report with respect to the DL PRS resources within the expected AOD/ZOD.  Regarding whether new requirement can be defined, we can discuss latter since this may be related to positioning latency reduction. |
| vivo | To Huawei  Thanks for your comment.  Regarding whether option 3 can help UE reduce the PRS measurement effort, yes, it is up to UE capability and PRS measurement requirement. But at least, it is helpful for UE reporting.  In addition, Option 3 is only a minimal enhancement of the assistance information which has been supported in UE-B.  So, we hope it can be supported. |
| Apple | We support option 3 (but in general, option 1/2 and Option 3 are talking about separate enhancements) |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

Since this is the first meeting where we discuss the options for adjacent beams in details, it would be good to identify the options and downselect in a future meeting. It is proposed to continue discussing further to see if the proposal can be agreed, or if the options need to be changed or extended with more options.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | OK to down-select in next meeting. Prefer to revise the main bullet to align the agreement we made in last meeting,  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and report: |
| vivo | Since there are no additional objection for option3 after our reply, we propose option 3 can be supported first and FFS for other options in future meeting.  So, the following proposal is suggested   * LMF to UE signaling of the boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data is supported for UE-A DL-AOD positioning method |
| InterDigital | We are ok to downselect in the next meeting. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with listing options and downselecting later. |
| LG | Agree with FL’s comment. |
| CATT | Support to down-select in next meeting. |
| FL | Based on the received comments, the proposal is updated as follow (accounting for Fraunhofer added option).  To ZTE: I think the proposed reworded is a bit too generic, since assistance data is always for the purpose of measuring and reporting. Perhaps you can clarify your intention further.  Proposal 3.1b:  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE:   * Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the AD * Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority for the UE measurements. * Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data. * Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indication subset of adjacent PRS resources of for the UE measurements. * FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure * FFS: How to define adjacent beams |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 3.1b with the updated Option 4 as follows:  Proposal 3.1b:  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE:   * Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the AD * Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority for the UE measurements. * Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data. * Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of adjacent PRS resources for the UE measurements. * FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure * FFS: How to define adjacent beams |
| OPPO | We are fine with the prosaol 3.1b to do more stufy and do down-selection in next meeting. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to downselect in the next meeting. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support FL’s recommendation to downselect options at next meeting. |
| Sony | Support the FL’s revised version |
| Nokia/NSB | Generally okay for the FL revised version but suggest also to add the option of doing nothing (i.e., support no options). In our understanding the options are quite different and have some different understanding among companies. |
| ZTE | We’re find with the FL’s revised version. We can make decision in next meeting. |
| Qualcomm | All 4 options are not just identifyign „adjacent beams“; they could be used to indicate preferred-beams / high-priority-beams to be measured and reported. We prefer the propsoal to be written accordingly. Signaling-wise the solutions chould be general enough, and not restrict to the „adjacent beams“. Either way, what we really want to do with this signaling? To inform the UE which resources to be measured & reported first (or with high priority) no?  Proposal 3.1b:  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate high priority beams in the signalling to the UE:   * Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify high priority beams in the AD * Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority for the UE measurements. * Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data. * Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of adjacent PRS resources for the UE measurements. * FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure * FFS: How to define adjacent beams |
| CEWiT | Support the FL’s proposal 3.1b. We are okay with down selection in next meeting also. |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments before GTW#2

The proposal was commented and revised by CATT and later by Qualcomm. Regarding the update by qualcomm, it is the FL’s opinion that there could be different understanding of the meaning of “priority”. Option 2 clearly proposes to use the order of the AD to signal what PRS beams should be measured and reported in priority. Option 1 is more about providing the structure of the adjacent beams, so the UE will take the decision to select the “best beam” and then identify the neighbouring beams to subsequently measure and report. Therefore, the wording for CATT is kept as a basis for the GTW discussion. Of course, further change can be discussed during the online session or later.

Proposal 3.1b:

For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE:

* Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the AD
* Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority for the UE measurements.
* Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data.
* Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of adjacent PRS resources for the UE measurements.
* FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure
* FFS: How to define adjacent beams

The following agreement was struck during GTW#2:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, select one or more of the following to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting:   * Option 1: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD) * Option 2: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with an order of priority of PRS resources. * Option 3: the LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data. * Option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of PRS resources. * FFS: Detailed signaling and procedure * FFS: How to define adjacent beams |

### Aspect #4 Support of additional gnodeB beam information

#### Summary and FL proposal

The following agreement was reached during RAN1#104b:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD:   * Support gNB providing the beam/antenna information to the LMF.   + The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD   + FFS: the details of contents of the beam/antenna information   + FFS: the details of how to provide the beam/antenna information.   + Note: The antenna information is related to reducing the overhead of beam information * Send an LS to RAN2/RAN3 regarding the option of angle report from gNB to LMF for UE-A DL-AoD requesting them to consider this option in Rel-17. |

The following proposal were made in RAN1#104b-e contributions: [2][3][4][5][6][7][8][11][12][14][17][20][22]:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [2] | ***Proposal 5: For reporting gNB beam/antenna information, support the following elements***   * ***: The number of antenna elements along the horizontal axis*** * ***: The number of antenna elements along the vertical axis*** * ***: The antenna element spacing along the horizontal axis*** * ***: The antenna element spacing along the vertical axis*** |
| [3] | **Proposal 1:**   * ***For DFT beams, only antenna configuration information needs to be provided, and the antenna configuration information includes at least the following information:***   + - * ***[,], is the number of horizontal antennas, is the number of the vertical antenna;***       * ***Antenna spacing: dH, dV***       * ***(optionally)Antenna pattern, such as omnidirectional or directional***   **Proposal 2**   * ***For Non-DFT beams, select one of the following options as the beam/antenna information:***   + - * ***Option 1: Providing mapping table for each PRS resource***       * ***Option 2: Providing the typical parameter of beams (such as intersection point of multiple beams , beamwidth) for each PRS resource***       * ***Option 3: The parameters of the approximate function which is used to represent the beam response of the PRS resource.***   **Proposal 3**   * ***For Non-DFT beams, support providing the typical parameter of beams (such as intersection point of multiple beams , beamwidth) for UE-A and UE-B DL-AoD. Support providing mapping table only for UE-A DL-AoD.*** |
| [4] | ***Proposal 7: NR Rel-17 should support a gNB to report the transmission characteristics of a TRP beam to LMF or UE, including:***   * ***The structure and parameters of the transmitting antenna array, such as antenna element distribution, element shape and size, element spacing, etc.*** * ***Analog beamforming vector.*** * ***Digital beamforming vector, such as codebook used for precoding.***   ***Proposal 8: In order to improve the accuracy of the beam response established by LMF or UE, it is necessary to consider the amplitude and phase inconsistency parameters in the TX channel of each antenna element of the TRP transmitter. gNB should report the following parameters to LMF or UE:***   * ***Timing delays and gains for all RF channels, or differences of timing delays and gains between all RF channels and specific RF channels*** * ***Timing delays from all antenna elements, or time delay differences between all antenna elements and a specific antenna element)*** * ***Gain of all antenna elements, or gain difference between all antenna elements and a specific antenna element.*** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Study further at least the following options for beam/antenna information delivery:***   * ***Quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***   + ***Opt. 1: Provide the angle(s) that a relative RSRP level is valid, from a pre-defined/configured RSRP-level set.***      - ***E.g., Angles for the [-1, -3, -5, -6, -9, -10, -12, -15, -20] dB levels***   + ***Opt. 2: Provide the relative RSRP for multiple tuples of (AoD, ZoD)*** * ***Consider Delta Signaling to reduce further the overhead***   ***Proposal 2: Introduce more than one levels of quantization for the beam information to trade-off beam representation accuracy and overhead.***  ***Proposal 3: Reuse the associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information and reduce the overhead of sending repetitive beam patterns across TRPs.*** |
| [8] | ***Proposal 1: The TRP can provide the following information to the LMF:***   * ***The antenna modeling of the TRP Tx antennas, e.g., including the number antennas, antenna spacing.*** * ***The precoder applied on each DL PRS resource.*** |
| [11] | **Proposal 1: Beam/antenna information can be provided via LPP ProvideAssistanceData** |
| [12] | **Proposal 1**   * + **Support enhancement for the DL-AOD estimation in Rel-17 by utilizing the gNB/TRP beam/antenna information, including the following:**     - **gNB/TRP beam information:**       * **Phase value per antenna element / port**       * **Amplitude value per antenna element (optionally)**     - **gNB/TRP antenna array information:**       * **Antenna array orientation in space with respect to the global coordinate system (when information is provided to UE)**       * **Antenna pattern of the single antenna element (optionally)**       * **For the uniform rectangular planar array, provide the total number of elements over horizontal and vertical dimension as well as the antenna spacing per dimension**       * **In general case, provide the coordinates of the antenna array elements in the local coordinate system** |
| [14] | **Proposal 4: For UE-A DL-AoD positioning: support gNB to report the TX antenna configuration (e.g., antenna codebook configuration, number of elements, and antenna pattern)and TX beam configuration (e.g. beamwidth and gain). For UE-B DL-AoD positioning: gNB sends this information to the UE.** |
| [17] | **Proposal 6**: Any additional beam/antenna information reported by the TRP should be optional.  **Proposal 7**: Support TRPs to optionally report multiple directions per DL PRS resource with each direction being associated with a power value relative to the boresight power for that resource.  **Proposal 8**: Include additional assistance data for UE based positioning, including TRP polarization and geometry. |
| [20] | **Proposal 3: Support the TRP providing beam information to the LMF; the information includes:**   * **a gain level for the reported main lobe and a the side lobe levels** * **a relative gain level a gain level for the reported main lobe and a the side lobe levels** |

Based on the proposals, the following ca be summarized:

* 6 companies [2][3][4][8][12][14] propose to have the gnodeB report the antenna configuration including the number of elements (vertical and horizontal), antenna spacing, and precoder information
* 4 companies [3][7][17][20] propose to use a gain/angle table for each PRS resource. In [5] it is proposed to limit the table to the span of the uncertainty window.
  + In [7], overhead reduction is discussed and it is proposed to link PRSs with equal beam gain tables via their PRS ID.
* In [4], the issue of timing delay is raised. In the FL view, this issue is more suitable to AI 8.5.1
* In [17], it is proposed to specifically include additional assistance data for UE-B, including TRP polarization and geometry.

Since there are two approaches proposed for the content of the beam/antenna information, it is proposed to discuss which of them should be selected, or if both solution should be specified.

**Proposal 4.1**

**For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, select one or more of the following:**

* **Option 1: the gNB reports the antenna configuration including** 
  + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal),**
  + **antenna spacing dh and dv**
  + **precoder information** 
    - **for DFT-based beams, precoder information is reported with PMI**
    - **FFS for non-DFT beams**
* **Option 2: the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources.**
  + **FFS: representation of the mapping (e.g. parametric function approximating the beam response, or gain/angle table)**

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Agree with this proposal. Option 1 is more appropriate for uniform distributed antenna array. While Option 2 is useful for the case that gNB/TRP has beam pattern information at hand. |
| CATT | Support Option 1. |
| OPPO | Option 1 |
| Fraunhofer | Support Option 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Option 1, we do not think the precoder information is needed. We already have boresight direction information in Rel-16, and the precoder can be determined by the boresight direction information along with the antenna configuration. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support option 2. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to support both and not downselect. The tradeoff is clear and each option has the pros/cons.   * Option 1 is optimized for DFT-based implemetnations and can reduce a lot the overhead compared to Option 2. * However, if the beams are not DFT-based, or the antennas are not uniformly spaced, there is limitations with Option 1. Option 2 can handle those scenarios with the cost of higher overhead.   Instead of debating which one is better, we believe it is useful to reach a common understanding that both are useful for difference scenarios, and can just be up to each gNB/deployment option what to use. So, maybe we could have Option 1 as the DFT-based parametrization (without adding FFS for non-DFT beams), and then use Option 2 as the solution that addreses the non-DFT beam option.  A comment/question for Option 1:   * Wouldnt the Antenna pattern of a single antenna element be needed to be optionally provided if the antenna elements are not omni?   With regards to the comment from HW, we would like to check it further, so prefer to include that clarification in the proposal.  Based on the above, we make the following alternative proposal:  **For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, ~~select one or more of the following~~ support both the following options:**   * **Option 1: the gNB reports the Uniform Planal Array (UPA) antenna configuration including**    + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**   + **antenna spacing dh and dv**   + **For DFT-based beams, precoder information for each PRS resource**     - **Check whether the already reported boresight directions are sufficient, or whether more information is needed**     - **~~FFS for non-DFT beams~~**   + **Antenna Element pattern Information**     - **FFS: Details** * **Option 2: the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources.**   + **FFS: representation of the mapping (e.g. parametric function approximating the beam response, or gain/angle table)**   **In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD** |
| SONY | We support Option 1. |
| Samsung | Not sure if option1 is enough, if LMF needs to which angle/direction a given beam actually pointing to from a TRP, it seems LMF also needs to know the facing angle of the antental igna (e.g., the down-tilt angale, the facing direction of the igna), from our understanding the current parameters from option1 are only giving a beam direction based on the LCS of the igna. |
| Vivo | For option1, we have similar view with Huawei, and for option 2, we think our views for beamwidth information to reduce overhead is not captured.  To QC, for option1, we wonder why limiting to UPA antenna configuration.  So we propose  **For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, ~~select one or more of the following~~ support both the following options:**   * **Option 1: the gNB reports the [Uniform Planal Array (UPA)] antenna configuration including**    + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**   + **antenna spacing dh and dv**   + **For DFT-based beams, FFS:precoder information for each PRS resource**     - **Check whether the already reported boresight directions are sufficient, or whether more information is needed**     - **~~FFS for non-DFT beams~~**   + **Antenna Element pattern Information**     - **FFS: Details** * **Option 2: the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources.**   + **FFS: representation of the mapping (e.g. parametric function approximating the beam response, or gain/angle table, beamwidth, intersection point of multiple beams )**   **In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD** |
| LG | We slightly support option 1. |
| Intel | Support Option 1.  We are OK to add the antenna element pattern information (as optional).  We would like to keep the FFS for non-DFT based precoders as in the original FL’s proposal. |
| China Telecom | Option 1 |
| InterDigital | We also agree with Samsung that angle related information about the panel such as downtilt angle should be included in Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to keep both options to be studied then, together with the FFS that were pointed out by the companies.  To SS/Interdigital: Each PRS resource already has location and boreisght direction. Are you saying that these information is not enough? Either way, it doenst hurt to add an additional FFS to verify whether the Option 1 will work.  **For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, select one or more of the following:**   * **Option 1: the gNB reports the [Uniform Planal Array (UPA)] antenna configuration including at least the following parameter:**   + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**   + **antenna spacing dh and dv**   + **For DFT-based beams, FFS:precoder information for each PRS resource**     - **Check whether the already reported boresight directions are sufficient, or whether more information is needed**     - **FFS for non-DFT beams**   + **Antenna Element pattern Information**     - **FFS: Details**   + **FFS: If additional information about panel/orientation is needed** * **Option 2: the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources.**   + **FFS: representation of the mapping (e.g. parametric function approximating the beam response, or gain/angle table, beamwidth, intersection point of multiple beams )**   **In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD** |
| Ericsson | We support option 2. The information in option 1 will disclose implementation of the gNB to an external node, and will also limit the choices for the implementation to the cases covered by the AD. Moreover, we see that the option 2 will have significantly lower overhead. |
| ZTE | OK with the latest revision from QC. We can decide in next meeting on whether one or more options can be supported. |
| CEWiT | We agree with Qualcomm’s view. We support to keep both the options. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments

The latest updated proposal from the comment by Qualcomm can be used as a basis for discussion in the GTW session:

**Proposal 4.1b**

**For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, select one or more of the following:**

* **Option 1: the gNB reports the [Uniform Planal Array (UPA)] antenna configuration including at least the following parameter:**
  + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**
  + **antenna spacing dh and dv**
  + **For DFT-based beams, FFS: precoder information for each PRS resource**
    - **Check whether the already reported boresight directions are sufficient, or whether more information is needed**
    - **FFS for non-DFT beams**
  + **Antenna Element pattern Information**
    - **FFS: Details**
  + **FFS: If additional information about panel/orientation is needed**
* **Option 2: the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources.**
  + **FFS: representation of the mapping (e.g. parametric function approximating the beam response, or gain/angle table, beamwidth, intersection point of multiple beams )**
* In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD

Since there was no time to discuss during GTW#2, it is proposed to continue the discussion.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Support in principle  But propose to move“for DFT-based beams” behind FFS   * + **~~For DFT-based beams,~~ FFS: For DFT-based beams, precoder information for each PRS resource** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle. For the FFS in option 2 we would prefer to remove the (e.g.,). We don’t feel that it brings value unless we are going to list out specific options. We will anyways discuss the respresentation of the mapping. |
| CATT | Support Option 1. And we are also fine to keep both options in this meeting and down-select in next meeting. |
| InterDigital | Regarding the last sentence, for UE-based, we just want to clarify if gNB beam/antenna information are provided by the LMF to the UE. If so we would like to suggest the following change.   * In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE by the LMF for UE-based DL-AoD   In addition we would like to purpose the following note. Is the intention to select either Option 1 or 2 or both, and apply the selected option to the information transferred from the LMF to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD? For example, if we agree to transfer the information in Option 1 from gNB to LMF, the information in Option 2 is not transferred from the LMF to the UE?  Note : The information, transferred from the gNB to the LMF, in the selected option(s) above can be provided to the UE by the LMF. |
| Qualcomm | We consider this the highest priority item in this subagenda. We need to agree to the options so that there is time to perform evaluations of both options and make further decisions in the remaining items of the WI.  We are OK witht he additional note by IDC, since this is how it would be, LMF provides assistance data to the UE, not a gNB. |
| ZTE | We’re fine to keep both options in this meeting. The note from IDC seems reasonable.  One small typo should be corrected. It should be **[Uniform** **Planar Array (UPA)].** |
| Intel | We agree with QC, that this is high priority issue.  We support Option 1, but can agree on both options. |

### Aspect #5 AoD uncertainty window

#### Summary and FL proposal

In RAN1#104b-e, the following agreement was reached:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For the purpose of both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD, and with regards to the support of AOD measurements with an expected uncertainty window, study further whether to support at most one of the following options:   + Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE     - Single Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]   + Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE     - Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]   + Option 3: Indication of expected AoD/ZoD or AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty is not introduced.   + FFS: details of signaling * FFS: Applicability of this agreement to other Positioning methods |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [2] | ***Proposal 1: Support indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE***   * ***Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]*** * ***Note: This is also applicable to DL-TDOA and Multi-RTT methods.*** |
| [3] | **Proposal 4**   * ***The validity of the expected DL-AoD may need to be considered since the expected DL-AoD will easily be changed with the UE movement.***   **Proposal 5**   * ***Supporting to provide the boresight angle of the PRS resource first for selecting PRS resources by expected DL-AoD/ZoD.***   **Proposal 6**   * ***A UE capability for whether UE can identify the GCS angle of Rx Beam needed to be introduced if Rx beam selection within the expected window is agreed.*** * ***UE behavior and selection criterion for Rx Beam selection needed to be considered if Rx beam selection within the expected window is agreed.***   **Proposal 7:**   * ***Expected DL-AoD is provided to the UE for each TRP.*** |
| [4] | ***Proposal 5: Either the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value (option 1) or the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value (option 2) could be provided to UE for each TRP.***  ***Proposal 6: SSB index, DL PRS resource index, or SRS resource index can be used to define the reference direction for the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value*** ***or DL-AoA/ZoA value.*** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 3:*** *For the purpose of both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD, and with regards to the support of AOD measurements with an expected uncertainty window, which includes,*   * *Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE* * *DL PRS resources transmitted from a single antenna reference point (or geographical coordinate) are associated with a single value of Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value).* |
| [7] | ***Proposal 5: With regards to expected Angle of Departure, support Option 1 with the following signaling details:***   * ***Expected azimuth angle of departure as (φAOD – ΔφAOD/2, φAOD + ΔφAOD/2)***   + ***φAOD – expected azimuth angle of departure, ΔφAOD – uncertainty range for expected azimuth angle of departure*** * ***Expected zenith angle of departure as (θAOD – ΔθAOD/2, θAOD + ΔθAOD/2)***   + ***θAOD – expected zenith angle of departure ΔθAOD – uncertainty range for expected zenith angle of departure*** |
| [8] | Proposal 3: On uncertainty window for DL-AoD, support Option 3, i..e, not introduce expected AoD/ZoD or AoA/ZoA and uncertainty |
| [11] | **Proposal 2 : With regards to expected uncertainty window for AoD, support Option 1 “Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE** |
| [12] | **Proposal 4**   * **For the purpose of UE-A and UE-B DL-AOD positioning solution support indication of the expected DL-AOD/ZOD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AOD/ZOD value) range(s) by LMF to the UE for each TRP, if DL-AOD reporting from the UE to LMF is supported**   **Proposal 5**   * **For the purpose of UE-A and UE-B DL-AOD positioning solution support indication of the expected DL-AOA/ZOA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AOA/ZOA value) range(s) by LMF to the UE for each TRP, if UE antenna orientation in space is known/calibrated**   + **Note: an example of such a UE can be a reference UE with known coordinates and antenna orientation in space** |
| [13] | **Proposal 3**: For DL-AoD technique, support DL-AoD/ZoD assistance information (expected and uncertainty window), signaled from LMF to the UE for each TRP measurement. |
| [15] | ***Proposal 6: For the purpose of both UE based and UE assisted DL-AoD, the LMF can provide UE the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) ranges if these can be accurately achieved.*** |
| [16] | ***Proposal 1:***   * For indication of expected uncertainty window to enhance DL-AoD, the configuration of both expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (option 2) is supported.   ***Proposal 2:***   * For UE to judge whether configured expected uncertainty window with is useful or not, pre-calculated location of UE needs to be additionally provided for the UE-based positioning measurement. |
| [17] | **Proposal 12**: Support Option 2 – Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE.  **Proposal 13**: For UE-based mode, support option 1: indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE.  **Proposal 14**: Support of indication of expected AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to gNBs/TRPs in on-demand PRS framework.  Proposal 15: Study angle difference measurements for AoA of DL PRS resources in Rel-17. |
| [18] | *Proposal 6: Slightly prefer Option 1 for LoS path.*   * *Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE.* |
| [19] | **Proposal 1:**   * **We support one of the following options**   + **Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE**   + **Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE** |
| [22] | Proposal 12 LMF can optionally signal to the UE an indication that consist of a list of IDs of DL PRS Resources associated to beams that are within a DL-AOD uncertainty region. |

The companies’ proposals are based on the study agreement from RAN1#104b-e. The options are supported as follow:

* + Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty
    - Supported by 10 companies [3][4] [5][7][11][12][13][15][17][18]
  + Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty
    - Supported by 4 companies [2] [4][16][17]
  + Option 3: Indication of expected AoD/ZoD or AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty is not introduced.
    - Supported by 1 company [8]

In [2], it is also proposed to have the AoA window ignaled for all DL and DL+UL methods

In [3] it is proposed to introduce a capability for the UE RX beam identification based on the ignaled window.[22] propose to instead signal a list of PRS resources within the uncertainty region.

Since both options have a significant amount of support, it is proposed to discuss supporting both options, and discuss whether to support them for other methods than DL AoD

**Proposal 5.1**

**For the purpose of both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD, and with regards to the support of AOD measurements with an expected uncertainty window, support the following options:**

* **Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE**
  + - **Single Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]**
* **Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE** 
  + - **Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]**
* **FFS: details of signaling**
* **FFS: Applicability to other Positioning methods**

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | For progress, we are ok with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Our understanding is that only option would be supported. So the main bullet should be “support one of the following options”.  Option 1 defines the expected uncertainty angle from TRP perspective, while Option 2 is from UE perspective. In our view, the expected uncertainty angle is used for UE to decide which reference signals that UE has to measure. As we know, for UE-based DL-AOD, the boresight direction of reference signal is defined from TRP perspective. This should be reused for the expected uncertainty angle window, so UE doesn‘t have to do coordinate transformation.  In addition, we propose to revise the sub-bullet for both options since different antenna reference points within the same TRP may have different geographical coordinates.   * + - **Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each antenna reference point.** |
| CATT | Either the option 1 or the option 2 is fine for us, but not both of them. The expected DL-AoD/ZoD value (option 1) is defined from gNB perspective, and the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value (option 2) is from the UE perspective. In the LOS scenario, these two options are equivalent. Therefore, either option could be supported. |
| OPPO | As explained in our tdoc, we think either Option 1 or Option 2 are not well justified. However, for progress, we can be ok with Option 1 if Option 1 is majority view. And we do not support Option 2.  Re Option 2: we do not think it is valid. The AoA and ZoA is from the perspective of UE. It is not possible/feasible for the LMF to know the expected AoA or ZoA of one UE. |
| Fraunhofer | Support Options 1 and 2.  In our understanding the FFS on applicability applies for UL as well: to reduce the SRS beam sweeping range! |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Reply to OPPO:  It is feasible if DL-AoA/ZoA is expressed in the GCS. Of course LMF is not aware of the AoA/ZoA in LCS. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support Option 1 |
| SONY | We support FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal and prefer Option 1. Option 1 and Option 2 are equivalent in the scenario of LoS path, but not in the scenarip of NloS path. And from the perspective of TRP, Option 1 is feasible. |
| Samsung | Option 1 is prefered. |
| Vivo | Support Option 1, and we are not okay to support both option.  We propose to remove the bracket of [TRP],and ARP is not okay for us.  Firstly, introducing ARP may be beneficial for high accuracy positioning since the antenna spacing is 10cm level. But for expected AoD, the benefit of introducing expected AoD per ARP is difficult to understand since it is a coarse estimation and with a search window.  Secondly,in Rel-16, expected RSTD is provided to the UE for each TRP. And we don’t see the reason letting expected AoD provided per ARP which is different with expected RSTD.  Lastly, it is noted there is no parameter is related to ARP in NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData. That is ARP only used in UE-B assistance data. The architecture of NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData may need to be revised if we support providing expected AoD for each ARP.  So we prefer to remove the bracket of [TRP]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Just would like to reply to the comments regarding DL-AoD and DL-AoA being not the same for NLOS path:  It depends on how DL-AoD is defined for the reflecting path. If it is defined between the reflector and the UE, it is the same as DL-AoA; Otherwise, it makes no use for the UE if it describes the AoD between TRP and the reflector. |
| LG | We generally fine with supporting either the option 1 or the option 2. However, for both of them, even though UE receives above information related with an expected uncertainty window, UE cannot make sure whether the information is valid or not at the current time. So, we think that pre-calculated location of UE needs to be additionally provided for the UE to check the validity. |
| ZTE | To vivo,  Rel-17 try to meet sub-meter level accuracy, why do we need to follow the mechanism for expected RSTD defined in Rel-16 that has loose accuracy requirement. Different antenna reference points within the same TRP may have different geographical coordinates. Even the geographical coordinates may be very close, which can still improve positioning accuracy to meet Rel-17 targets.  To Huawei,  We assume that the reference point (or reflector as mentioned by Huawei) should be TRP. As we agreed, one [TRP] may only be associated with a single uncertainty window, which means all DL PRS resources share the same uncertainty window. If the uncertainty window is only for a NLOS path, which may only be useful for one DL PRS resource that include this NLOS path. Other DL PRS resources associated with this [TRP] has no information on how to use it. |
| Intel | Support Option 2 for Ues with known antenna orientation in space. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To ZTE  In our view, NLOS path is not the major use case here to our understanding. However, even if we deal with NLOS path, it is still possible to be associated with multiple PRS resources. See the figure below, which can be quite similar to the LOS path. Of course, to deal with the NLOS case, LMF needs to be aware of the path propagation condition.  BS  UE  Expected DL-AOD  Expected DL-AOA |
| ZTE | To Huawei,  We think the major use case for expected DL-AOD is to indicate the uncertainty of LOS direction although expected DL-AOD can also be applied to NLOS use case. As you said, NLOS use case may need prior channel information(i.e. coordinate of reflector and yellow path[NLOS] in your figure), which is quite limited. In our understanding, the expected DL-AOD can help UE to find the best PRS resource whose transmitted beam is around the expected DL-AOD (i.e. the PRS resource that is transmitted around the red path[LOS] in your figure.) |
| Apple | We support Option 1 |
| Ericsson | We don’t really see how the UE will use the expected AoD/AoA. In our view, I would be better for the network to signal what specific PRS are suitable to be measured. |
| Vivo 2 | Since the boresight angle will be discussed in future meeting, we have some concerns if the proposal is supported first. For example, is there any benefit(s) of introducing the expected AoD for UE-A if the UE does not know the angle of the PRS? Is the benefit is clear for UE-B since the UE may have the more accurate and real-time location results if the information only used in UE-B?  In addition, we concern the previous positioning result (as prior information) for determining ‘expected DL-AoD’ is accurate and timely enough considering the UE mobility.  Besides, if the ‘expected DL-AoD’ is determined by CID positioning, we’re also not clear the CID is different or not in our evaluation scenarios( IIOT/indoor). If not, is there any benefit(s) of introducing this information? |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support FL proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | To Ercisson, the network may have trouble to know exactly what PRS to tell the UE to measure and therefore it is helpful for the UE to have an expected angle. This can help with the measurement burden on the UE especially in a dynamic environment where the UE may receive the PRS with a strong reflection. |
| Qualcomm | To Ericsson; we have simlar view as Nokia: The information can be used as following: UE gets a set with X PRS resources, and alreayd knows the boresigh direction for each one. It can decide to process a subset of those, or re-prioritize how the processing will be.  To vivo: At least for UE-B, it is clear what the benefits are. With regards to mobility, thats the same issue as expectedRSTD, and it is being supported alreayd in the specification.  To HW: Similar view with ZTE with regards to the debate between Option 1 and Option 2. HW assumes some multipath-based / virtual-TRP-based positioning, but to do that, the LMF needs to know where those reflective Objects are. We are not disucssing yet such enhancements, and it is better to leave this for future work. For example, both Ues (for UE-b) and LMF would have to know the locaiton of the reflective objects in order to exploit them. We prefer to consider all related enhancements in future releases, and try to focus on LOS-based positioning now, where having expectedDL-AOD (Option 1) is more natural. |
| Vivo 2 | To QC：In our view, the CID positioning can be used to guarantee the expected RSTD in a window. Considering the coverage of CID may larger than the coverage of TRP if the CID is the same in our evaluation scenarios( IIOT/indoor), the expected AoD window is difficult to derive by the CID positioning in this condition |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The proposal can discussed online to clarify the issues. Since several companies voiced support for only one option, it is reworded to “select one or more” instead of selecting both options:

**Proposal 5.1b**

**For the purpose of both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD, and with regards to the support of AOD measurements with an expected uncertainty window, support one or more of following options:**

* **Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE**
  + - **Single Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]**
* **Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE** 
  + - **Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP]**
* **FFS: details of signaling**
* **FFS: Applicability to other Positioning methods**

Since there was no time to discuss during GTW#2, it is proposed to continue the discussion.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | We think we shouldn’t support more than one option according to our previous agreement.  Agreement:  For the purpose of both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD, and with regards to the support of AOD measurements with an expected uncertainty window, study further whether to support at most one of the following options:   * Option 1: Indication of expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE   + Single Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP] * Option 2: Indication of expected DL-AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) is signaled by the LMF to the UE   + Single Expected DL-AoA/ZoA and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoA/ZoA value) range(s) can be provided to the UE for each [TRP] * Option 3: Indication of expected AoD/ZoD or AoA/ZoA value and uncertainty is not introduced. * FFS: details of signaling |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL proposal. |
| CATT | We support only one Option, either Option 1 or Option 2, since they are equivalent in the LOS case. Don’t support keep both options. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | As vivo pointed out, one option should be supported. We prefer to conclude this item and agree on Option 1. Value of Option 2 is only for scenarios of multipath-based / virtual-TRP-based positioning which is not in scope, nor will it result to a complete solution if Option 2 is supported now.  To vivo’s previous comment: CID is not the only method that is used to derive a first UE’s location. There are so many methods, and in many cases it will be easy to determine that hte UE is located within a specific range of angles (e.g. simple/trivial example: an omni indoor gNB and a UE located in one side of the room; the UE could process the beams in the other side of the room with lower priority. Another example, a gNB outside a house, and a UE inside the house; the UE may be wihtin +-20 degrees all day; the UE can process the beams that are pointing to the other direction with smaller priority. There can be so many examples). |
| ZTE | We share similar with Qualcomm. People may understand the differences between Option 1 and Option 2 in the intensive discussions above. We support Option 1 if it’s possible to decide in this meeting. |
| Intel | We still think that Option 2 is viable for the reference UE with known antenna orientation in space. |
| LG | Agree with FL’s proposal |

### Aspect #6 2-step beam refinement

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [8][16][17], it is propose to enable beam refinement for DL-AOD, with the support of a 2 stage beam-sweeping procedure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [8] | Proposal 6: Support UE-specific beam refinement on DL PRS resource for DL-AoD measurement. |
| [16] | ***Proposal 5:***   * To overcome beam resolution problem, 2-step beam adjustment procedure needs to be considered. |
| [17] | **Proposal 10**: Consider two stage beam-sweeping for DL-AoD together with on-demand PRS transmission and reception  **Proposal 11**: Support association between resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets (at the same TRP) to facilitate support of two stage beam sweeping. |
|  |  |

**Proposal 6.1:**

**To support two-stage beam sweeping, study further the association between resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets at the same TRP**

* + **Other options are not precluded**

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would like to understand how the procedure can work.  Does proposal 6.1 mean that   * UE will be configured with two sets of PRS resources, and there is resource-level association between the PRS resources in the first set and the PRS resources in the second set * UE will measure all PRS resources in the first PRS resource set * UE will only measure a subset of PRS resources in the second PRS resource set depending on the outcome of measurement on the first PRS resource set   We believe this will have some impact on the measurement requirement defined by RAN4 if the measurement is two-staged. How will the measurement latency be specified? How can UE ensure a reliable measurement on the first PRS resource set so as to select the correct subset of PRS resources in the second PRS resource set. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. Association of a wide beam and narrow beam can be further studied in this case. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal.  To Huawei, one possible way is that the UE makes two PRS-RSRP reports. The first one based on the first set and then later one based on the second set. We could discuss the details further. We don’t think the measurement latency of a given set would be impacted (if anything the 2nd set could have shorter latency due to the UE measuring fewer resources).  One other possible way could be for the association to be more like additional assistance information. E.g., inform the UE of the assocation of the resources such that if the UE measures the first set reliably it can reduce the measurement overhead in the 2nd set. |
| LG | We are supportive of the proposal. |
| CATT | Support.  The two-stage beam sweeping of association between wide beams and narrow beams can be further stuided. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally supportive. |
| ZTE | We think this can already be supported by implementation. Currently, one TRP can be configured with 2 DL PRS resource sets per positioning frequency layer. We think the first set can be transmitted wide beams and second set can be transmitted with narrow beams. In addition, current spec supports the QCL source of one DL PRS resource can be another DL PRS resource from the same TRP. Therefore, we think the beam information in second set can already be associated with the resources in first set. |
| Qualcomm | We tend to have the same views as ZTE, but since this is a study item, we could |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

Since the discussion started later than for the other aspects in the AI, it is propose to continue the discussion until GTW#3.

#### Second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal.  To ZTE, QC: we don’t feel that QCL information is sufficient. For example, a UE doesn’t know if a wide or narrow beam is being used now from gNB side. So it is free to choose the Rx beam it wants. So there is no restriction currently on the UE and therefore for a „wide“ Tx beam it may choose a narrow Rx beam. That narrow Rx beam may not directly apply to the narrow Tx beams, especially if there are multiple narrow beams nested in a single wide beam. We think it is useful to study associating wide/narrow beams between sets more than just the current QCL. |
| CATT | Support to further study 2-step beam refinement, since it looks like this scheme has the benefits on the aspects of both accuracy and latency. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | It seems our previous reply is not complete, sorry for that. Even though we think that it can be based on implementation, we also want to point out that there can be enhancements already agreed to be supported (or already discusssed) that can enable this. For example, we can have in UE-A some level of beam information also sent to the UE, so that the UE knows whether a wide beam or narrow bean is being used (related to Aspect #6).  Furthermore, in Nokia’s paper, there is a connection of the 2-stage beam sweeping to on-demand PRS. We also think that a UE could request specific beam directions to be used, and then enable the 2-stage beam sweeping by scheduling those specific narrow beams. However, relation to on-demand and UE-initialted/LMF-initiated on-demand enhancements to facilitate further this feature is missing.  We make the following changes in the proposal:  **For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AoD, at least for the purpose of enabling two-stage PRS beam sweeping, study further at least the following:**   * **Enhancements in the association between resources belonging in two DL PRS resource sets of the same TRP** * **Companies are encouraged to evaluate whether other potential enhancements in this subagenda or other subagendas (e.g. additional beam information, on-demand PRS framework) could be used to enable this feature.**   **Other options are not precluded** |
| ZTE | We can agree to further study this issue rather than decide to support it right now. As pointed out by Qualcomm, there could be overlapping with on-demand PRS so that this feature can be supported directly. |
| CATT-2 | We think the updated propsal from QC is better. From our point of view, since two level beam sweeping (SSB/CSI-RS) is already supported for beam management, the 2-stage DL-PRS beam for positioning is worth to be studied furtherly. Moreover, the second stage DL-PRS will be specific beams, and it is also related to both on-demand PRS and adjacent beam reporting(Aspect #3). |
| LG | We are okay with further study on this aspect. |

## Other aspects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [15] | ***Proposal 2: Support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.***  ***Proposal 3: aspects of PRS resource configuration, DL transmission beam indication and UE measurement and report needs to be considered in order to support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.*** |
| [17] | **Proposal 1:** RAN1 to study beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms in order to improve the positioning accuracy achievable with DL-AoD. Including:   * UE-based positioning: the beam offset (BO) could be signaled to the UE, as either an indicator, e.g. low/medium/high, each specifying an error range or as a specific value computed by the network * UE-assisted positioning: LMF should be aware of the BO and compensate it when computing the position estimate. * Signaling aspects:   + LMF signals to TRPs that a BO beam re-tuning is needed. The BO correction may be explicitly signalled to the TRP by the LMF; alternatively, the LMF may send a Boolean indication that a BO recomputation and adjustement is needed.   + UE measurement reports to facilitate BO identification and potential correction.   **Proposal 2:** RAN1 to specify support for enabling a selected device with known location to support configuration by the network to help with beam offset estimation, among other parameters. In particular, RAN1 should investigate methods and signaling required to enable the selected reference device to:   * Be configured as a reference device, e.g. device should reports its capabilities such as fixed location knowledge or high accuracy GNSS receiver availability, device estimated velocity, etc. * Report back a selected set of measurements of beamed PRS used by the network to compute and compensate for beam offset errors. This could include additional reporting capabilities (i.e., higher number of beam reports) * Ability of reference device to determine beam offset errors are present.   **Proposal 10**: Consider two stage beam-sweeping for DL-AoD together with on-demand PRS transmission and reception  **Proposal 11**: Support association between resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets (at the same TRP) to facilitate support of two stage beam sweeping. |
| [18] | *Proposal 5: Estimate the angle error by a reference node whose accurate location is known.* |
| [21] | ***Proposal 3: Supportive of processing priority of PRS measurements for DL-AoD measurements, however this can be discussed under a common framework including other positioning measurements in 8.5.4 latency reduction AI.*** |

1. Conclusion

**TBD**
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