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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:

106-e-NR-ePos-03] Email discussion/approval on accuracy improvements for DL-AoD positioning solutions with checkpoints for agreements on August 19, 24 and 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
* Aspect#6 2-step beam refinement

In order to speed up progress, it is proposed to first consider proposals marked as high priority, and proceed with other proposal if time allows.

1. Aspects for discussion

## Main discussion topics

### Aspect #1 reporting of first arrival path

#### Summary

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#105e and it was agreed to support measurement and reporting of the first path PRS-RSRP

|  |
| --- |
| 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 |

In [[1][2][3][4][5] [7][9][10][13][14][15][16][21][22], companies have proposed solution to the following issues:

* Definition of first path RSRP [1][2][10][13][21]
  + Path RSRP is defined at the path time of arrival
  + Path RSRP is defined over a configured window[15][16]
  + Reported Relative to PRS RSRP [1][10][2][13]
* Reporting of first path RSRP is proposed to either:
  + Be included alongside RSRP
  + Be included as replacement for RSRP, with an indicator signaling which measurement is reported[5].
* Inclusion of path RSRP in other methods (multi RTT, DL TDOA)[13],[21]
* Support of further measurements beside power, e.g. phase[1][13], TOA[2][21], intra-TRP TDOA[9][2]
  + One company [3] suggested that the benefit of time information reporting should be clarified
  + One company [3] raises the issue of phase discontinuity regarding phase measurements (option 2,4,5), and propose to postpone angle based measurements to rel18.
* Assistance data to identify the first path [4]
* Reporting of multiple resources per set [7]
* Report triggering past a given threshold [14]
* Reporting of more than 1 path [21]
* Reporting of UE AoA and orientation[22]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| Error: Reference source not found | ***Proposal 1: Support the phase reporting for the first path in DL-AoD.***  ***Proposal 2: Adopt the following definition of path RSRP.***   * ***FFS: the path RSRP measurement evaluation window*** * ***Send an LS to RAN4*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 1:*** *The PRS RSRP of the first path is defined as the receiving power of the detected path used for the TOA value relative to the DL PRS-RSRP of the associated DL PRS resource.*   * *Send LS to RAN4 to design new mapping table according to the above definition.*   ***Proposal 2:*** *For UE-assisted DL-AOD, 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 3:*** *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 derived from difference reference signals.* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 13***   * ***DL PRS reference signal received power of the first path (DL first path PRS-RSRP), is the linear average over the power components in the first path detected direction of power contributions (in [W]) of resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals configured for RSRP measurements within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth.***   ***Proposal 14***   * ***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 15***   * ***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 16**   * ***The angle-based AoD positioning or phase-based AoD positioning are postponed to the future release.*** |
| [4] | **Proposal 5: Time window for PRS-RSRP and selection of the first path are UE implementation aspect.**  **Proposal 6: Support assistance information from LMF to UE to assist UE in selecting the first path.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 1: An indicator of whether the report includes all paths or first arrival path only is supported.***  ***FL note: the indicator signal whether the RSRP is “all paths” (i.e. legacy) RSRP, or first arrival path RSRP.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 1**: For DL-AoD support reporting of multiple PRS resources per PRS resource set, with each resource being associated with time of arrival information. |
| [9] | Proposal 6: In DL-AoD measurement report, support the UE to report the relative time-of-arrival of those reported PRS resources of each TRP. (i.e., Option 3). |
| [10] | ***Proposal 4: For the measurement & signaling of the earliest path RSRP, support the UE reporting, per PRS resource:***   * ***the relative received power of the earliest path over the total RSRP of the PRS resource.***    + ***Maximum value is 0 dB***   + ***Minimum value: [-30] dB***   + ***Step size: [0.5] dB*** |
| [13] | **Proposal 2**   * **For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AOD and DL-TDOA positioning methods, the UE can be requested to measure and report to LMF (for UE-assisted) the DL PRS-RSRP of the first path defined as follows:**   + ***RSRPFP* = 10 × lg(*P*0/*P*) in [dBm], *P*0 is the power of the first path, *P* is the total receive power corresponding to the measured DL PRS-RSRP value within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth**   + **If receiver diversity is used by the UE, then the reported DL PRS-RSRP of the first path should not be lower than the corresponding DL PRS-RSRP of the first path of any of individual receiver branches**   + **The *RSRPFP* parameter is defined in the finite range [-X, 0], where X defines some threshold in [dBm] identifying the level of sensitivity for receive power**   + **The granularity (or step size) of the measured *RSRPFP* parameter is set equal to Y in [dBm], identifying the sufficient level of accuracy, required in the measurements**   + **FFS: X in [dBm], Y in [dBm] (up to RAN4 discussion)**   **Proposal 3**   * **For UL-AOA and UL-TDOA positioning methods, the gNB can be requested to measure and report the UL SRS-RSRP of the first path to LMF**   **Proposal 4**   * **For Multi-RTT positioning method:**   + **the UE can be requested to measure and report the DL PRS-RSRP of the first path to LMF**   + **the gNB can be requested to measure and report the UL SRS-RSRP of the first path to LMF**   **Proposal 5**   * **For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, the UE can be requested to measure and report to LMF the phase of the first path** |
| [14] | **Proposal 1: For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AoD, the UE reports the PRS RSRP of the first path once the RSRP, accumulated over a preconfigured duration, is above the threshold configured by the LMF** |
| [15] | **Proposal 1**: 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. |
| [16] | **Proposal 2-1**: Define per-path RSRP at pre-DFT domain  **Proposal 2-2**: The pre-DFT domain is defined as the domain after transforming by IDFT the channel frequency response value at resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth  **Proposal 2-3**: The RSRP for a single path could be defined as the sum over the power contributions(in [W]) of the taps within a measurement window at the pre-DFT domain  **Proposal 2-4**: For the CIR observation of each DL-PRS resource, the measurement window for a certain path is considered to be identical across the resources. The size and range of the measurement window could be determined by UE |
| [21] | **Proposal 1 Include DL PRS-RSRP-PP of the first path in NR DL-AoD Location Information alongside the existing DL PRS-RSRP measurement.**  **Proposal 2 Include DL PRS-RSRP-PP 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.**  **Proposal 3 The DL PRS-RSRP-PP is reported together with an associated timing measurement of the corresponding path.**  **Proposal 4 Include additional paths in the DL-AOD measurement report. For each additional path the DL PRS-RSRP-PP and the associated timing measurement should be reported.** |
| [22] | **Proposal 1:** **For DL\_AoD based positioning,** **the standards should support reporting of FAP- RSRP and FAP-RTOA measurements by UE.**  **Proposal 2: For DL\_AoD based positioning, the standards should also support reporting of FAP-UE-AoA and UE-orientation measurements by UE to LMP.** |

Based on the contributions, the following is proposed on aspect #1:

#### Proposal 1.1 (high priority proposal)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.1: For definition of the PRS RSRP per path,**

* **Option 1: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the power of the channel impulse response at a given path delay**
* **Option 2: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the accumulated power of the channel impulse response over a time window** 
  + **FFS: how is the window conveyed to the UE (i.e. fixed in specification or configured in measurement request)**
* **FFS further details of the definition**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | We prefer that the following online proposal is seen as start point  Alternate Proposal:  The measured path PRS RSRP is the power of the channel impulse response at a certain path delay.   * Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement. * Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement after completion of further discussion. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the alternate proposal by Mr Chairman, but, as we pointed out, the „power“ could correspond to relative power with respect to PRS RSRP (related to the next proposal). We suggest to combine this alternate proposal with the options shown below (or best, if we can agree from the beginnign with Option 1 from the Propsoal 1.2) |
| MTK | It seems no harm to add a note for the alternate proposal, since most companies have studied and understood how to do the measurement by having a time window. The note doesnt need to explicitly describe time window, just to describe the relationship between a given path delay and sampling point/sampling grid  Alternate Proposal:  The measured path PRS RSRP is the power of the channel impulse response at a certain path delay.   * Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid * Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement. * Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement after completion of further discussion. |
| ZTE | The same view with Qualcomm.  To MTK, we prefer not to add a note. RAN4 will make their decision. |
| Intel | Support the alternate proposal. Agree to define the relative power with respect to the PRS RSRP. |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the alternate proposal and the note added by MTK. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with MTK’s revision or Chair’s alternative proposal.  As commented by QC, we also think that there should be some “normalization rule” to define path RSRP in the same order of the existing RSRP, which is the mean Rx EPRE. Technically, it is not clear to what path power would refer, e.g. expressed in dBm or something else.  Another issue is that it may depend on whether absolute requirement is defined or only relative requirement is defined. For the purpose DL-AoD, we think relative path RSRP (the same first path across multiple PRS resources) should be sufficient. By relative path RSRP, I am not saying the relative value to the Rel-16 PRS RSRP (all path RSRP), but rather the relative value for the same path between different beams.  Therefore, we would suggest to add the following sub-bullet.   * Up to RAN4 to define absolute or relative or both requirements. |
| CATT | We support the alternate Proposal. We prefer to define the path PRS PRSP and related performance requirements in RAN4. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the alternate proposal. As for the note proposed by MTK, “a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid” can be the detail in RAN4 discussion. We propose to modify the note as follows   * ~~Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid~~ * Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement. * Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement ~~after completion of further discussion~~. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally fine with the alternate proposal from Chairman, but we would like to clarify if PRS RSRP per path needs to be defined in TS 38.215 or not. |
| CEWiT | We support the alternate proposal and agree with Intel’s views on reporting relative to PRS-RSRP. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the alternate proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the alternative proposal proposed online. And we are also fine to support relative PRS-RSRP per path. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the alternate proposal as discussed during the GTW session. |
| LG | We perfer to support alternate proposal. |
| SONY | We are fine with the propose alternate proposal made by MTK. |
| Futurewei | Support Alternate proposal from Vivo |
| OPPO | We prefer the alternate from MTK |
| MTK2 | The note we propose to add is not to mandate anything for RAN4. Also, since RAN1 is the leading working group, we dont see anything wrong to provide information to RAN4.  Furthermore, the “channel impulse respone“ may need to addressed as well in the definition of path RSRP. The 38.215 has defined more specifically for PRS-RSRP:  DL PRS reference signal received power (DL PRS-RSRP), is defined as the linear average over the power contributions (in [W]) of **the resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals configured for RSRP measurements within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth.**  I suggest to come out the definition in next week before sending LS to RAN4. So the channel impulse response in alternative proposal should be related to some sentences in the definition of PRS-RSRP. Actually some companies such as vivo has provided corresponding wordings in the contribution |

#### Second round of discussion

During the first round of discussion, the proposal was revised online at the GTW. Based on the received comments, some companies want to include to the definition of path RSRP that it should be relative to RSRP. However, one comment pointed that there is a dependency on how RAN4 wants to define the requirement. In the FL understanding, the measurement could be define without normalization, but measurement reports could be defined with a normalization. As a way forward, it is propose to ask to RAN4 whether normalization could be embedded in the measurement definition.

Regarding which work group should define RSRP (based on the comment from CATT and nokia), it is the FL understanding that RAN1 has the responsibility to define the measurement in 38.215. I agree with MTK that a definition ready for inclusion in the specification would be good to have prior to sending the LS to RAN4. In the next round of comment, it is proposed to try and reformulate (if needed) the path RSRP definition in a wording suitable for 38.215.

**Revised proposal 1.1a**

**The measured path PRS RSRP is the power in [W] of the channel impulse response experienced by a DL PRS resource configured for path PRS RSRP measurement at a certain path delay.**

* **Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid**
* **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.**
* **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement, and asking whether normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.1a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Ok.  Propose the following modification:  **Revised proposal 1.1a**  **The measured path PRS RSRP is the power in [W] of the channel impulse response experienced by a DL PRS resource configured for path PRS RSRP measurement at a certain path delay.**   * **Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid** * **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.** * **RAN1 assumes that the per path PRS RSRP measurement is normalized to the DL PRS RSRP defined in Rel.16** * **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement, and asking for feedback on the above definition ~~whether normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition.~~** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal. For now, we think that RAN4 needs to be involved in the issue of whether to define the absolute value or relative/normalized value, so we prefer the proposal as it is without additional modification from Intel. |
| Apple | Questions for clarification: 1) what is the difference, if any, between RSRP measurement over „a certain path delay“ and „time window“? 2) main bullet sounds like some PRS resources are configured for path specific PRS-RSRP, while some other PRS resources are not. In our view, path-specific PRS-RSRP, if indicated, is applicable to all PRS resources? |
| vivo | The wording “ experienced by “ in the main bullet seems a little weird.  In our view, the first path definition is more easy, such as:  The measured first path PRS RSRP is the power of the channel impulse response at a first detected path delay. |
| CATT | OK to define the path PRS RSRP in RAN1 and leave the performance requirements to RAN4.  Regarding the main bullet, the definition of path PRS RSPR is still not clear for us. When it says “experienced by a DL PRS resource”, what about two or more DL PRS resources, we think path PRS RSPR should be measured on resource elements of one or more DL PRS resources. We prefer the revision of main bullet as follows,  **Updated main bullet of Revised proposal 1.1a**  **The measured path PRS RSRP is the power in [W] of the channel impulse response experienced by resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals ~~a DL PRS resource~~ configured for path PRS RSRP measurement at a certain path delay.**  And we are fine with MTK’s note. |
| Xiaomi | According to the definition of DL PRS RSRP in 38.215,  “ DL PRS reference signal received power (DL PRS-RSRP), is defined as the linear average over the power contributions (in [W]) of the resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals configured for RSRP measurements within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth.“  The definition of path PRS RSRP can be updated by adding “at a certain path delay“ as below:  The measured path PRS RSRP is the linear average over the power contributions (in [W]) of the resource elements that carry DL PRS reference signals configured for RSRP measurements within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth at a certain path delay. |
| ZTE | Support FL’s proposal without modification. RAN4 will do their work to define for the measurement. |

#### Third round of discussion

The comments can be summarized as below:

* There is still concern on including normalization into the definition before RAN4 is consulted.
* The wording “DL PRS resource configured for path PRS RSRP measurement” should be rephrased
* The proposal can be aligned better toward exisiting measurement definitions for RSRP.

Based on the comment, the following reworded proposal is given. The CATT proposal is used as a starting point, with a rephrasing of the “configured” part of the proposal as suggested by the comments:

**Revised proposal 1.1b**

**The measured path PRS RSRP is the power in [W] at a certain delay of the channel impulse response over which ~~experienced by~~ resource elements that carry a DL PRS reference signal are received ~~a DL PRS resource for which the UE has been requested to perform the configured for path PRS RSRP measurement at a certain path delay.~~**

* **Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid**
* **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.**
* **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement, and asking whether normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.1b**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think that the path PRS RSRP should also be kind of average over REs, so that path RSRP should in the same order of magnitude as RSRP.  Given that we prefer to defer the discussion in the next meeting. |
| CATT | Support the proposal in principle, since we share the same view with FL that the definition of path PRS RSRP should be aligned better toward exisiting measurement definitions for RSRP in 38.215.  We also think Huawei’s comments are reasonable, since maybe we need more time to refine the definition of path PRS RSRP. If we cannot reach the consensus on the proposal, we can further discuss it at next meeting. |
| Intel | OK with the FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Maybe it can be modify as following based on the current RSRP definition   * ***The measured path PRS RSRP, is the linear average over the power components of power contributions (in [W]) of resource elements at a certain delay of the channel impulse response that carry DL PRS reference signals configured for RSRP measurements within the considered measurement frequency bandwidth.*** |
| Apple | My previous question is not addressed yet, so I have to repeat (sorry fort hat): what’s the definition of „at a ceritan delay“? Is is associated with a specific tap on channel delay spread or CIR? Ist he PRS-RSRP measured for all taps that are received within the „certain delay“? |
| Qualcomm | We tend to disagree with the changes of vivo. It is not a linear average the per path RSRP. UE receives the PRS REs -> descrables -> IFFT -> earliest Tap detection -> per-path RSRP, right? Could vivo explain why a „linear average“ is needed to be added?  Independent of how the path-RSRP is defined, what matters is how it is reported and what will be the requirements, which was the proposal shown below that is closed now. The „Note“ also doesnt seem is needed for us.  We are also OK to dsicuss htis next meeting, since it doesnt seem to be blocking progress on a lot of other subsequent agreements that may be needed. |
| Samsung | Okay with FL’s proposal. In general, the path RSRP is the power measured in time domain. Introducing the definition in frequency domain alike the legacy way is not necessary.  The note is not necessary (non nomative one.) The path decision should be up to UE implemtation. We prefer the following revision:  **The measured path PRS RSRP is the power in [W] ~~at~~ corresponding to a certain delay of the channel impulse response over which   ~~experienced by~~resource elements that carry a DL PRS reference signal are received ~~a DL PRS resource for which the UE has been requested to perform the configured for path PRS RSRP measurement at a certain path delay.~~**   * **~~Note: a certain path delay is independent of any point on the sampling grid~~** * **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.** * **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement, and asking whether normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition.** |
| ZTE | We also don’t see the need to get a linear average per path RSRP. The reason why the DL PRS-RSRP is derived from a linear average is that the DL PRS-RSRP is measured from frequency domain. While the path RSRP should be defined from time domain. |
| vivo2 | We are okay to discuss in the next meeting due to obvious controversy. And we have no strong view for our previous comment or FL proposal. But we would like to further clarify our proposal.  Firstly, we agree with the measurement process from QC. But we believe Time domain and frequency domain are equivalent based on Parseval theorem. That is , we assumed is channel impluse response of ideal one path.  So one path RSRP in the ideal CIR can be equivalent to linear average over the power components of power contributions (in [W]) of resource elements at the corresponding delay direction.  Besides, consider reusing some previous description in RSRP definition, we provide the pervious proposal. And hope our reply is useful for some concerns. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok to support FL’s proposal and RAN4 can provide their feedback on this path RSRP measurement definition if they have major concerns. |
| FL | From the FL point of view, it is fine to defer the completion of the discussion. However, we also have to remember that we need an answer from RAN4 on normalization. With two meetings left, It will be difficult to have a response from RAN4 in time for the release completion.  To Apple: my understanding (proponents can confirm) of a certain delay is that the measurement from the UE should reflect the understanding of the UE of the power of the CIR at a delay position/channel tap. The requirement as to how the UE derive that power can be discussed in RAN4.  To Samsung: it is understood that the note does not have a normative impact. However, some companies have expressed that it helps understanding the context of the agreement. If we can avoid delaying the discussion by keeping the note, I would like to keep it.  Regarding the averaging of path RSRP over Res: from FL perspective the average of Res can be added if the whole definition is in the frequency domain. In the time domain, the measurement is the the power at a certain delay of the channel impulse response. In the frequency domain, you would first extract the path components for each PDP delay by projecting the signal onto a set phase rotation vector corresponding to a list of delay, and for each delay you would then take the average of the Res. Thus we should decide in which domain the definition should be. |

#### Fourth round of discussion

There was several comments regarding capturing in the definition the averaging over PRS Res. In the FL understanding, the averaging is done when computing the path RSRP in the frequency domain.

The following proposals were discussed online at the GTW:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal:  For definition of the path PRS RSRP,   * Option 1: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the power of the channel impulse response at a certain path delay * Option 2: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the accumulated power of the channel impulse response over a time duration corresponding to the given path delay   + FFS: how is the window conveyed to the UE (i.e. fixed in specification or configured in measurement request) * FFS further details of the definition * Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement   Alternate Proposal:  The measured path PRS RSRP is the power of the channel impulse response at a certain path delay.   * Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement. * Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement after completion of further discussion. |

It seems that option 1 in the main proposal is very close to the alternate proposal. the interpretation in the frequency domain can also be added to the proposal if this clarify the issue, and we can decide of the exact wording to be added in 215. it is proposed to try and converge using the following proposal:

**Proposal1.1c:**

**For definition of the path PRS RSRP,**

* **Option 1: the measured path PRS RSRP correspond to the power of the channel impulse response, at a certain path delay, over which the DL PRS is received.** 
  + **In the frequency domain, the path PRS RSRP is measured as the linear average of the power contribution for a certain delay in the channel impulse response of resource elements occupied by the DL PRS,**

* **Option 2: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the accumulated power of the channel impulse response over which the DL PRS is received, over a time duration corresponding to the given path delay** 
  + **FFS: how is the window conveyed to the UE (i.e. fixed in specification or configured in measurement request)**
* **FFS further details of the definition**
* **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement**
* **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.1c**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | OK with the FL’s proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal, and prefer Opton 1. |
| Intel | We think that the certain path delay definition is not provided and needs to be defined. It can be defined with respect to the first arrival path or some RX timing reference. We propose that the first arrival path is associated with the zero time delay.  Our understanding that UE can select DL PRS measurement bandwidth depending on application or positioning requirements. Therefore, we would like to add **FFS on relationship with the UE DL PRS measurement bandwidth**.  Additionally, given that normalization aspects were discussed and included in the previous proposal, we suggest to add FFS into the current proposal:   * **FFS: normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition.** |
| Nokia/NSB | From the third round dsicussion, we are not sure why the following sentence of the third bullet was removed ‘‘and asking whether normalization of the path RSRP measurement with DL PRS RSRP (i.e. RSRP for all path as defined in Rel-16) could be included in the measurement definition“  The definition of the certain path is also unclear to us. In the previous proposal, we thought the first sub-bullet contains the minimum information about the concept of the first path but it was removed. We understand Samsung’s commnet on the third round. The path decision/detection may be up to UE’s implementation, but if we would like to define the measurement in 38.215, the definition should be clear. We are okay to discuss this issue in the next meeting. |
| Futurewei | Resolving or clarifying the open issues of ‘a certain path delay‘ in Option 1 and ‘over a time duration corresponding to the given path delay‘ in Option 2 are needed. From the FSS (in the third bullet), we also admit we dont have the definitions stable yet. So, it seems premature to rush into these two options. For example, the definition of path seems to have different meanings or implications in the strict sense of the words. |
| Samsung | Regarding option 1, we have concern on the subbullet  ”…In the frequency domain, the path PRS RSRP is measured as the linear average of the power contribution for a certain delay in the channel impulse response of resource elements occupied by the DL PRS,”  In theory, the path RSRP can be defined as    In particular if n=0, then    Thus, the calculation for RSRP is not the linear average of the power but it should be the **power of linear average of the PRS REs.**  For option 2, the terminology of “first arrival path” has already existed in the spec 38.215 (see 5.1.30), which is up to UE implementation. The same philosophy should apply to first path RSRP. I don’t think there is necessarity to introduce the window (or time duration), and it shoud be up to UE implementation.  Thus we suggest the following change:  **For definition of the path PRS RSRP, downselect one of the following options:**   * **Option 1: the measured path PRS RSRP correspond to the power of the channel impulse response,  at a certain path delay, over which the DL PRS is received.**   + **In the frequency domain, the path PRS RSRP is measured as ~~the linear average of the power contribution for a certain delay in the channel impulse response of resource elements occupied by the DL PRS~~ the power of the linear avergage of the REs occupied by PRS for a certain delay in the channel impulse response.** * **Option 2: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the accumulated power of the channel impulse response over which the DL PRS is received, over a time duration corresponding to the given path delay**   + **FFS: how is the window conveyed to the UE (i.e. fixed in specification or configured in measurement request)** * **FFS further details of the definition** * **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement** * **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.**   With the above changes, we prefer option 1. |
| Applex | Support FL’s proposal (Option 2 is preffered) |
| Qualcomm | We prefer option 1 and we agree with SS’s concern on the first version of the subbulet. However, overall, we dont think that there is a need to say something about the frequency domain operation. Just the main bullet is enough for us.  We also dont see the necessity of any window of option 2.  But if we remove the subbulet in Option 1, we can accept the 2 options. No need to send an LS yet, since we havent downselected. |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 1 without sub-bullet. Whether it should be defined from time domain or frequency domain is up to further discussion.  The window is almost impossible to define because the spread of first detected path may depend on the time resolution(or bandwidth)and the misalignment of TOA and sample grid, which could be different for different channels (or resources).  We’re also fine to have two options to be selected at next meeting. |
| OPPO | We prefer the Option 1 too and also think the sub-bullet shall be removed. In frequency domain, it is no way to measure the RSRP of one path.  Regarding Option 2: even though we do not prefer it, we suggest in the FFS part: adding whether there.  **Proposal1.1c:**  **For definition of the path PRS RSRP,**   * **Option 1: the measured path PRS RSRP correspond to the power of the channel impulse response, at a certain path delay, over which the DL PRS is received.**    + **~~In the frequency domain, the path PRS RSRP is measured as the linear average of the power contribution for a certain delay in the channel impulse response of resource elements occupied by the DL PRS,~~**      * **Option 2: the path PRS RSRP correspond to the accumulated power of the channel impulse response over which the DL PRS is received, over a time duration corresponding to the given path delay**    + **FFS: whether/how is the window conveyed to the UE (i.e. fixed in specification or configured in measurement request)** * **FFS further details of the definition** * **Send LS to RAN4 informing them of this agreement** * **Up to RAN4 to define any test/requirement for the measurement.** |
| vivo 2 | We are fine with the FL’s proposal, and okay to discuss in the next meeting.  Beside, we and Sumsang used different assumptions. one is a single tap in the time domain, However, we assume that it is an ideal single-path CIR(including delay spread ) in the entire time domain. For example:    In this case, maybe we encountered the same difficulty as the time domain |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general, we are aligned with SS’s understanding, and average over all REs is similar to the normalization.  We do not see the need to agree to either options now or list the options. How to measure/test the path-RSRP anyway needs further investigation, we may end up with neither options.  To ZTE: on the window, our understanding is that the window can be single sample in the discrete time domain or the window can also be defined on the continuous time domain with the absolute time duration that is associated with the PRS bandwidth, e.g. 100MHz PRS. In the latter case, we can have the window length as 5ns around the first path, so that the PDP in the +/- 5ns window around the path is integrated. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the FL’s proposal in principle and also fine to have further discussion in next meeting. |
| mtk | In our view, to mention frequency domain for path PRS RSRP is not needed. We can simply point out the relation between the derived channel impulse response and the corresponding PRS REs allocated in frequency domain |

#### Proposal 1.2 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.2: For reporting of the PRS RSRP per path,**

* **Option 1: the PRS RSRP per path is reported relative to the PRS RSRP, and together with PRS RSRP in the same measurement report**
* **Option 2: the PRS RSRP is reported either per path or for all path (rel16 PRS RSRP) in the same measurement report** 
  + **FFS: use of an indicator to distinguish the two measurements**
* **FFS further detail of the report formatting, including granularity**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Same comment in online, we suggest modify the PRS RSRP per path to path PRS RSRP  And for the two option, option 1 is preferred. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |
| MTK | Option 1 provides more information to LMF. Seems better |
| ZTE | Option 1 |
| Intel | Option 1 |
| Fraunhofer | Prefer Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It depends on whether the absolute RSRP requirement is defined or not. We prefer to let RAN4 work out.  For DL-AoD, we think what is useful is the relative path RSRP for the same path across multiple resources. Whether the relative value with the Rel-16 PRS RSRP is accurate does not matter that much. |
| CATT | We prefer Option 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 1 |
| CEWiT | Support Option-1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Option 1 |
| Xiaomi | First we want to clarify that the PRS RSRP in Option 1 is the one for all path(Rel 16 PRS RSRP), is my understandign right? If yes, we can update it as below:   * **Option 1: the PRS RSRP per path is reported relative to the PRS RSRP for all path (Rel16 PRS RSRP), and together with PRS RSRP for all path (Rel16 PRS RSRP) in the same measurement report**   And we prefer the updated Option 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 |
| LG | We support option #1. |
| Sony | Option 1 |
| Futurewei | Do not support, not essential if we already have proposal from 1.1 |
| OPPO | Option 2. The UE does not need to report both PRS resource RSRP and RSRP per path. The reason for why supporting per path RSRP is the RSRP per resoucre does not give the current informaiton for AOD in multipath enviroment. That means the use case when per path RSRP is needed is when the per resource RSRP does not work. Then why do we report both? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | We do not think reporting relative value to the total RSRP is useful, since what matters is the difference of path RSRP between resources.  We would point out it relies on how RAN4 defines the requirement. For DL-AoD, It could be possible that absolute requirement and relative requirement are defined, and relative requirement should actually refers to the relative power of a path for a DL PRS resource with respect to reference DL PRS resources, instead of with respect to the total RSRP. |
| FL | Based on the discussion on proposal 1.1, we can close the issue for now and wait for RAN4 feedback. If needed, we can re-open the issue. |

#### Proposal 1.3 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.3**

**The PRS-RSRP per path report can include measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set**

* **FFS: use of intra-TRP TDOA when reporting more than 1 PRS per TRP.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | We are confused with the proposal. Is there any other works needs to be done except adding the highlight IE as follows.  -- ASN1START  NR-DL-AoD-SignalMeasurementInformation-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-AoD-MeasList-r16 NR-DL-AoD-MeasList-r16,  ...  }  NR-DL-AoD-MeasList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE(1..nrMaxTRPs-r16)) OF NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement-r16  NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255),  nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL,  nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL,  nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,  nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,  nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result-r16 INTEGER (0..126),  nr-DL-PRS-Path-RSRP-Result-r17 INTEGER \*\*\*  nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex-r16 INTEGER (1..8) OPTIONAL,  nr-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16  NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 OPTIONAL,  ...  }  NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..7)) OF  NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16  NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL,  nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL,  nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16,  nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r16 INTEGER (0..30),  nr-DL-PRS-Path-RSRP-ResultDiff-r16 INTEGER \*\*\*  nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex-r16 INTEGER (1..8) OPTIONAL,  ...  }  -- ASN1STOP |
| Qualcomm | Same view as vivo; isnt that the obvious way we ll specify it? |
| MTK | This proposal is quite intuitive. What is more important is when UE measure path RSRP for multiple PRS resources within a same set, the location of given path delay needs to be the same among measurements for the PRS resources. We believe that RAN1 needs to specify this. This is not RAN4 job  We dont see the use case that UE reports path RSRP with different path delays among PRS resources  So we suggest to modify the proposal as,  **The PRS-RSRP per path report can include measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set, with same path delay for the measurements** |
| ZTE | Similar to PRS RSRP, which is reported per DL PRS resource. We don’t need to discuss this proposal. |
| Intel | It is unclear, do we assume the same path delay or different path delays across the PRS resources for the first arrival path RSRP measurements? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To our understanding, Rel-16 does not restrict the PRS-RSRP reported across multiple sets per TRP.  We do see some value for reporting path RSRP for different sets, e.g. the first set uses DFT beam and the second set uses differential beam. How the reporting is done depends on Aspect #3. |
| CATT | We share the similar view with vivo and Qualcomm. We just need to add the highlighted IEs in vivo’s comments. |
| InterDigital | We have the same question as Intel. |
| Nokia/NSB | It is unclear to us. We think it is obvious that we need to add the per-path PRS RSRP to the current TS 37.355, this proposal can be discussed after introducing path PRS RSRP reporting if needed. |
| Xiaomi | It is straightforward to inlcude the PRS RSRP per path from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set . We are OK to the proposal. Whether same path delay or different path delay across the PRS resources need to be further discussed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok with proposal, clarification is needed on the path delay across DL PRS resources in the same resource set. |
| LG | We have the same view with nokia. |
| OPPO | Do think we need to dicuss this. |
| FL | Based on the comments it seems we can close the issue regarding whether the measurement can be reported for each resource. The clarification regarding the path delay should however be discussed. |

#### second round of discussion

Based on the comments, it is proposed to clarify that all resource should report power for the same path:

**Proposal 1.3b:**

**The report for path PRS-RSRP measurement can include path PRS-RSRP measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set, with the same path delay used for the measurements**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.3b**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | “same path delay” means PRS resources within the resource set with the same CIR? Or it means the same “certain path delay” in P1-1? |
| InterDigital | We have a similar question as Apple. Is the intention here to report path PRS-RSRP measurements for multiple PRS resources ONLY IF the same path-delay profile is observed for the PRS resources? |
| vivo | We can understand the intention, it is just like our simulation assumption, the path delay composition of all resources is assumed as the same.  However, from an implementation point of view, it is very difficult to extract especially for UE with mobility. For example, given the period of PRS can be configured such as {4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 32, 40, 64, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1280, 2560, 5120, 10240}ms, and the slot offset can be 0~periodicity-1, this may result in a larger time interval and UE displacement between different resources/beams. In this situation, adopt the above first path definition may result in problems that many beams can’t report those RSRP because the first path is different. For us, the “first path” is difficult to select and define in multiple PRS resources. |
| Qualcomm | No need to write: „same path delay“. The UE will just report relative RSRP of the first arrival path for each PRS resource. It is up to UE implementation to decide.  For example, imagine the beams are not transmitted at the same time from the Tx side (e.g. different beams have different group delays) The UE should still find the earliest path for each beam separately, and this is the right thing to do. If it finds the earliest path for the 1st beam, and uses that for the a 2nd beam, it will be a wrong solution.  Overall, the UE should report the path-RSRP for the earliest path for each PRS resource separately. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the same path delay could be somehow restrictive and as companies proposed, may not be correct in some scenarios. At least from our side, reporting the path RSRP for the same path should be important, whether the same path should have the same delay or not, or how UE determines that the first path under different Tx beams are actually the same path can be up to UE to decide.  Perhaps we can say  **Proposal 1.3b update:**  **The report for path PRS-RSRP measurement can include path PRS-RSRP measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set, with the same path ~~delay~~ used for the measurements**  **Note: From RAN1 perspective, it can be up to UE implementation on how to determine same path across multiple resources.** |
| ZTE | Similar view with Qualcomm. Each DL PRS resource will determine their own first detected path. No restriction is needed. |
| SONY | We slightly prefer HW's updated proposal. Since the group delay at different beams or timing error at different resources may not be the same, the delay of he first arrival path may also differ.  One remaining comment from us: "same path" or "same path delay". Is it a common understanding that here we are referring to the same propagation delay? |

#### Third round of discussion

There is near consensus in the comments to remove the “same path delay” part of the proposal, and leave the choice of delay to implementation. There is an additional modification from Huawei that could be a potential compromise, stating that the UE will report what it considers to be the same path measurement for all the measured PRS in the set while leaving to UE implementation to select the same path. The proposal is revised as follow:

**Proposal 1.3c**

**The report for path PRS-RSRP measurement can include path PRS-RSRP measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set, with the same path ~~delay~~ used for the measurements.**

* **Note: From RAN1 perspective, it can be up to UE implementation on how to determine same path across multiple resources.**

**Proposal 1.3c**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | Support the proposal in principle.  In addition, in previous version, the word of ”same” means the same delay. If we delete the word “delay”, what about we also replacing the word of “same” with “corresponidng”, as the wording of “the same path” is also somehow restrictive.  Our prefered revison as follows,  **Proposal 1.3c (Updated)**  **The report for path PRS-RSRP measurement can include path PRS-RSRP measurements from multiple PRS resources in the same resource set, with the ~~same~~** **corresponding paths ~~delay~~ used for the measurements.**   * **Note: From RAN1 perspective, it can be up to UE implementation on how to determine ~~same~~ the corresponding paths across multiple resources.** |
| Qualcomm | Not needed. The path RSRP is for the earliest path only, up to UE implementation how to derive the earliest path of each resource. |
| Samsung | Similar view as QC. We only agree on the first path RSRP by far. Even for the general path RSRP, it is up to UE implementation to determine the corresponding path. |
| ZTE | Not needed. Each DL PRS resource will determine their own first detected path and get its path RSRP. |
| FL | Since most commenting companies think the proposal is not needed, it will not be brought up to discussion online. |
| LG | From ourunderstanding, the path PRS-RSRP measurement can be single or multiple depending on how many PRS resource are used for derivation and we think it is up to UE implementation. If multiple PRS-RSRP measurents are reported and the number of reported path PRS-RSRP measurements is same with measuremenred PRS resources, we think that each measurement is related to each PRS resource. But, in case of that single path PRS-RSRP measurement are derived from multiple PRS resources, a specific rule as above the proposal. If our understanding is right, we prefer the proposal in CATT’s comment. |
| OPPO | Share the similar understanding as QC, Samsung and ZTE, this proposal is not needed. It is part of system implementation. |

#### Proposal 1.4 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.4**

**The PRS-RSRP per path report can include the phase of the measured path.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Too late for this release for us, lets focus on closing the issues. |
| Intel | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. We think if there is phase discontinuity, it can be estimated by the PRU. |
| CATT | We prefer this issue to be low priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | We have simlar view with QC. Do not support. |
| CEWiT | Low priority. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Low priority |
| LG | Not support. |
| Futurewei | Do not support |
| OPPO | Do not support |
| FL | Based on the majority commenting that the issue i seither too late/low prio or not supported, we don’t need to discuss this further. |

#### Proposal 1.5

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.5:**

**The PRS-RSRP per path report can include the time of arrival of the measured path.**

* **FFS: use of intra-TRP TDOA when reporting more than 1 PRS per TRP.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Not support. |
| ZTE | Support. In order to get path RSRP, UE of course has to get the first detected path first. The TOA and intra-TRP can benefit LMF to identify which resource corresponds to LOS direction when LOS path is blocked. However, path RSRP cannot do this if RSRP for LOS path is smaller that RSRP for NLOS path. |
| CATT | Support. We think it is useful to include the ToA of the measured path with the path PRS-RSRP reporting. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. This feature is helpful for LMF to find the beam direction toward LoS path. |
| CEWiT | Support. Path-ToA along with path-RSRP will be useful specially in obstructed LOS scenarios. |
| Xiaomi | Support. It is useful for LMF to decide which one is the first arrival path. |
| LG | Agree with the proposal. But, we think the proposal needs to be dealt with in AI 8.5.5. |
| Futurewei | Do not support, unproven optimization. |
| OPPO | Support the propoal. It is benefical to provide more information for each path. Each path definitely have different ToA and RSRP. |
| Ericsson | Support. Similar view with Nokia. |
| vivo | Same comment in online, we suggest to modify the PRS RSRP per path to path PRS RSRP  And for the FFS, it is unclear to us what is intra TRP TDOA since only per pair of dl-PRS-ID DL RSTD measurements is supported in R16. And “**more than 1 PRS per TRP**” is also unclear to us, could the proponents further explain it, Otherwise, we suggest to remove the FFS. |
|  |  |

#### Second round of discussion

Based on the comment, the proposal is revised to align the wording with “path PRS RSRP” and with the FFS removed.

**Proposal 1.5b:**

**The path PRS-RSRP report can include the time of arrival of the measured path.**

* **~~FFS: use of intra-TRP TDOA when reporting more than 1 PRS per TRP.~~**

**Proposal 1.5b**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |

#### Proposal 1.6 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.6:**

**Reporting of PRS RSRP per path is supported for DL-TDOA and multi RTT.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.6**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Related to PDP reporting in other subagenda. Discuss it there. |
| ZTE | We should focus on DL-AOD first. |
| Intel | We would prefer to consider it in the NLOS/multipath agenda item. |
| CATT | We think this issue can be discussed in AI 8.5.5 to avoid potential duplicated discussion. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to discuss this issue in AI 8.5.5. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| LG | We think the proposal needs to be dealt with in AI 8.5.5. |
| OPPO | Similar views as other companies, this can be handled in 8.5.5 |
| FL | Is sees there is consensus to move the issue to AI 8.5.5, so we can close the issue. |

#### Proposal 1.7 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.7:**

**The measurement report for AoD can include the UE AoA measurement and UE orientation.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Not support. UE AoA is the first time that we are discussing; too late to open this issue now. |
| ZTE | Open for further discuss. |
| Intel | This is OK for the PRU, so we can be supportive for the PRU only. In general case the orientation of the UE antenna is not known. |
| CATT | We prefer this issue to be low priority. |
| InterDigital | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think reporting of relative AoA with AoD measurement report is beneficial. |
| CEWiT | Support. FAP-AoA and UE-orientation reporting can help with NloS identification and mitigation. |
| Sony | Low Priority. How the UE obtain the orientation? |
| Futurewei | Do not support |
| OPPO | Do not support. The UE AoA and oeritention information are not useful. |
| LG | Not support. |
| FL | Based on the number of non-supporting companies, it is proposed not to discuss the issue online at this meeting and leave it open for the next meeting. |

#### Proposal 1.8 (closed)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 1.8:**

**The measurement reporting of PRS-RSRP per path for DL-AoD can be configured to be conditioned to a predefined threshold.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 1.8**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Unnecessary optimization or unclear the usefulness. Further discussion/motivation may be needed. |
| ZTE | RAN4 will decide the mapping table for path RSRP. There is no need to have such threshold. |
| CATT | We prefer to discuss this issue in RAN4. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. The benefit and motivation of this proposal are unclear to us. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have similar view with Qualcomm. |
| LG | We think it is up to RAN4. |
| Futurewei | Do not support |
| OPPO | Do not support. The motivation is not clear. |
| FL | the issue is either not supported or seen as suitable for RAN4. Therefore, we can close it for the meeting. |

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

#### Summary and Proposal 2.1

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. |

As in RAN1#105e, there is a majority of companies supporting an increase of the maximum number of PRS measured and reported via *NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement-r16*

* [3][6][7][8][10] [11] want to increase the number of measurements to be reported
* [9][15] want to stay with release 16 measurements capacity of 8 measurements in *NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement-r16*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [3] | ***Proposal 17***   * ***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.*** |
| [6] | ***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.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 2**: Support “Option 3: Up to N>8 measurements” as candidate enhancement. FFS value of N. |
| [8] | ***Proposal 2: Up to N>=8 measurements in a measurement report for reporting of RSRP measurement per TRP.*** |
| [9] | Proposal 5: For UE-assisted DL AoD, support Option1, up to 8 RSRP measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16). |
| [10] | ***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*** |
| [11] | **Proposal 1: For UE-assisted DL AOD, support up to N>=8 measurements for reporting of RSRP measurements per TRP.** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 2:***   * 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 3:***   * 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. |
| [15] | **Proposal 2**: 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. |

#### First round of discussion

It is proposed to continue discussing the proposal brought up during the last e-meetings. Considering the number of issues to be discussed during the meeting, this issue is given a lower priority.

As a side note, it should be understood one “measurement” in the proposal correspond to the measurement reported for a PRS for a given Rx-beam. The total number of measurements in a report should include the adjacent beams reporting (if agreed) as well as multiple Rx beams measurement for the same PRS.

**Proposal 2.1**

**For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 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**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 2.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Even though we are supportive, this is low priority, and prefer not to spend time on it online. |
| ZTE | Okay for this. But we don’t expect that more that 8 DL PRS RSRPs are associated with the same Rx beam index. In order to provide more information for LMF to decide which Rx beam index is the best, we should limit the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index.  We would like to have another FFS,  FFS: Limit the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index |
| Intel | Low priority |
| Fraunhofer | Support, N= 16. |
| CATT | Support this proposal and we prefer to discuss this issue with high priority.  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. And we are fine to limit the the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index. |
| Nokia/SB | We are generally okay, but we would like to make sure the measurement is DL PRS RSRP in the main bullet. |
| CEWiT | Low Priority. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are supportive of the proposal and share similar view with ZTE. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. But, we also prefer the proposal as a lower priority. |
| OPPO | Do not support. The motivation for reporting more than 8 is not clear. We can not use that the bitwidth of beam index being 8 in high layer signalling design to justify that. In NR FR2, the UE generally does not have so many Rx beams. And reporting the RSRP of PRS with respect to multiple different rx beam is not benefical technically. For each PRS/Tx beam, only the best beam pair link can provide valid AoD information. |
| FL | It seems the issue is still not reaching consensus. Regarding the measurement that in the first proposal, i agree with nokia that this is unclear. In the FL view, the measurement could be also the RSRP per path if it is agree/specified. But given the current specs, the agreement is limited to RSRP. Let’s clarify the proposal as follow:  **Proposal 2.1b**  **For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 DL PRS 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** |

#### Second round of discussion

The proposal is slightly reworded for clarity:

**Proposal 2.1b**

**For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 DL PRS 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**

**Proposal 2.1b**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** | |
| CATT | Support. | |
| Nokia/NSB | Support | |
| vivo | Support | |
| LG | Support. But, since the proposal can vary depending on the discussion on path RSRP, we prefer to discuss the proposal after that. | |
| Qualcomm | We are OK, but it is minor issue for us. | |
| OPPO | We prefer not to support.  As we explained in previous round, the justification for reporting more than 8 is not clear. We can not use that the bitwidth of beam index being 8 in high layer signalling design to justify that. In NR FR2, the UE generally does not have so many Rx beams. And reporting the RSRP of PRS with respect to multiple different rx beam is not benefical technically. For each PRS/Tx beam, only the best beam pair link can provide valid AoD information.  We would like to hear solid reason for why we must increase the number to be more than 8. | |
| ZTE | As we commented in last round, “we don’t expect that more that 8 DL PRS RSRPs are associated with the same Rx beam index. In order to provide more information for LMF to decide which Rx beam index is the best, we should limit the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index.  “  **For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 DL PRS 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** * **FFS: Limit the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index** | |
| FL | | Since the proposal is not completely stable, we can skip it at the GTW. We can see if we can resolve it offline and make further progress. |

#### third round of discussion

we can use ZTE’s proposal as a way forward for further discussion:

**proposal 2.1c**

**For UE-A DL-AOD, support reporting more than 8 DL PRS 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**

**FFS: Limit the maximum number of DL PRS RSRP associated with the same Rx beam index**

**Proposal 2.1c**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | Support.  We would like to provide the motivation and justifications of this proposal as follows,  At LMF side, the RSRPs measured from the DL PRSs of a TRP with the same Rx beam by a UE are normally used to calculate the DL-AoD from the TRP to the UE. The Figure below shows the beam patterns of 8 PRS resources, where DFT-based beamforming is assumed. For each beam, there are interference from the sidelobe of neighboring beams. It is complicated for LMF to obtain accurate DL-AoDs based the reported RSRP values. For example, given a reported RSRP value for a TX beam, a unique DL-AoD value may not be obtained (as there are multiple angles correspond to the same RSRP value) unless the RSRP corresponds to the borsight direction. For a UE with multiple Rx beams, if the RSRP measurements from the DL PRSs of a TRP using different RX beams are all reported, multiple groups of RSRP values, each group corresponds to an RX beam, could be obtained for the TRP. In other words, for each DL PRS resource, multiple RSRP measurements associate with different RX beams should be reported. Then, LMF would calculate multiple candidate DL-AoDs from the multiple groups of RSRP values, which provides the opportunity of improving the estimation accuracy of UE location.    **Figure : Beam pattern of PRS**  However, 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 an 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. In order to solve the problem, we propose to increase the maximum number N of RSRP measurements (denoted by N in the previous agreement) allowed for each TRP to be larger than 8. Whether to support N>8 could be subject to the UE capability. From our point of view, at least N=16 should be supported for reporting RSRP measurements corresponding to two Rx beams. Supportive of other values for N should further consider the increased reporting overhead.  We hope the above explanation will help understand the intention of the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sony | We still consider the legacy approach is sufficient. At least, low priority for now. |
| ZTE | OK with the proposal. |
| LG | Agree with principle. |
| Qualcomm | OK but low priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |

### Aspect #3 adjacent beam reporting

#### Summary

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 discussion progressed in RAN1#105e and the following agreement was made:

|  |
| --- |
| 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 |

The proposals in [1][3][4][5][6][7][8][9][10][12][14][16][18][19][20][21] can be summarized as follow:

* There is a strong correlation between proposals supporting option 1 and 4, i.e. supporting having the assistance data organized in subsets where each subset correspond to a beam and its associated/adjeacent beams. In [1][3][5] [6][9][12][19][21], it is proposed to organize to AD in subsets of PRS resources. [18] proposes to identify adjacent resources by resource index.
* [3][6][8][2][14][16][20] proposed to also support option 3 (boresight direction)
* [10][20] see the issue as a PRS prioritization discussion
* [4][7] see the issue as low priority or do not support the enhancement

Based on the proposals, it is propose to introduce adjacent beams by signalling the subsets of PRS beams adjacent to a given PRS. The impact on PRS processing priority should be discussed further. For example, whether the UE should process all “main beams” before processing “adjacent beams” or vice versa. Given the support for signaling of boresight direction, it is also proposed to be supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| Error: Reference source not found | ***Proposal 3: For dealing with assistance data to indicate the “adjacent beams”, select Option 4.***   * ***Option 4: the LMF sends the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of PRS resources.*** * ***Note: Option 2 can be discussed if PRS resource level priority is introduced.***   ***Proposal 4: Support indicating for a PRS resource (resource A) a subset of PRS resources (subset B) in the assistance data, and if UE reports RSRP of the resource A as the main result of DL-AoD, UE shall include the RSRP of the resources in the corresponding subset B.*** |
| [3] | ***Proposal 10***   * ***Support option 3 at least that providing the boresight direction of PRS resource to UE for UE-A DL-AoD.***   **Proposal 11**   * ***Support option 4 at least that providing expected AoD information to indicate that subset of PRS resources within it is a high priority to be measured and reporting.***   ***Proposal 12***   * ***DL-AoD measurement and reporting with the subset of PRS resources can be requested when the requirement of latency and power consumption is tight .*** |
| [4] | **Proposal 1: Down-prioritize the usage of assistance data (AD) to indicate adjacent beam. The similar enhancements can be obtained by on-demand PRS operation and/or two-stage beam sweeping to enable LMF to indicate specific PRS resources.** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 4: For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, support that the LMF sends the beam information in the assistance data with indicated subset of PRS resources.***  ***Proposal 5: For DL-AoD, LMF can request UE to measure and report on specific PRS resources***   * ***FFS: whether by implicit rules and/or explicit signaling*** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 2: For UE-Based and UE-Assisted DL-AOD positioning method in Rel-17, both option 1 and option 3 of the agreement of the last meeting should be supported:***   * ***Option 1: The LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD)*** * ***Option 3: The LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 5**: Do not support enhancements for adjacent beam reporting (i.e., do not support option 1). |
| [8] | ***Proposal 1: For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, downselect between the following to indicate adjacent beams in the signalling to the UE, we prefer option 4: the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of PRS resources.*** |
| [9] | Proposal 3: For DL-AoD positioning method, support Option 1, i.e., LMF indicates adjacent beams in assistance data:   * 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. |
| [10] | ***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. 3: 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).*** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 1:***   * For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, select Option 4 (‘the LMF send the beam information in the AD with indicated subset of PRS resources’) |
| [14] | **Proposal 3: Support Option 3 (The LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data)** |
| [16] | **Proposal 3-1**: Support that LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data |
| [18] | *Proposal 1: Adjacent PRS resources can be predefined by resource index.* |
| [19] | **Proposal 1: The LMF sends beam information in the AD with the indicated subset of PRS resources (Option 4).** |
| [20] | ***Proposal 1: Support Option 2 of transmitting the beam information in the AD with an explicit order of priority of PRS resources. Explicit priority indications can be signaled in the AD. Send LS to RAN2 to confirm signalling.***  ***Proposal 2: Support Option 3 to extend the current framework of providing boresight information in the case of UE-assisted DL-AoD positioning.***  ***Proposal 3: Reporting of beam information corresponding to Option 2, can be implicitly performed using the same prioritization order provided in the AD as configured by the LMF.*** |
| [21] | **Proposal 7 For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting: the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD). (Option 1 in the agreement at RAN1#105e)**  **Proposal 8 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) For each DL PRS Resource, one list of general neighbors.**  **Proposal 9 The UE should report the DL PRS-RSRP-PP measurement for the DL PRS Resource with the highest first path DL PRS-RSRP-PP measurement and all its neighbors.**  **Proposal 10 First path DL PRS-RSRP-PP measurements of adjacent DL PRS Resources that the UE reports should be performed using the same Rx-beam.** |

#### Proposal 3.1 (high priority proposal)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 3.1:**

**For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD) by signalling for each PRS resource a subset of PRS resources to be identified as adjacent to the PRS resource.**

**-FFS: how to distinguish between adjeacent resources in elevation and azimuth**

**-FFS: the impact of processing adjacent beams on PRS processing prioritizations**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 3.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Agree with the intention, and revise some wording as follows  **Proposal 3.1:**  **For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD) by signalling for each PRS resource in a subset of PRS resources to be identified as adjacent to the PRS resource.**  **-FFS: how to distinguish between adjacent resources in elevation and azimuth**  **-FFS: the impact of processing adjacent beams on PRS processing prioritizations** |
| Qualcomm | Not support. This feature can be supported by just reusing the boresight directions + expectedAoD. |
| ZTE | Not support. The same view as Qualcomm. |
| Fraunhofer | Support.  When considering Rel-17 enhancements for AoD, the boresight information will not be sufficient and can be also misleading. For UE-A, reduced information worsens the performance, which to overcome requires high signaling overhead that is not justified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support with revision:  **Proposal 3.1:**  **For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource a subset of PRS resources.**    **-FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources** |
| CATT | Support the vivo’s version.  In addtion, we think the following option is also can be included as the potential solution:   * The LMF includes boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support. We have similar view with Qualcomm |
| Xiaomi | It seems that the proposal is the combination of Option 1 and Option 4. Can we understand that the solution with indicating adjacent beams by PRS resource index is covered by this proposal? If yes, can we add an example into the sub-bullet: for example, indicate adjacent beams by PRS resource index? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Do not support. Explicit adjacent beam indication is not necessary rather this can be generalized in terms of how the UE is explicitly configured to prioritize the PRS resources to be measured, which already covers the cases where the beams to be measured are adjacent. |
| LG | Agree with the principle. But, in our understanding, we think that resource specific configration is not necessary if lists of subsets of PRS resources are configured. For example, if LMF provides two subset {Resource #0, Resource #2, Resource #5} and { Resource #1, Resource #3, Resource #4} and Resource #2 is the best performance at UE, UE may also report all of other resources which in the same subset. We think it is a simple and direct way. So, we prefer to modify the proposal as shown below:  **Proposal 3.1:**  **For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD) by signalling for ~~each PRS resource in~~ list of subsets of PRS resources to be identified as adjacent to the PRS resource.**  **~~-FFS: how to distinguish between adjacent resources in elevation and azimuth~~**  **-FFS: the impact of processing adjacent beams on PRS processing prioritizations** |
| Sony | Not support. |
| OPPO | Support the version from vivo |
| MTK | Basically we are negative for this proposal and we prefer the boresight indication which is proposal 3.2.  To move forward, we suggest both proposal 3.1 and 3.2 could be supported. It depends on UE to request which one as assistance information. And we do think that LMF can derive the direction without getting RSRPs of neighboring beams. We show example in our comment for proposal 3.2 |
| Ericsson | Support. The version of vivo or Huawei is OK with us. |
|  |  |

#### Second round of discussion

Based on the feedback, we can continue the discussion based on Huawei’s rewording:

**Proposal 3.1b:**

**For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource a subset of PRS resources.**

**-FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 3.1b**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support and prefer to support providing boresight direction with expectedAoD. We think it is an easier way to support this functionality. We only need to reuse of the boresight information and have not seen strong objection for introducing expectedAoD. |
| vivo | Support  To Nokia  If only the DFT beam is supported in Aspect#4, we also think only reuse of the boresight information is enough for this. But actually, the majority think power/angle is needed (we think it is for irregular DFTbeam), in this case, the proposal is needed. |
| LG | We are supportive with the proposal. But, as nokia mentioned, we can also agree that the fuctionality can be substitued by supporting proposal 3.2. we think that we don’t need to support all of them for same functionality. We need to check which is more suitable and has less specification impact. We are open to both of them. |
| QC | Not support: Unncesary signaling when there are simpler solutions possible with much lower specification impact. |
| Xiaomi | We want to clarify the solution with indicating adjacent beams by PRS resource index is covered by this proposal? For example, the subset of PRS resource is PRS resource with index from #i-4 to #i+4 except #i for the PRS resource with inde #i. |
| OPPO | Do not support. The updated proposal is not clear. Indicate ”a subset of PRS resources”: what is relationshop between this subset and the PRS resource? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. What is key to adjacent beams/boresight direction is that UE will report only the associated subset if the PRS resource is selected, i.e. if UE finds that PRS resource A has the highest RSRP, then UE will include in the measurement report the subset of PRS resource associated with resource A.  Even if boresight beam direction is provided to the UE, there is no clear behaviour defined for the UE on the report. |
| ZTE | Don’t support. The same view as Nokia. |
| SONY | Not support.  We think it is not necessary to provide AD for each PRS resource. Considering multiple PRS resources used in one measurement occasion, LMF may need to indicate a huge amount of subsets, which will end up with a heavy payload. |
| Apple | Not support. We share similar view as SONY, QC, OPPO |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Do not support, we still view this as a prioritization issue of select PRS resources and prefer this to be captured in the proposal as an FFS. |

#### Third round of discussion

The proposal was discussed online in the following form:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3.1c.**  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource, a subset of PRS resources which indicates the beam information for the purpose of DL-AOD measurement.   * FFS: Details on the subset of PRS resources * FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Support  We would like to further explain our understanding of the proposal. Signal(ling, v.t.) a subset of PRS resources for each PRS resource is more like indicates all adjacent information for each PRS resource by a generic solution for all the kinds of beams(including DFT beam). So, consider the generic solution(proposal 4.2) is supported firstly, could we also support a generic solution for adjacent beam?  In addition, we acknowledge it may impact the resource selection for reporting. For example, UE may choose the best PRS resource and corresponding PRS resource in the subset associated with the best PRS resource to be reported (the corresponding benefits have been shown in our Tdoc many times). But it also depended on further discussion. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear how this proposal is related to „resource management“ and not **only** for „resource selection for reporting“.  Explanation:   * The UE is expected to measure the PRS resources that meet the side conditions, either way. * So, for the UE to use the additional AD on „the subset of PRS resources“, it needs to first measure all the PRS resources, to determine the strongest PRS resource. * If either way the UE has to measure all of the,, then, why do we need the subset of PRS resources? * The only reasonable explanation seems to be that this can **only** affect the resource selection for reporting. In other words, if the UE can report only X RSRPs back to the network, and the set has >X resources inside, then provide a guidance to the UE which X RSRPs will be reported. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not support this proposal and still support proposal 3.2 for the following two reasons.  First, the similar functionality is provided with the minimum spec impact by expanding the current boresight information for UE-B to UE-A with expectedAoD. Second, we understand the UE behavior for meausrement (which PRS resource needs to be first measured) can be different, but we do not think the UE reporting behavior can be different. The UE has no obligation to report measurements for all PRS resources of a subset. Regarding the issue of providing the adjacent beam information, we think that the extension of foresight beam information with expectedAoD is the simple solution. |
| Fraunhofer | Support.  To QC: the discussion in Aspect #3 is to provide UE with AD to enable adjacent beam reporting. In our understanding the first three bullets are not part of the discussions in this aspect. Even though these can still be enhanced in principle by for example indicating the PRS acquistion resources within and over the subsets. It is also not clear how can the alternating proposal can resolve these concerns.  To Nokia: Regarding the functionality we don’t share the views given the agreement made on Aspect#4. On the second aspect, we don’t see that UE must report all resources within a subset as well, however this the detail that can be resolved within the FFS point. |
| ZTE | We don’t support this proposal.   * boresight direction for UE-B is supported in Rel-16. What we need to do is simpley extend the use case to UE-A. There is no much spec impact. * If UE is provided with boresight direction, UE can find any adjacent beams surrounded by a DL PRS resource rather than a subset of DL PRS resources as mentioned in this proposal. * Based on my understanding of this proposal, UE anyway has to measure all DL PRS resources to find a DL PRS resource corresponding to the largest RSRP, and be forced to report the subset associated with this DL PRS resource. We don’t see the need to restrict UE’s reporting behavior, it’s up to UE implementation if UE knows the boresight direction. |
| OPPO | Support.  The subset of PRS resouces for one PRS resource is used to indicate the relative spatial direction information. For one PRS resource, if UE reports the AoD measurement for it, the UE can also measure the AoD measurement of resources in the associated subset, those informnation can assist the LMF to refine the calculation of AoD. |
| vivo | Same views as Fraunhofer, and I am wondering why boresight direction is fine for aspect 3 and not for aspect 4? We can not accept this reason here.  In addition, for the question ” If either way the UE has to measure all of the,, then, why do we need the subset of PRS resources? “， we want to say this is a reason why we want to introduce adjacent beam to enhance AoD positioning. The performance benefit of the adjacent beam is shown in our and Ericsson's evaluation at least.  And for the situation of the set has >X resources, we believe it can be avoid by UE capability or order within set. To be honest, we don’t think it is a big issue since LMF knows UE capability and PRS location, even the maxDL-PRS-RSRP-MeasurementsPerTRP is decided by LMF.  Besides, we believe the proposal is as the name “assistance data” stands, they may help UE measure and report (resource selection in some scenario). It has no restriction on UE behavior and reporting. If companies have concern, whether we can add a note or FFS like that:  Note: This does not imply any restriction on UE measurement |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar understanding as QC, which is why we support the proposal.  It may not affect the UE PRS measurement procedure, but it affects the selection in the reporting if there is a maximum RSRP per TRP request from the LMF.  How about the following modification to make it clear?  **Proposal 3.1c.**  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource, a subset of PRS resources which indicates the beam information for the purpose of DL-AOD measurement.   * Subject to UE capability, a UE may include the RSRPs for the subset of the PRS in the DL-AoD additional measurements if RSRP of the associated PRS is reported in nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result. * FFS: Details on the subset of PRS resources * FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources   It is unclear to us for proposal 3.2 how such behaviour is defined in spec. We would be willing to compromise to accept 3.2 if the proponents can clarify, but we do not accept it being left entirely up to UE implementation. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks to HW & vivo, & all for their response. OK, so since now we are talking about reporting priotization, it is a bit more clear.  Do we agree that if the set have up X resources, and the UE supports up to X RSRP reporting, then the UE either way will report X RSRPs, if all meet the side conditions? So, it doesnt matter if it gets any additional AD or not.  So, the topic of discussion will be: the set has X resources, but the UE supports to report up to Y RSRPs, where Y<X. E.g, The set has 64 resources, and the spec only supports up to 8 resources, so in rel-16, the UE has to make a choice which resources to reports, and it seems some companies want to help the UE to pick which resources to report, right? This is what this proposal seems to be about.  If we agree that 3.1 helps with the RSRP reporting prioritization in the scenario explained above, the same could be done also in Proposal 3.2 as follows:   * Give to the UE the boresight directions of each PRS resource (already specified for UE-B) * The UE, at a baseline, performs all the measurements (similar to Proposal 3.1).   + Going a bit on a tangent here, but in Proposal 3.2 actually, if expectedAOD is provided, there may not even be a need for the UE to „attempt to measure“ all the beams. The UE could try to do some implementation-based optimizations / power-saving enhancements, to just use the expectedAoD and the boresight directions to measure and report the correct subset. In Proposal 3.1, such optimizations are not possible since the UE has to measure everything, and we are just talking about some reporting prioritization. * UE reports the PRS resources (up to the maximum the UE’s capability on RSRP reporting) by prioritizing those that are closest in the angular domain. „Closest in the angular domain“ could be defined as those that have min/max/average from both the angular or Zenith boresight directions.   In either Proposal 3.1 or 3.2, we have preference to keep the „measurement aspect“ up to the UE’s decision and implementation, and not be dicated by the network. |
| Xiaomi | It seems there are different understanding on the motivation of the proposal. From our understanding, it is to provide the adjacent beams of the PRS with the strongest PRS RSRP in the assiste data. And we try to understand the signaling in the proposal, does it mean there are two-step beam sweeping? In the first step, UE try to decide which PRS reousrce is the one with the strongest RSRP, then UE can measure the subset of PRS resource accosiated with the PRS resource with the strongest RSRP. If my understanding is right, compared to the way that indicating adjacent beams by PRS resource index and configuring all PRS resource in the first step, the pros of the proposal is to reduce the number of measured PRS resource? |
| MTK | We understand Huawei’s intention that it is actually related to what RSRP of resources to REPORT  In our views, UE find a resource with strongest RSRP and UE surely report it. UE may report other RSRPs with 2nd strongest, 3rd strongest and so on, which is to follow the measured RSRP strength, and report the corresponding differential RSRP with the strongest RSRP. It seems to us that this has been quite similar to report RSRP with a subset (neighbor beams)  It also seems to us that, following the order of measured RSRP strength for reporting is quite natural way. We can also consider this as a feasible solution of reporting |
| vivo | To MTK  What you said is why we propose to introduce an adjacent beam. Compared with the strongest beam selection, the adjacent beam selection has obvious performance improvement, which is shown in our and Ericsson’s Tdoc.  To Xiaomi  We have the same understanding with Qc and Huawei that it does not affect the UE PRS measurement procedure. Anyway, it is assistance data enhancement, right?  To Qc  We acknowledge proposal 3.1 is the same as proposal 3.2 if only consider the DFT Beam. But Just like QC proposed in 4.2, we should adopt a generic solution (It can be applied to all kinds of beams ) first other than a specific solution(It may only apply to some beam shapes ).  Besides, we would like to note expected AoD is more like UE location-associated information, the validity and performance is difficult to guarantee. And there is no test case for that information  Therefore, we propose  **Proposal 3.1c.**  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource, a subset of PRS resources which indicates the beam information for the purpose of DL-AOD measurement.   * FFS: Subject to UE capability, a UE may include the RSRPs for the subset of the PRS in the DL-AoD additional measurements if RSRP of the associated PRS is reported in nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result. * FFS: Details on the subset of PRS resources * FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources * Note: This does not imply any restriction on UE measurement |

#### Proposal 3.2 (high priority proposal)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 3.2:**

**For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, the LMF can include boresight direction information for each PRS resource in the assistance data.**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 3.2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support (together with expectedAoD so that this proposal is useful) |
| ZTE | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Don’t Support.  We think that boresight information can be usefull but not sufficient on its own. Additional AD, considering enhancements in this WI, related to prominent sidelobes due to antenna radiation imperfections, the azimuth/elevation information associated with main and sidelobes or beamwidth information needs to be provided as well for the UE to select the right “adjacent” PRS resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Do not support.  There is no clear UE behaviour defined for using the boresight direction. What can network expect from UE through providing the boresight direction? Are supporting companies willing to mandate how UE should process PRS with this AD? |
| CATT | Support as we had commented in proposal 3.1. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. In our understanding, this feature was already supported for UE-based positioning and it can be expanded to UE-assisted positioning. |
| Xiaomi | We think expected DL AoD/ZoD can provide more information |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Share similar view to Nokia. |
| LG | We have the same view as Nokia and Lenovo. |
| OPPO | Support.  In release 16, that informaiton is provided only to UE-based method. Such information is useful for UE-assist method too. |
| MTK | We support this proposal. From our perspective, the boresight indication is good enough.  The technical reason is, assume there are 8 beams, b0~b7, if for example b3 is the strongest beam and b2, b4 are neighboring beam of b3. UE reports a vector of RSRPs for [b3 b2 b4 b1 b5] or simply [b3 b2 b4], and this vector could be used to determine the direction. To report a vector of RSRPs [b3 b1 b5] can also determine the direction.  The report [b3 b1 b5] somehow could be better than [b3 b2 b4] because the change of RSRP difference between b3 and b1/b5 is larger than that between b3 and b2/b4 at different direction. Remember that some companies propose the concept of using differential beam together with normal beam, which is to consider larger RSRP difference between differenal beam and normal beam which may improve accuracy |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Again we would like to point out that supporting companies presume how UE should do with the AD, but specification should define UE behaviour, especially on the processing and reporting signaling.  Are all the companies agree to have boresight direction for UE-A DL-AoD, but leave all the others entirely up to UE implementation? |
| ZTE | Support. This proposal should be combined with expectedAoD.  Regarding the UE behavior, we think there could be two ways,   1. The same behavior as Rel-16. It’s up to UE how to use this information to process the DL PRS sources that are within the angle window. 2. When UE do duration calculation for buffering capability,UE only consider the DL PRS sources that are within the angle window. |
| Ericsson | Do not support. Proposal 3.1. provides a better alternative for the general cases. Depending on the beam shape, the boresight information gives an incomplete picture (for example, if the beams all do not have the same width). |
| Nokia/NSB | Question to Huawei,HiSilicon:  According to Proposal 3.1, should the UE report the PRS RSRP measurements for the multiple PRS resources within the subset of PRS resources?  In our understanding, the purpose of both proposals is to help UE identify adjacent beams and both proposals do not enforce UE to report measurements for specific PRS resource(s). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To Nokia:  We think that in proposal 3.1, we are expecting some behaviour from UE side.  Let’s assume the following association:   * PRS resource #0 – subset {PRS resource #A, PRS resource #B, PRS resource #C} * PRS resource #1 – subset {PRS resource #D, PRS resource #E, PRS resource #F} * PRS resource #2 – subset {PRS resource #G, PRS resource #H, PRS resource #I} * And so on   Then from UE perspective, it is expected to find the best Tx beam among PRS resource #0, #1, #2, and if e.g. PRS resource #1 yields the highest RSRP/first path RSRP, report measurements for the subset associated with PRS resource #1, i.e. {PRS resource #D, #E, #F}. Note that the resources with numerical IDs (0,1,2,...) may have overlap with alphabetic IDs (A,B,C,...).  There should be a clear impact on the UE behaviour at least on the reporting if we decided to enhance assistance data. |
| Nokia/NSB | In our understanding from the folloing which is captured from vivo’s revision (added ‘‘in‘‘)of Proposal 3.1, we are expecting the following UE behavior.  **“the LMF explicitly identify adjacent beams in the assistance data (AD) by signalling for each PRS resource in a subset of PRS resources to be identified as adjacent to the PRS resource. “**  For example, let us assume that there are 3 subsets.  Subset #1 = {PRS resource #1, PRS resource #2, PRS resource #3},  Subset #2 = {PRS resource #4, PRS resource #5, PRS resource #6},  Subset #3 = {PRS resource #7, PRS resource #8, PRS resource #9},  The LMF configures UE with the above three subsets, so that the UE can identify each PRS resource within a subset is transmitted with adjacent beam. Then, the UE is able to determine prioritization on which PRS resources the UE first estimate. For example, assuming equal transmission beam spacing between PRS resources, the UE first estimate PRS resource #2, resource #5 and resource #8. If the PRS resource #2 shows the highest RSRP, then next the UE may estimate PRS resource #1 and PRS resource #3. However, our understanding from this proposal is that whether or not to report RSRP for all PRS resources within the subset is totally up to UE since the UE is not indicated to report measurements for specific resources. If the LMF enforce UE to report measurements for specific PRS resources, we think that further agreement is necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To Nokia:  The subset division is not appropriate even for adjacent beams.  Let’s assume the beams from left to right is numbered with #1 to #9, but what Nokia proposed does not provide information that #3 and #4 are ajacent, and if UE measures #3, UE should also measure #2 and #4 for the sake of claimed benefit.  In addition, it is not clear given {PRS resource #1, #2, #3} whether #1 and #3 can be considered as adjacent, which I believe not.  Why not accept the following method, which can be easily extended in the current *NR-DL-PRS-Resource* IE?  PRS resource #1 – {PRS resource #2, PRS resource #3}  PRS resource #2 – {PRS resource #1, PRS resource #3}  PRS resource #3 – {PRS resource #2, PRS resource #4}  PRS resource #4 – {PRS resource #3, PRS resource #5}  PRS resource #5 – {PRS resource #4, PRS resource #6}  ...  We disagree with adding „in“ in the proposal, which only makes it obscure, and the original proposal (complied with the English grammar) in our understanding should be interpreted as  **(by) signal(ling, v.t.) a subset of PRS resources for each PRS resource ...** |
| vivo | We think the issue is almost the same as Aspect 4. That is, proposal 3.1 can be used for all kinds of beams, including DFT beams also, whereas proposal 3.2 is not...  In this case, could we accept a generic solution(proposal 3.1) firstly and consider any low-overhead optimizations at a later phase. |
| CATT | We support to accept the proposal 3.1 firstly, since proposal 3.1 is a general solution and more clear. |
| ZTE2 | Support.The boresight direction information is assistance date, which helps UE to identify the transmission beam directions. It’s up to UE implementation to decide the reported RSRPs. |

### Aspect #4 Support of additional gnodeB beam information (closed)

#### Summary

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 two options were agreed to be further discussed during RAN1#105e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  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 at least the following parameter:   + the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)   + antenna spacing dh and dv   + FFS: 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: 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 (angle, RSRP)intersection point) * Other options are not precluded * In either option, the gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF for UE-based DL-AoD |

The options were discussed in [1][2][3][4][6][7][9][10][13][14][18][19][21]. The options are supported as follow:

* Option 1 is proposed in [1][3][4][6][9][13][18]
* Option 2 is proposed in [2][3][7][10][14][19][21]
* Note:
  + [3] mention that both option could be supported for different cases.
  + [21] proposes to support option 2 via assistance data for UE based positioning, and without specification (i.e. via O&M) for UE assisted positioning.

Since the two option can be seen as complementing each other, it is proposed to discuss them separately.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| Error: Reference source not found | ***Proposal 5: Support to reuse the existing boresight direction to assist LMF/UE to emulate the beam response for Option 1 DFT-based angle calculation enhancement.***   * ***The boresight ZoD/AoD information should be based on DFT precoder without considering the spatial shaping of the antenna element radiation pattern.*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 5:*** *At least for UE-based DL-AOD, a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources can be provided to UE, where the angle is restricted to an expected uncertainty window provided by the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) range(s).* |
| [3] | * ***To decide whether to support Non-DFT-based beams information reporting before selecting one or more options from the previous agreement.*** * ***Support at least the following (option 1 in previous agreement) for the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gNB:***   + ***Option 1: the gNB reports the antenna configuration including at least the following parameter:***     - * ***the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)***       * ***antenna spacing dh and dv***       * ***(optionally) Antenna Element pattern Information, such as omnidirectional or directional***   + ***The antenna configuration is the actually used antenna configuration for the DL-PRS Resources in a TRP/ or an ARP.*** * ***Support option 2 in previous agreement for the Non-DFT-based beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gNB.*** * ***For Non-DFT-based beam/antenna information, support the following options:***   + ***Provide the typical parameter of beams (such as intersection point of multiple beams , beamwidth) for UE-A and UE-B DL-AoD.***   + ***Provide mapping table only for UE-A DL-AoD.*** |
| [4] | **Proposal 7: 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.** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 5: NR Rel-17 should support a gNB to report the transmission characteristics of a TRP beam to LMF, including:***   * ***The number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)*** * ***Antenna spacing dh and dv*** * ***For DFT-based beams, precoder information for each PRS resource (oversampling factor of the DFT-based beams)*** * ***Antenna element pattern information*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 3**: 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 4**: Include additional assistance data for UE based positioning, including TRP polarization and geometry. |
| [9] | ***Proposal 1: For beam/antenna information provided to LMF, do not support to select both Option 1 and Option 2.***  ***Proposal 2: Support Option 1 for the TRP to provide the assist information to the LMF:***   * ***In addition to the antenna configuration information, the TRP provides the precoder applied on each DL PRS resource.*** |
| [10] | ***Proposal 1: Support Option 2: Quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***   * ***Opt. 2A: Provide the relative power-level(s) for a configurable uniformly sampled angular window in azimuth and zenith with respect to the boresight direction of each PRS resource***   + ***E.g., For a window of [-60,60] degrees and [-30,30] degrees in azimuth and zenith dimensions respectively with a step size of 1 dB, provide the relative power-level.*** * ***Opt. 2B: Provide the angle(s) that a relative power-level is valid from a configurable power-level set.***    + ***E.g., (Azimuth, Zenith) angles for the [-1, -3, -5, -6, -9, -10, -12, -15, -20] dB relative power-levels***   ***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.*** |
| [13] | * **The beam/antenna information can be optionally reported by the gNB to LMF including the following parameters:**   + **The total number of antenna panels for horizontal and vertical dimensions – *Ng* and *Mg***   + **The distance spacing between the antenna panels in horizontal and vertical dimensions – *dg*,*H* and *dg*,*V***   + **The total number of antenna elements within the antenna panel for horizontal and vertical dimensions – *Np* and *Mp***   + **The distance spacing between the antenna elements within the antenna panel for horizontal and vertical dimensions – *dH* and *dV***   + **The signaling that the angular DL PRS boresight spatial directions correspond to the DFT-based pre-coded beams:**     - **The LMF may request the gNB for DL PRS Resource transmission using DFT pre-coded beams with the specific spatial directions defined by the set of the azimuth and zenith angles (*φn*, *θn*)**   + **Antenna element pattern information defined in the gain/angle table as shown in Table I, where antenna gain is represented as a function of the azimuth and zenith angles**     - **The granularity of the azimuth and zenith angles report can be set up equal to 1 [deg] or 0.1 [deg]**   + **The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF for UE-based DL-AOD:**     - **A UE may request the LMF for DL PRS Resource transmission using DFT pre-coded beams with the specific spatial directions defined by the set of the azimuth and zenith angles (*φn*, *θn*)** |
| [14] | **Proposal 2: Support Option 2 (the gNB reports a mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources)** |
| [18] | *Proposal 3: Prefer Option 1 for UE-B DL AoD positioning for the beam/antenna information provided by gNB.* |
| [19] | **Proposal 2: Support gNB to LMF reporting of information on the mapping of angle and beam gains for each of the PRS resources (Option 2). The information includes:**   * **A gain level for the reported main lobe and/or the side lobe levels.** * **A relative gain between the reported main lobe level and the side lobe levels.** |
| [21] | **Proposal 5 The LMF should be provided information of beams associated with PRS Resources over O&M. This can be done without specification impact.**  **Proposal 6 For UE based, the LMF can forward the information of beams associated with PRS resource in the form of a mapping of angle and beams gains for each of the PRS resources (option 2).** |

#### Proposal 4.1 (high priority proposal)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 4.1:**

**For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, the following is supported:**

* **the gNB can report the antenna configuration including one or more of the following parameters:**
  + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**
  + **antenna spacing dh and dv**
  + **PRS boresight direction**
  + **FFS: 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: Antenna Element pattern Information**
    - **FFS: Details**
  + **FFS: If additional information about panel/orientation is needed**
* **the gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF for UE-based DL-AoD**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 4.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | Suggest to remove the first FFS since DFT beam index and boresight directions are equivalent based following formula. So, already reported boresight directions are sufficient for DFT-based beams.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | , | (0) | |
| Qualcomm | Highest priority to progress on this Aspect #4.  Prefer to have a solution that works across a variety of TRP implementations, i.e. Proposal 4.2.  Proposal 4.1 could work for DFT beams only, but in many scenarios of interest, such beams are not being used. We need to have generic solutiosn that will work in a variety of scenarios (indoor, outdoor, FR1, FR2, etc). |
| ZTE | Okay with the proposal. |
| Intel | We also think that this is a high priority. We support the proposal 4.1 and think that reporting of the boresight directions is sufficient.  As for proposal 4.2, we believe that it would be more difficult to support, since gNB may not have the information on the measured antenna pattern at all. In that case the reporting of antenna parameters is much more feasible. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We do not need any of the FFS, and the boresight direction is already supported. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | “ PRS boresight direction” can be removed since it is already supported for UE-based AoD. |
| Qualcomm2 | To Intel: The biggest issue with this option is that it works only under some parametric-assumption. E.g., a DFT beam can be parametrized using 6 parameters (dH,dV, N, T, boresight ZOD, boresigh AoD), but what if the gNBs do not have DFT beams? We think that in many scnearios, such beams are not being used. Also, even if they are used, they are always „approximate“, so, we risk of both a model-mismatch and limited model applicability.  Even though we could be OK to have this solution as a 2nd option (without the FFS, i.e. just a DFT-based parametric expression with 6 configured parameters), it cannot be the mainstream/generic solution that UE-Based DL-AoD will use. |
| Nokia/NSB | Except for the FFS on precoder information, we are okay. |
| CEWiT | We support this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | PRS boresight direction has been already supported, thus it can be removed. |
| LG | We think that proposal. 4.1 and 4.2 have the same purpose and they were introduced in the last meeting. in this perspective, we think one of the proposals (options) should be selected. In our understanding, since the proposal is only useful for ULA, we prefer to support proposal 4.2. |
| Sony | Support the proposal |
| OPPO | Support the proposal |
| MTK | The actual beam shape needs to be calibrated. The DFT beam is just ideal, and in reality, the actual beam shape could be distorted by something like the phase mismatch between RF chain. So we are negative to proposal 4.1, and we prefer proposal 4.2 because 4.2 can use the actual beam shape through calibration |
| Ericsson | Do not support. As discussed in our contribution, such solution would limit implementation and assumes that the parameters are known to the gNB, which is not necessarily the case. |
| Intel | To QC:  We do not see these two options as competing to each other, each option has its advantages and disadvantages. We propose to combine Proposals 4.1 and 4.2 and not to split them.  Based on the discussion above and the comments received from the companies, we propose to remove the FFSs.  Suggest the following update of the Proposal 4.1:  **For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, the following is supported:**   * **the gNB can report the antenna configuration including ~~one or more of~~ the following parameters:**   + **the number of antenna elements (vertical and horizontal)**   + **antenna spacing dh and dv**   + **PRS boresight directions, i.e. azimuth and zenith angles of the boresight directions**   + **~~FFS: 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: Antenna Element pattern Information~~**     - **~~FFS: Details~~**   + **~~FFS: If additional information about panel/orientation is needed~~** * **the gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF for UE-based DL-AoD** |
| FL | We can use the latest wording from intel as an initial proposal for online discussion. |

#### Proposal 4.2 (high priority proposal)

#### First round of discussion

**Proposal 4.2:**

**For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, the following is supported:**

**The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP**

* **FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization**
* **FFS: how the report is constructed.**
  + **Opt. A: Provide the relative power-level(s) for a configurable uniformly sampled angular window in azimuth and zenith with respect to the boresight direction of each PRS resource**
  + **E.g., For a window of [-60,60] degrees and [-30,30] degrees in azimuth and zenith dimensions respectively with a step size of 1 dB, provide the relative power-level.**
  + **Opt. B: Provide the angle(s) that a relative power-level is valid from a configurable power-level set.**
  + **E.g., (Azimuth, Zenith) angles for the [-1, -3, -5, -6, -9, -10, -12, -15, -20] dB relative power-levels**
  + **Other options are not precluded.**
* **FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information**

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 4.2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | Suggest to add option C as follows  **Opt. C: Provide the** **beamwidth for the fixed relative power level**   * + **E.g., beamwidth for the -3 dB relative power-levels** |
| Qualcomm | Highest priority proposal. Support of this proposal.  This solution is more generic, applies across a variety of TRP implementations and can be easily specified.  To vivo: Option C is a subset of Option B for a relative power level of {-3 dB} only. |
| ZTE | Opt.A. We prefer FFS the angular window |
| Intel | We prefer option 1 (proposal 4.1), since we think it is more feasible to support it. But we are OK to support option 2 (proposal 4.2) as well. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure why Power/Angle response per resource is used.  To our understanding, Power/Resource per Angle is more appropriate. It matches DL-AOD reporting, where the UE only reports multiple pair of Power/Resource, and LMF is targeted to find the best match in the angle domain angle.  We are afrait the current mechanism would require the same normalization of radiated power across all PRS resource and angles, which is not necessary, and rediation pattern may also reveal the antenna element radiation pattern.  For Option A, not clear why we need uniformly sampled angle, which is too restrictive.  For Option B, it is not possible to measure the –XdB rediation circle in the 3D space.  If such value is obtained through real test, network would need to ensure the same distance between TRP and testing point so that there is no pathloss impact.  If such value is obtained through emulation, the antenna radiation pattern needs to be considered.  So to our understanding, if the rediation pattern is used, we should go with the following alternative:  **The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.**   * **For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.** * **The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in the angle** |
| CATT | We think it is important to discuss and determine the formats of beam/antenna information provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, but we think RAN3 also should be involved and an LS is needed after we had the conclusion.  We prefer the updated Proposal 4.2 as follows,  **Updated Proposal 4.2:**  **For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, the following is supported:**  **The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP**   * **FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization** * **FFS: how the report is constructed.**   + **Opt. A: Provide the relative power-level(s) for a configurable uniformly sampled angular window in azimuth and zenith with respect to the boresight direction of each PRS resource**   + **E.g., For a window of [-60,60] degrees and [-30,30] degrees in azimuth and zenith dimensions respectively with a step size of 1 dB, provide the relative power-level.**   + **Opt. B: Provide the angle(s) that a relative power-level is valid from a configurable power-level set.**   + **E.g., (Azimuth, Zenith) angles for the [-1, -3, -5, -6, -9, -10, -12, -15, -20] dB relative power-levels**   + **Other options are not precluded.** * **FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information**   **Send LS to RAN3 informing them of the agreement** |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm2 | To HW: it looks your proposal just reports something similar, in a different parametrization, and it is a 2nd order detail. What about the following, to try to clarify this in the next meeting?  ***For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, decide to support one of the following options:***   * ***Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***    + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource*** * ***Option 2.2: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.***   + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle***   + ***For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.*** * ***FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization*** * ***FFS: how the report is constructed*** * ***FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information*** * ***The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF*** * ***Send an LS to RAN2 & RAN3 with this agreement*** |
| CEWiT | We prefer Proposal 4.1 but we are okay with this proposal too. |
| Xiaomi | Is it to select one of Proposal 4.1 and Proposal 4.2, or to support both of them and each will be used in different scenario? |
| LG | Same with our comment’s in the proposal 4.1. |
| Sony | We are OK with the updated proposal made by QC2. |
| OPPO | DO not support.  Proposal 4.1 is engouh. We do not support to specify dulipate functions. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to discuss Proposal 4.1 and Proposal 4.2 together. Since the purpose of the two proposals is to provide the same functionality for the angle calculation, we do not see the necessity of supporting both options (Proposal 4.1 and 4.2). That is, if this proposal provides a more general solution with reasonable overhead and is agreed upon, we do not see a strong necessity to support Proposal 4.1. |
| MTK | The modified proposal by QC2 matches our thinking. And both option 2.1 and 2.2 are feasible to realize using a vecor of reported RSRPs to find the direction  So we support QC2’s modified proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with QC’s update proposal.  We do not think an LS to RAN2/RAN3 would be helpful since RAN1 has not made any conclusion on the options yet. Is the intention to let RAN2/RAN3 to check the feasibililiy to be developed by RAN1? |
| Ericsson | We support the LMF to forward this information tot he UE, but think that it is un-necessary to have the gNB-LMF interface specified. In general the gNB does not have knowledge oft he beam implementation and the information would be loaded to the LMF in O&M |
| Qualcomm3 | To address E// comment: Can we say: up to RAN2/RAN3 the signaling/procedures on how the LMF receives this information from the gNBs.  To HW: No i dont think the intention is to check feasibility. As pointed out by E//, it seems that there might need to be discussions from other groups on how the LMF gets that information. Discussing these aspects in RAN1 will just burn unncessary time.  To OPPO (and supports of Proposal 4.1): Proposal 4.1 technically and fundamentally cannot do the same as this proposal. If OPPO thinks that a single solution should be specified, then it should Porposal 4.2 since: it can be used for all kinds of beams, inlcuding DFT beams also, whereas the other way around is not true.. It is beyond technical doubt, that if one option is to be chosen, a solution that is general and can address a variety of TRP & scenarios should be chosen. Proposal 4.1 can be thought as a low-overhead optimization that is applicable to a limited set of scenarios. We are not in a stage that overhead optimizations, nor reducing the scope of our solutions should be considered as the main way forward. Additional enhancements can be considered in the future, but we need to have our baseline straight here.  We urge proponents of 4.1 to accept a generic solution and consider any low-overhead optimizations at a later phase. Please se updated proposal below:  ***For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, decide to support one of the following options:***   * ***Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***    + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource*** * ***Option 2.2: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.***   + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle***   + ***For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.*** * ***FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization*** * ***FFS: how the report is constructed*** * ***FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information*** * ***The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF*** * ***Note: Up to RAN2 & RAN3 the signaling/procedures on how the LMF receives this information from the gNBs***   ***Send an LS to RAN2 & RAN3 with this agreement*** |
| ZTE | We’re generally fine with the proposal from Qualcomm3. However, we think it’s too early to send LS toRAN2&RAN2 before we make decision of down-selection and all FFS points. |
| Apple | Support proposal from Qualcomm3 |

#### second round of discussion

The last comment from Qualcomm can be used as a basis for discussion, with the proposed 3rd option from vivo. Proposal 4.1. and 4.2. both have supporters and oponents with strong opinion. It seems that P4.2. has advanced more, but we can discuss both at the next GTW.

**Proposal 4.2b**

***For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, decide to support one of the following options:***

* ***Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP*** 
  + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource***
* ***Option 2.2: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.***
  + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle***
  + ***For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.***
* ***Option 3:* Provide the beamwidth for the fixed relative power level** 
  + **E.g., beamwidth for the -3 dB relative power-levels**
* ***FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization***
* ***FFS: how the report is constructed***
* ***FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information***
* ***The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF***
* ***Note: Up to RAN2 & RAN3 the signaling/procedures on how the LMF receives this information from the gNBs***
* ***Send an LS to RAN2 & RAN3 with this agreement***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 is a subset of Option 2.1 with just a single power-level. It could just be a subbulet inside option 2.1; and no need to split it for now.   * ***Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***    + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource***   + ***FFS: How many relative power levels can be included (e.g., single -3 dB power-levels, multiple power-levels, etc).*** |
| ZTE | OK with the suggestion from Qualcomm. |
| vivo | We support the FL proposal, but for the sake of progress, we can accept QC‘s proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with either FL’s or Qualcomm’s version of the proposal. |
| CATT | Support the QC’s version above. |
| FL | Let’s use the rewording from qualcomm at the next GTW. I will not change the wording further, but based on the number of unresolved FFS, it seems too early to send the agreement in an LS to other working groups:   **Proposal 4.2c**  ***For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, decide to support one of the following options:***   * ***Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP***    + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource***   + ***FFS: How many relative power levels can be included (e.g., single -3 dB power-levels, multiple power-levels, etc).*** * ***Option 2.2: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.***   + ***The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle***   + ***For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported.*** * ***FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization*** * ***FFS: how the report is constructed*** * ***FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information*** * ***The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF*** * ***Note: Up to RAN2 & RAN3 the signaling/procedures on how the LMF receives this information from the gNBs*** * ***Send an LS to RAN2 & RAN3 with this agreement*** |

#### Conclusion

the discussion produced the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  For the beam/antenna information to be optionally provided to the LMF by the gnodeB, decide to support one of the following options:   * Option 2.1: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power/Angle response per PRS resource per TRP   + The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power of that resource   + FFS: How many relative power levels can be included (e.g., single -3 dB power-levels, multiple power-levels, etc). * Option 2.2: The gNB reports quantized version of the relative Power between PRS resources per angle per TRP.   + The relative power is defined with respect to the peak power in each angle   + For each angle, at least two PRS resources are reported. * FFS: support of multiple levels of quantization * FFS: how the report is constructed * FFS: overhead reduction mechanisms, including reusing of associated-dl-PRS-ID as a way of signaling that 2 TRPs have the same beam information * The gNB beam/antenna information can optionally be provided to the UE by the LMF * Note: Up to RAN2 & RAN3 the signaling/procedures on how the LMF receives this information from the gNBs * Send an LS to RAN2 & RAN3 with this agreement |

### 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 |

Proposals in provide updated view on the issue. As in RAN1#105e, there is a split of support between the options, with contribution also mentioning not introducing the expected AoA/AoD value and uncertainty, or instead using the signalling of PRS IDs corresponding to the window:

* Option 1 is supported by [2][3][5][10][15][18]
  + use of PRS ID(s) to cover the expected value and uncertainty is mentioned in [21]
* Option 2 is supported by [1][7]
* Use of a PRS as reference direction is mentioned in [6], and use of PRS ID(s) to cover the expected and uncertainty is mentioned in [21]
* [9] does not support introducing the feature

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| Error: Reference source not found | ***Proposal 6: 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.*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 4:*** *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 TRP (or a single ARP if configured) are associated with a single value of Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value).*   *Note: The expected uncertainty window is defined by the LOS direction between a TRP (or a ARP if configured) and a UE.* |
| [3] | **Proposal 5**   * ***Support to provide the boresight angle of the PRS resource first for selecting PRS resources by expected DL-AoD/ZoD.***   **Proposal 6**   * ***Support intention 1 first for providing an Expected DL-AoD/ZoD and uncertainty information to indicate a subset of DL PRSs expected to be measured in an angle range.***   ***FL note: intention 1 refers to using expected AoD to select the PRS resources to be measured.***  **Proposal 7**   * ***The validity of the expected DL-AoD (for example: one-shot information) may need to be considered since the expected DL-AoD will easily be changed with the UE movement.***   **Proposal 8**   * ***If expected AoD is supported in Rel-17 positioning, adopt the expected AoD as in the following table.***  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | ***Expected RSTD*** | ***Expected AoD*** | | Parent IE | *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData* | *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData-r17,or RequestLocationInformation* | | Value range | +/- 500 us | 0-360 degree | | Cast Type | Unicast and broadcast | Unicast | | Update Rate | Cell-specific information and Update with the *NR-DL-PRS-AssistanceData* | One-shot UE-specific information and Update when transmitted *RequestLocationInformation* | | Present | Mandatory present | Optional present |   ***Proposal 9***   * ***Expected DL-AoD is provided to the UE for each TRP.*** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 6: For the purpose of both UE based and UE assisted DL-AoD, the LMF can provide the UEwith the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value and uncertainty (of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD value) ranges if these can be accurately determined.*** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 3: The reference direction of the expected DL-AoD/ZoD or DL-AoA/ZoA, which can be the resource ID(s) of DL/UL reference signals or SSB index, should be indicated to UE.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 9**: 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 10**: 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 11**: 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. |
| [9] | Proposal 4: On uncertainty window for DL-AoD, support Option 3, i..e, do not introduce expected AoD/ZoD or AoA/ZoA and uncertainty |
| [10] | ***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*** |
| [15] | **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. |
| [17] | **Proposal 1:**   * **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** |
| [18] | *Proposal 2: 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.* |
| [21] | Proposal 11 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. |

Based on the discussion, the proposal from RAN1#105e is amended to include the proposal of [21] as an alternative to the AoD/ZoD uncertainty. As it is now time to converge on the issue, the proposal is reworded to support both options, with the understanding that the discussion will make the proposal evolve (option 3 being covered if the proposal is not supported).

**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, the following is supported**

* **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**
  + - **FFS: how to signal value and range:**
      * **Option A: 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 B: a list of PRS indices corresponding to the uncertainty, with one PRS index identifying the expected value, if any.**
* **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**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Support only Option 1. This feauture is useful for the UE to focus its efforts to a limited set of beams, and have some prior information about the AoD. It is unclear why it has created so much controversy. |
| ZTE | Option 1. We think this is a high priority proposal. |
| Intel | Support option 2, i.e. DL-AOA/ZOA value and uncertainty range reporting at least for the PRU with the known antenna orientation in space. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. It is direct from UE Rx perspective. |
| CATT | Support either Option 1 or Option 2, but not the both options. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support both options. If we need down-select, at least option 2 is necessary to help UE determine Rx beam direction. |
| CEWiT | We prefer Option-1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We perfer to select either Option 1 or Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | We think only one is needed and we prefer Option 1. |
| LG | We are open to discuss it. But, if we want to select one of them, we slightly support option 2 because it is more UE perpective. |
| FL | We can try bringing the discussion at the GTW if there is time, but other items can be prioritized. |
| Qualcomm2 | With this it is an improtnat item to be solved. We dont see why other items shoudl be prirotized. |
| ZTE2 | We can try to treat the Proposal 3.1,3.2 and 5.1 together. We prefer to support both proposal 3.2 and 5.1. |

### Aspect #6 2-step beam refinement

#### Summary and FL proposal

RAN1#105e was the first meeting where 2-step beam refinement/sweeping was discussed. In [1]

[2][4][5][6][7][9][10][11][12][19][20], the understanding of what a 2-step procedure would include was discussed by companies. The following was identified:

* [1][5] uses the 2-step procedure for coupling a PRS “normal beam” to a second “differential beam”
* [4][10][11][] proposes that a 2 step procedure should be coupled to on demand PRS
* [6][7][9][12][19][20] discuss association/refinement between PRS in two separate resource sets in the same TRP
  + - [7] further details that the second resource set in the 2 step procedure is the one used for reporting.
* [2] proposes to deprioritize the issue

Since the discussion is relatively new, a good first step is to clarify whether the discussion should be part of the on-demand PRS agenda. If so, we can close the discussion in this AI. If the discussion continues as part of the AoD agenda, since a lot of pressing issues need to be closed, it is proposed to downprioritize the issue.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1] | ***Proposal 7: Support 2-stage PRS beam sweeping for differential beam where the first PRS resource set corresponds to the normal beam and the second PRS resource set corresponds to the differential beam.***  ***Proposal 8: No need to discuss reconfiguration of a single resource set to enable 2-stage beam sweeping.*** |
| [2] | ***Proposal 9:*** *Don’t support or at least* *deprioritize corresponding enhancements on two-stage PRS beam sweeping.* |
| [4] | **Proposal 2: Support LMF to assist gNBs to facilitate the two-stage beam sweeping operation. It can be performed such as LMF configures sweeping beam directly by on-demand PRS, or LMF sent assistance information to gNB (e.g., the expected AoD range, beam width).**    **Proposal 3: Support two-stage beam sweeping for DL-AOD and DL-TDOA positioning** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 2: Support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.***  ***Proposal 3: In the aspects of PRS resource configuration, DL transmission beam indication and UE measurement and report needs to be included in order to support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.*** |
| [6] | ***Proposal 4: For two-stage PRS beam sweeping, the dynamic association between DL PRS resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets of the same TRP should be supported.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 6**: Support association between resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets (at the same TRP) to facilitate support of two stage beam sweeping.    **Proposal 7:** In two-stage beam sweeping DL-AoD, the positioning report should be generated only based on the second-stage PRSs.    **Proposal 8:** Support and study on-demand PRS framework for two-stage PRS beam sweeping. |
| [9] | Proposal 7: Support UE-specific beam refinement on DL PRS resource in On-demand DL PRS.  Proposal 8: For beam refinement on DL PRS:   * Support to provide DL PRS beam information (NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo) to the UE for DL-AoD methods. * Do not introduce additional association between PRS resources for beam operation. |
| [10] | ***Proposal 8: With regards to two-stage beam sweeping, treat it within the on-demand PRS framework and support the UE to be able to report one or more desired beam directions / PRS resources / PRS resource sets from the already configured AD or the potential on-demand PRS configurations.*** |
| [11] | **Proposal 2: For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL methods, support a two-stage DL PRS beam sweeping, and the discussion can be put under the on-demand DL PRS subagenda.** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 4:***   * Regarding 2-stage PRS beam sweeping, RAN1 should consider the following procedure for 2-stage beam reporting:   + In case of the first PRS resource set, it can be composed of multiple PRS resources and they are associated with wide beams.   + And then, the multiple PRS resources that are in the second PRS resource set can be associated with narrow beams. LMF can configure associated PRS resources based on the measurement report in the first step. |
| [19] | **Proposal 3: For improving device efficiency, support a procedure that enables the device to activate or deactivate measurements on DL-PRS resources in the second stage depending on the received associated DL PRS resources in the first stage.** |
| [20] | ***Proposal 4: Association between resources belonging to two DL PRS resource sets of the same TRP can be enabled by a grouping ID and can be signalled in the assistance data.***  ***Proposal 5: Two-stage PRS beam sweeping can be enabled by the on-demand PRS mechanism.*** |

**Proposal 6.1:**

**The discussion on 2-step beam refinement is moved under the on-demand PRS agenda**

#### First round of discussion

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| CATT | We prefer to sitll discuss 2-step beam refinement in AI 8.5.3, since this issue is not only related to on-demand PRS, but also the normal DL PRS. |
| InterDigital | It is ok to discuss how the 2-step beam sweeping can be realized by on-demand PRS under the on-demand PRS AI. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not agree with FL’s proposal. This 2-step beam for DL-AoD is related to both AI 8.5.3 and AI 8.5.6. Even if we discuss this issue on others agenda, it also needs discussion in this AI 8.5.3. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok to discuss this in the on-demand PRS AI, although enhancing the association between PRS in two separate resource sets of the same TRP can impact the DL-AoD procedure. |
| LG | We also think that the pressing issues in this agenda outnumber the AI for on-demand PRS. To balance and to smooth progress, we agree with FL’s proposal. |
| SONY | OK to discuss in on-demand PRS. We consider 2-step beam refinement can be applied to both DL-AoD and DL-TDOA. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To Nokia, with the proposal suggestion in 3.1c, two-staged beam sweeping can be supported if the subset of PRS resources and the corresponding PRS resource are in two PRS resource sets.  **Proposal 3.1c.**  For UE-assisted DL-AOD positioning method, to enhance the signaling to the UE for the purpose of PRS resource(s) measurement and reporting, the LMF indicates in the assistance data (AD) for each PRS resource, a subset of PRS resources which indicates the beam information for the purpose of DL-AOD measurement.   * Subject to UE capability, a UE may include the RSRPs for the subset of the PRS in the DL-AoD additional measurements if RSRP of the associated PRS is reported in nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result. * FFS: Details on the subset of PRS resources * FFS: the impact of processing the subset of PRS resources |

## Other aspects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [2] | * ***Proposal 6****: To extend the application scope of DL PRS Rx beam index, when the UE reports DL PRS-RSRP measurements from* ***DL PRS resource sets associated with the same positioning frequency layer and the same TRP****, the UE may indicate which DL PRS-RSRP measurements associated with the same higher layer parameter DL PRS Rx beam index have been performed using the same spatial domain filter for reception.* |
| [2] | ***Proposal 7:*** *To address the issue on DL PRS-RSRP measurements reporting for DL-AOD when different DL PRS resource sets are configured with different transmission powers, considering at least one of the following options,*   * *Option 1: All DL PRS resource sets associated the same TRP should be configured with the same transmission power.* * *Option 2: The additional DL PRS-RSRP measurement can be less than, equal to or larger than zero according to the mapping table designed in TS 38.133 of Table 10.1.24.3.2-2.* * *Option 3: Supporting UE to report more than one absolute DL PRS-RSRP measurements per TRP.* * *Option 4: Supporting UE to report scaling RSRP.* |
| [2] | ***Proposal 8****: The source reference signal for QCL of a target DL PRS resource can be,*   * *A SSB: the SSB and the target DL PRS resource are from the same band. Meanwhile, the associated Physical Cell ID of the SSB should be the same as corresponding information associated the target DL PRS resource.* * *A source DL PRS resource: the source DL PRS resource and the target DL PRS resource are from the same positioning frequency layer (or the same band) and the same TRP.* |
| [5] | ***Proposal 7: For two-stage PRS beam sweeping, support that one PRS resource set corresponding to wide beams with each PRS resource is associated with the PRS resources in another PRS resource set corresponding to narrow beams.*** |
| [7] | **Proposal 13:** RAN1 to specify support for enabling a PRU 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 ability of reference device to determine beam offset errors are present. |
| [18] | *Proposal 4: Estimate the angle error by a reference node whose accurate location is known.* |

#### Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | We encourage interested companies to further consider the proposals 6,7,8 from ZTE, which includes some problems in Rel-16 that may impact the DL-AOD positioning . |

1. Conclusion

**TBD**
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