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1. Introduction

This document presents a summary of submitted contributions to AI 9.5.1.1 (“SL positioning reference signal”) and the discussions and decisions during RAN1 #112bis-e meeting.

[112bis-e-R18-Pos-01] Email discussion on SL positioning reference signal by April 26 – Debdeep (Intel)

* Check points: April 21, April 26

As part of the Rel-18 WI on expanded and improved NR positioning Error: Reference source not found, the following objectives towards support of SL positioning are discussed under this agenda item.

|  |
| --- |
| * **Specify solutions for support of sidelink positioning (including ranging) in NR systems, including the following [RAN1, RAN2, RAN3, RAN4]:**   + **Specify SL PRS for support of sidelink positioning such that the SL PRS uses a comb-based (full RE mapping pattern is not precluded) frequency domain structure and a pseudorandom-based sequence where the existing sequence of DL-PRS is used as a starting point [RAN1].**     - **Specify support for SL PRS bandwidths of up to 100 MHz in FR1 spectrum.**     - **NOTE: SL PRS transmission in FR2 is not precluded but no FR2 specific aspects will be specified.**   + Specify measurements to support RTT-type solutions using SL, SL-AoA, and SL-TDOA [RAN1, RAN2].   + Specify support of resource allocation for SL PRS:     - Including resource allocation Scheme 1 and Scheme 2, where Scheme 1 corresponds to a network-centric SL PRS resource allocation and Scheme 2 corresponds to UE autonomous SL PRS resource allocation [RAN1].       * For resource allocation mechanism for SL PRS in Scheme 2:         + Study and specify support of sensing-based resource allocation, and/or a random resource selection [RAN1].         + Study and specify solutions for congestion control for SL PRS and/or inter-UE coordination for SL-PRS [RAN1].     - Support resource allocation for shared resource pool with Rel-16/17/18 sidelink communication and dedicated resource pool for SL PRS [RAN1].       * NOTE: For SL positioning resource (pre-)configuration in a shared resource pool with Rel-16/17/18 sidelink communication, backward compatibility with legacy Rel-16/17 UEs should be ensured.   + **Specify procedures for transmit power control for SL PRS transmissions at least based on open loop power control (OLPC) [RAN1].**   + Specify signalling and associated UE behavior for support of unicast, groupcast (not including many to one) and broadcast of SL PRS transmissions [RAN1, RAN2].   + Specify reporting signalling and procedures to facilitate support of SL positioning in all coverage scenarios and for PC5-only and joint PC5-Uu scenarios [RAN2, RAN3]:     - Specify the protocol and procedures for SL positioning between UEs (Protocol for Sidelink positioning procedures (SLPP)).     - Specify the protocol and procedures for SL positioning between UEs and LMF.   + Specify signalling to NG-RAN for sidelink positioning and ranging service authorizations as needed. [RAN3, RAN2]   + Specify corresponding new core requirements, as well as identifying and specify the impact on the existing RAN4 specification, including RRM measurements and procedures [RAN4]. |

Based on the submitted contributions to RAN1 #112bis-e meeting, the discussion points are categorized into the following topics:

* SL PRS design
  + SL PRS resources and resource sets
  + Sequence design for SL PRS
  + Mapping SL PRS to physical resources
  + Multiplexing of different SL PRS resources
    - *NOTE: PSCCH and control information associated with SL PRS are expected to be discussed in AI 9.5.1.3*
  + Other issues
* Transmit power control for SL PRS
  + General considerations
  + Open loop PC (OLPC) for SL PRS transmissions

Please follow the naming convention in this example:

* *SLPRS\_FLS -v000.docx*
* *SLPRS\_FLS -v001-CompanyA.docx*
* *SLPRS\_FLS -v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*
* *SLPRS\_FLS -v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*

If needed, you may “lock” a spreadsheet file for 30 minutes by creating a checkout file, as in this example:

* Assume CompanyC wants to update *SLPRS\_FLS-v002-CompanyA-CompanyB.docx*.
* CompanyC uploads an empty file named *SLPRS\_FLS-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.checkout*
* CompanyC checks that no one else has created a checkout file simultaneously, and if there is a collision, CompanyC tries to coordinate with the company who made the other checkout (see, e.g., contact list below).
* CompanyC then has 30 minutes to upload *SLPRS\_FLS-v003-CompanyB-CompanyC.docx*
* If no update is uploaded in 30 minutes, other companies can ignore the checkout file.
* Note that the file timestamps on the server are in UTC time.

To avoid excessive email load on the RAN1 email reflector, please note that there is NO need to send an info email to the reflector just to inform that you have uploaded a new version of this document. Companies are invited to enter the contact info in the table below.

## [High] FL1 Question 1-1

* *Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this agenda item:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| CATT | Xiaotao Ren | [renxiaotao@catt.cn](mailto:renxiaotao@catt.cn) |
| vivo | Yuanyuan wang | yuanyuan.wang.txyj@vivo.com |
| Fraunhofer | Mohammad Alawieh | mohammad.alawieh@iis.fraunhofer.de |
| OPPO | Shichang Zhang | shichangzhang@oppo.com |
| Panasonic | Yang KANG | Yang.kang@sg.panasonic.com |
| LGE | Woo-Suk Ko | woosuk.ko@lge.com |
| Spreadtrum | Zhenzhu Lei | Reven.lei@unisoc.com |
| Apple | Kome Oteri | ooteri@apple.com |
| Futurewei | George Calcev | gcalcev@futurewei.com |
| Continental Automotive | Reuben George Stephen | [reuben.george.stephen@continental-corporation.com](mailto:reuben.george.stephen@continental-corporation.com) |
| Qualcomm | Gabi Sarkis | gsarkis@qti.qualcomm.com |
| InterDigital | Fumihiro Hasegawa | Fumihiro.hasegawa@interdigital.com |
| Nokia, NSB | Torsten Wildschek, Prajwal Keshavamurthy | torsten.wildschek@nokia.com,  prajwal.keshavamurthy@nokia.com |
| Toyota | Claude Arzelier | claude.arzelier@toyota.com |
| ZTE | Mengzhen Li | li.mengzhen@zte.com.cn |
| NEC | Ying Zhao | zhao\_ying@nec.cn |
| Philips | Dan Jiang | dan.jiang@philips.com |

1. SL PRS Design
   1. SL PRS resources and resource sets

**Background:** For DL PRS, a hierarchical structure is defined starting with DL Positioning Frequency Layer (DL PFL), DL PRS resource sets, and DL PRS resources.

During RAN1 #112 meeting, the following agreements were made:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  A SL PFL is not defined. SL positioning RS are defined directly with respect to and contained within a single SL BWP and carrier.  **Agreement**  Support SCS values for SL PRS include:   * + 15 kHz, 30 kHz, 60 kHz for FR1, and 60 kHz, 120 kHz for FR2     - Which SCS values are required, and which ones are optional follow Rel-16 UE capabilities. |

There were also limited discussions regarding definitions for SL PRS resources and SL PRS resource sets and it is expected that the group would make further progress on this during the present meeting.

Inputs from submitted contributions to RAN1 #112bis-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| HW-HiSi [6] | *Proposal 9: Do not support to introduce the SL-PRS resource set concept.* |
| Spreadtrum [11] | *Proposal 8: The definition of DL PRS resources or resource sets in existing specification can be reused for SL-PRS resource allocation.* |
| Panasonic [15] | *Proposal 8: SL-PRS periodicity could be just same as or multiple times of S-SSB for simplicity.* |
| LGE [16] | *Proposal 11: SL PRS resource is defined as a set of SL resources, which is used for the measurement of a single sample/instance of SL PRS.* |
| Sharp [19] | *Proposal 2: A SL-PRS resource corresponds to one RE offset of the first SL-PRS symbol within a comb-based SL-PRS pattern.*  *Proposal 3: “SL-PRS resource set” is not supported.*  *Proposal 4: For periodic reservation of SL-PRS resources, the periodicity values supported in legacy SL communications are considered as a baseline.* |
| Samsung [20] | *Proposal 1: SL PRS resources and SL PRS resource sets are defined for SL positioning.*   * *SL PRS resource set can be configured with periodic reservation or without periodic reservation.* * *FFS: Other details on configuration parameters in SL PRS resources and SL PRS resource sets.* |
| CMCC [21] | *Proposal 3: At least support to define SL PRS resources similar to the definitions for DL PRS resources.*  *Proposal 4: Parameters of SL-PRS, e.g., SL PRS pattern (incl. number of symbols, comb size), and bandwidth, should be (pre-)configured in a resource pool level.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 2: RAN1 to define the SL PRS resource hierarchy in terms of SL Carrier SL BWPSL Resource PoolSL PRS Resource SetSL PRS Resources. Further consider the definition of a SL PRS resource with respect to one or more sub-channels.* |
| ZTE [23] | *Proposal 1: The concept of SL PRS resource set can be introduced considering forward compatibility where each consists one or more SL PRS resource(s).*   * *The maximum number of SL PRS resource set shall be set as 1 in Rel-18* * *At least the following parameters can be configured per resource set: SL PRS resource set ID, a list of SL PRS resources, power control related parameters (maximum transmission power, alpha, p0)* * *At least the following parameters can be configured per resource:* *SL PRS resource ID, SL PRS comb offset, SL PRS sequence ID if it is a higher layer configured parameter* |
| Apple [27] | *Proposal 1: The design of the sidelink reference signals for positioning should specify the following: numerology, supportable bandwidth, sequence design, frequency domain aspects (including comb-design, staggering pattern, granularity), time domain aspects and SL-PRS multiplexing.* |
| Ericsson [28] | *Proposal 1 For SL PRS, only SL PRS resources are used to configure the SL PRS in a resource pools, without SL PRS resource sets or SL PRS PFL.* |
| LGE [33] | *Proposal 4: SL PRS resource is defined as a set of SL resources, which is used for the measurement of a single sample/instance of SL PRS.*  *Proposal 5: SL PRS resource configuration includes at least the followings.*   * *SL PRS resource ID* * *Comb size of SL PRS resource* * *Number of symbols of SL PRS resource* |
| Qualcomm [29] | *Proposal 13: Higher layers signal SL-PRS comb size, number of symbols, periodicity, frequency-domain allocation, and scrambling seed.* |

***Summary of key observations based on submitted contributions:***

* *On SL PRS resource sets*
  + *Multiple companies propose or assume definition of SL PRS resource sets wherein a SL PRS resource set comprises of a number of SL PRS resources. However, in light of the option of referring to SL PRS resource pools, a clear need to define SL PRS resource sets remain unclear.*
    - *Thus, a primary motivation of defining SL PRS resource sets can be seen from perspective of forward compatibility, e.g., for assigning different SL PRS resources within a SL PRS resource set with different spatial beams. Thus, at least one company proposes that in Rel-18, the max number of SL PRS resource set is limited to one.*
    - *However, it should be noted that, if needed, SL PRS resource sets may be defined in future in a backward compatible manner.*
  + *At least three companies explicitly propose not to introduce SL PRS resource sets.*
* *On SL PRS resources* 
  + *As a starting point, SL PRS resources can be defined using similar approach as for DL PRS resources, with possible exception of periodicity.*
    - *Thus, a SL PRS resource may be defined by reference to a combination of:*
      * *SL PRS resource ID,*
      * *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*
      * *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M)*
      * *SL PRS frequency domain allocation – e.g., starting PRB and number of PRBs,*
      * *SL PRS periodicity for periodic and semi-persistent SL PRS,*
      * *SL PRS sequence ID if it is based on a higher layer-configured parameter.*
  + *For time domain representation of a SL PRS resource, companies either include or exclude AGC or AGC and Guard Symbols within a SL PRS resource or not. In this regard, given that the details of multiplexing of SL PRS with other SL channels/signals is still under discussion, it would be cleaner and simpler to define SL PRS resource and AGC and guard symbols separately.*
    - ***See FL1 Proposal 2.3.5-1***
    - *NOTE: Certainly, an AGC symbol may be generated by transmission of a symbol containing REs with SL PRS. This can be discussed in the context of Section 2.3.5.*
  + *NOTE: Details of configuration of SL PRS resource as part of SL PRS resource pool configuration can be discussed once there is further progress on SL PRS multiplexing options and need further coordination with AI 9.5.1.3.*
* *On SL PRS periodicity*
  + *There are some limited views expressed regarding supported periodicity values for periodic and/or semi-persistent SL PRS. More inputs and further progress in AI 9.5.1.3 may be necessary prior to addressing this point.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.1-1

* *SL PRS resource sets are not defined in Rel-18.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We prefer to define SL PRS resource set in order to align with the DL-PRS/SRS-pos resource set definition in Rel-16.  If the majority support not to define the SL PRS resource set, we can live with the proposal. |
| vivo | We are okay with proposal 2.1-1 |
| Fraunhofer | Okay. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| mtk | We slightly prefer to have the set definition to align with R16.  If in the future there is FR2 enhancement, the framework of having resource set has been there |
| Samsung | Thanks for good summary! In the perspective of forward compatibility and if there is no strong concern, we prefer to define the SL PRS resource set |
| Spreadtrum | If the majority support not to define the SL PRS resource set, we can live with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Prefer to define SL PRS resource sets in terms of future support |
| ZTE | Our first priority is to define resource set now but restrict the number of SL PRS resource set to 1 in Rel-18 for forward compatibility. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see any necessity to define SL PRS resource set. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Apple | We would prefer to have the SL PRS resource set defined for forward compatibility. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Continental Automotive | We are fine with not defining SL PRS resource set. |
| Qualcomm | Not support.  As noted by others, defining resource sets is important to provide forward compatibility.  ZTE’s proposals to define resource sets but limit the number to 1 would be a good compromise in our view. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | No strong opinion, but as of right now no sets are needed. It’s also not clear what would be the purpose of using multiple sets in the future. |
| Moderator | Based on the feedback,   * most companies support not introducing SL PRS resource sets in Rel-18 or can live without defining them in Rel-18; * four companies consider it important to define SL PRS resource sets in view of forward compatibility – for which some have cited FR2 use-case. Further, it is suggested that SL PRS resource sets may be introduced with limitation to the number being one in Rel-18.   With respect to forward compatibility, it should be noted that, depending on SL PRS resource identification (e.g., whether IDs are associated with a SL PRS resource, etc.), future introduction of SL PRS resource sets to group multiple SL PRS resources can be possible without compatibility issues.  Thus, considering the significant majority view, the original proposal is repeated below. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.1-1  * *SL PRS resource sets are not defined in Rel-18.* |
| CATT | We can live with the proposal.  However, if FR2 is specified for SL-PRS transmission, the SL-PRS resource set should also be introduced for beam sweeping. |
| LGE | Support |
| ZTE | We can be flexible as long as future introduction of SL PRS resource sets to group multiple SL PRS resources without compatibility issues is possible as FL clarified. |
| Samsung | We can compromise on this. However, ZTE’s proposal (restrict the number of SL PRS resource set to 1 in Rel-18) in the 1st round of discussion seems good idea. |
| CMCC | Support.  We share the same understanding as FL. In addition, in sidelink, currently, Rel-18 SL is studying FR2 beam management enhancement, note that no RS resource set for SL CSI-RS has been specified in R16/17, but no particular issue is identified without defining resource ID. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Xiaomi | support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| NEC | Support. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the ***following is recommended for email endorsement***. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.1-1  * *SL PRS resource sets are not defined in Rel-18.* |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.1-2

* *A SL PRS resource is identified by a combination of:* 
  + *SL PRS resource ID,*
  + *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*
  + *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M)*
  + *SL PRS frequency domain allocation – e.g., at least information on starting PRB and number of PRBs,*
  + *SL PRS periodicity for periodic and semi-persistent SL PRS,*
  + *SL PRS sequence ID if it is based on a higher layer-configured parameter.*
* *NOTE 1: The above does not imply signalling/(pre-)configuration of these parameters but only serves to define a SL PRS resource.*
* *NOTE 2: SL PRS resource configuration that may be provided as part of SL PRS resource pool configuration may only include some of the above.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | For the last bullet (SL PRS sequence ID), how to determine the SL PRS sequence ID is still on the discussion, so we prefer to remove the SL PRS sequence ID at this stage. |
| vivo | Firstly, we prefer to modify the naming as SL PRS pattern ID or SL PRS ID. That is because we are not sure how to associate the SL PRS resource with a single spatial beam information for FR2 in future release if different SL PRS resources are defined as different comb or symbols as above. In NR, the different SL PRS resources will be with different spatial beams, if we define SL PRS resources definition as time-frequence resources, it may lead to the s**ame resource ID can be associated with different spatial beams** but with the same comb or symbol in future release, it will be different as NR PRS source ID.  Agreement:   * A DL PRS Resource Set is defined as a set of DL PRS Resources, where each DL PRS Resource has a DL PRS Resource ID   + The DL PRS Resources in a DL PRS Resource set are associated with the same TRP * A DL PRS Resource ID in a DL PRS Resource set is associated with a single beam transmitted from a single TRP (A TRP may transmit one or more beams) * Note: This does not have any implications on whether the TRPs and beams from which signals are transmitted are known to the UE.   Secondly, we prefer to FFS the last sub-bullet. For sequence ID, we think it will be different for different UEs. But other parameters can be the same for different UEs. So, more discussion is needed for sequence ID. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| xiaomi | If SL PRS resource set is not introduced, is SL PRS resource ID still necessary? Hope proponent or the moderator can clarify. |
| Sharp | We propose to use a neutral name for “*SL PRS resource ID*” for the moment, e.g. “an ID of the SL PRS resource”. |
| OPPO | 1. If SL PRS resource set is not defined, as Proposal 2.1-1, *SL PRS resource ID* is not needed. 2. SL PRS may always occupy all the PRBs included in the resource pool, we propose to remove “*– e.g., at least information on starting PRB and number of PRBs,*” 3. SL PRS resource may not associate with a “*SL PRS sequence ID*”, as indicated in the next proposal, the ID if provided by higher layer may be associated with a UE. |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Support in general.  Static parameters can be defined as a part of SL PRS resource configuration, while the dynamic parameters associated to resource allocation such as comb RE offset and starting symbol offset can be signaled by e.g. SCI.  SL PRS sequence ID can be dynamically determined based on SRC/DST ID and/or CRC field of SCI, rather than statistically configured by a higher layer. |
| CMCC | We think that SL PRS resource is not necessary to be associated with a resource ID.  In NR positioning, a resource ID is used to identify different beams within a resource set, in SL PRS, as no optimization on FR2 incl. beam management is not pursued, we support Proposal 2.1-1 that resource set is not defined, and in this sense, seems not necessary to further introduce resource ID. |
| Samsung | Anyway, we need to discuss this after making decision for Proposal 2.1-1  Based on the agreement in the below,  **Agreement**  For SL-PRS transmission, at least support the following   * **SL-PRS transmissions with periodic reservation:** SL-PRS transmissions which are being reserved with a similar mechanism as the SL periodic resource reservation for another TB in legacy SL communication   + FFS: whether/what changes are needed * **SL-PRS transmissions without periodic reservation**: SL-PRS transmissions in which the SL-PRS is transmitted at least once without periodic reservation, with a similar mechanism as in legacy SL communication with SL resource without periodic reservation.   + FFS: Maximum number of reservations and transmissions after triggering   We need to have a parameter to enable/disable periodic reservation since the agreement say that a similar mechanism as the SL reservation. Also, if periodic reservation is enabled, a parameter for deciding periodicity is necessary.  In addition, we prefer add SL PRS sequence ID after making decision on this.   * *A SL PRS resource is identified by a combination of:*    + *SL PRS resource ID,*   + *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*   + *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M)*   + *SL PRS frequency domain allocation – e.g., at least information on starting PRB and number of PRBs,*   + *Enable/disable of SL PRS transmission with periodic reservation*   + *SL PRS transmission periodicity – FFS for supported values~~SL PRS periodicity for periodic and semi-persistent SL PRS,~~*   + *[SL PRS sequence ID if it is based on a higher layer-configured parameter.]* * *NOTE 1: The above does not imply signalling/(pre-)configuration of these parameters but only serves to define a SL PRS resource.* * *NOTE 2: SL PRS resource configuration that may be provided as part of SL PRS resource pool configuration may only include some of the above.* |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Supportive of FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Ok.  In our understanding, SL PRS resource id is quite important. For example, in measurement report, UE should report the corresponding SL PRS resource ID. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal itself is not clearly motivated.  We should either say a SL-PRS resource is identified by a resource ID or is identified by comb-offset within a given comb-size, starting symbol, and perhaps a sequence ID.  While on the other hand, if the intention is describing the parameters structure for SL-PRS resource, including frequency domain resource allocation, periodicity, number of symbols/starting symbol, comb size/offset, it should be formulated in another manner. |
| Apple | Set an FFS on the last sub-bullet i.e. sequence ID, until a decision is made on whether it is defined by higher layer signaling. Other bullets are fine. |
| SONY | Support in principle. As of now, we propose to set the above as a working assumption. |
| Intel | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | OK in principle. Needs more discussions. |
| Continental Automotive | We are OK in principle, but it is not clear how this definition would be used, since not all parameters may be (pre-)configured and we prefer that parameters like comb RE offset and comb size may be dynamically signaled. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | OK. |
| Moderator | Based on the feedback, it seems the use of “is identified by” may have caused some confusion and may not be the intention. The original intention was to describe the parameters associated with a SL PRS resource (the second interpretation from HW-HiSi).  Thus, it is also not intended that each of these parameters uniquely identify a SL PRS resource.  Next, as noted in Moderator’s response to Proposal 2.1-1, since we have agreed to multiplexing of SL PRS resources within a slot of a resource pool (at least for dedicated resource pools) and since we would also have Scheme 2 RA, it would be rather helpful to define SL PRS resource indices to identify SL PRS resources efficiently (first interpretation from HW-HiSi).  More importantly, if the identification of a SL PRS resource is based on a SL PRS resource ID, this provides scalability and future-proofness by decoupling SL PRS resource identification from associated parameters of a SL PRS resource and address concerns on future extension to identify SL PRS resources, e.g., based on spatial beams only.  Sequence ID would be relevant regardless of how it is determined. This is only saying that for a SL PRS resource, its sequence ID is a relevant parameter.  The identification of whether a SL PRS is with periodic reservation or not may not need a separate parameter and the information could be combined with the “periodicity” information. However, it is acknowledged that the current formulation (“periodicity if periodic/SP”) would not be sufficient. For now, these two are abstracted and the details can be discussed further.  Accordingly, the proposal is updated as below: [High] FL2 Proposal 2.1-2  * *Parameters associated with a SL PRS resource include:*    + *SL PRS resource ID,*   + *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*   + *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M),*   + *SL PRS frequency domain allocation,*   + *SL PRS with/without periodic reservation, periodicity values if with periodic reservations, and number of SL PRS occasions, otherwise. FFS: details.*   + *SL PRS sequence ID.*   + *Note: Additional parameters can be included as/when identified.* * *A SL PRS resource is identified by a SL PRS resource ID*   + *FFS: details.* * *NOTE 1: The above does not imply need for signalling/(pre-)configuration of these parameters.* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| LGE | Generally fine with FL proposal.  It is still not clear what SL PRS resource ID means. Does it represent every instance of SL PRS resource? For example, if UE transmits SL PRS periodically for same positioning method, does every SL PRS resource have different SL PRS resource ID, or same one?  [Moderator] It seems the simplest way would be to define a SL PRS resource ID to point to one instance of time-frequency resource in a slot for SL PRS transmission within a (dedicated or shared) SL PRS resource pool. So, for a SL PRS resource with periodic reservation/configuration or w/o periodic reservation but with multiple instances, a single SL PRS resource ID + information in the 5th sub-bullet above on periodicity/instances can be used to indicate all the instances of the SL PRS resource. |
| vivo | Sorry, we think the parameter still mix two-cases  Case 1, the resource ID is defined as Rel-16, a resource ID used to identify different beams within a resource set with a set of parameters in the configuration. In this case, the parameter can not include the sub-bult 3-4 since the comb value or Re offset should be determined based on sensing other than configuration  Case 2, different from Rel-16, the resource ID is defined for sensing, resource selection, or resource allocation. In this case, the parameter only can include the sub-bult 1-4  [Moderator] This is a good point. The intention is as for Case 2, and it does seem reasonable now to exclude sequence ID and information on periodicity/multiple instances.  In addition, based on the response of FL, FL think the two intention pointed out by Huawei is beneficial. So, we propose to discuss the concept or functionality of SL-PRS resources first. For example,  The multiple SL-PRS resources can be configured in a resource pool, the resource can be defined as  Alt 1: a set of static SL-PRS configurations, similar to DL PRS/UL SRS which is associated with a set of known parameters, and each resource can be associated single beam.  Alt 2: the granularity of RA  [Moderator] Alt. 1 and Alt 2 suggested above need not be mutually exclusive and a decision on Alt 1 vs. Alt 2 is not necessary to define SL PRS resource. Without association to beams, it can be also interpreted to correspond to a “single beam” case and thus, satisfy Alt 1. At the same time, it can be used as granularity of RA (separate discussion), thus satisfying Alt 2. At least it is expected to be used for RA as you explained above via “Case 2”. |
| ZTE | OK with FL’s proposal.  In our understanding, a SL-PRS resource ID represents the SL-PRS transmission share some common features (e.g. comb size, number of symbols in a slot) and used for resource allocation. |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with the proposal, but still the necessity to introduce resource ID is not quite clear, we would like to put an FFS on it. But anyways we think that it has no harm to introduce an ID to identify a SL PRS resource, we can live with it if majority supports the resource ID. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | It would be helpful to clarify that the “*SL PRS resource ID”* is used to identify a resource within a slot, as how to interpret the ID may impact the value range of it.  “*SL PRS sequence ID*” should be removed, we have 3 options for sequence ID in 2.2-1, none of them it to associate the sequence ID with a resource.  [Moderator] Yes, point taken. As responded to vivo, it may be best to keep seq ID out. |
| Xiaomi | We have similar concern as LG. In Uu interface DL PRS resource ID is locally defined within DL PRS resource set. However, if we do not have SL PRS resource set, in which scope the SL PRS ID shall be defined? From FL explanation it seems that SL PRS ID is defined to identify different SL PRS resources within a slot. If so, is SL PRS ID UE specific or UE common? We are not sure which understanding is correct.  [Moderator] See responses to LGE and vivo. The indexing would be specific to a resource pool. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Regarding LGE comment, to our understanding, SL-PRS resource ID at least could be used to label or differentiate the SL-PRS resources that could be multiplexed in a slot, so that the ID can be indicated in SCI instead of any parameter would be included in SCI. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  We share simlar view as Huawei the purpose of SL PRS resource ID. It could be a linkage between PSCCH and SL PRS resource ID or the SL PRS resource ID could be explicitly indicated in the SCI, but details can be further stuided. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Sharp | Fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | With the feedback received and good points raised, it seems it would be simplest to limit the definition of a SL PRS resource (and resource ID) to a slot and within scope of a resource pool. The proposal is updated below.  Note that in future, e.g., for FR2 support, the concept of SL PRS resource can easily be extended to map to time-frequency-*spatial* domains as well. With these simplifications, the NOTE1 can also be removed. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.1-2  * *A SL PRS resource refers to a a time-frequency resource within a slot of a dedicated or shared SL PRS resource pool that is used for SL PRS transmission.* * *Parameters associated with a SL PRS resource include:*    + *SL PRS resource ID,*   + *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*   + *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M),*   + *SL PRS frequency domain allocation,*   + *~~SL PRS with/without periodic reservation, periodicity values if with periodic reservations, and number of SL PRS occasions, otherwise. FFS: details.~~*   + *~~SL PRS sequence ID.~~*   + *Note: Additional parameters can be included as/when identified.* * *A SL PRS resource is identified by a SL PRS resource ID that is unique within a slot of a dedicated or shared SL PRS resource pool.*   + *FFS: details.* * *~~NOTE 1: The above does not imply need for signalling/(pre-)configuration of these parameters.~~* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| vivo | Based on the discussion of shared resource pool, we are not sure the multiplexing and frequency domain indication is needed for the shared resource pool, and prefer to remove shared resource pool at this stage. |
| OPPO | In the proposal SL PRS resource is defined in time-freqeuncy domain and identified by SL PRS resource ID, but as being discussed in Proposal 2.3.2-1, more than one BW may be allowed in a resource pool for SL PRS, if this was agreed, it seems not simple to clearly define all SL PRS resources in a slot and associate each of them to a unique resource ID. Given that, we propose to FFS “SL PRS resource ID” and the last bullet. |
| Futurewei | Our understanding is similar to vivo, therefore we could put [or shared] in square brackets for now |
| xiaomi | We have similar question as OPPO that whether SL PRS resource with different BW size, comb size and number of symbols in a slot will be considered with different SL PRS resource ID. |
| ZTE | Regarding the bullet of ‘SL PRS frequency domain allocation’, it is also applicable for shared RP? Most likely, we will agree the same bandwidth between PSSCH and SL-PRS, that is, the frequency domain allocation may not be a parameter of SL-PRS resource. Hence, we think that bullet should be clarified being used for dedicated pool. |
| CMCC | By going through the comments, now our understanding of this proposal is that the intention is to identify that by defining which parameters, one can uniquely determine a SL PRS resource, similar as the definition we have for DL PRS in TS 38.214. Is this the right understanding?  If so, I think most parameters listed seems OK, and regarding the frequency domain allocation, we’d like to be clarified that does it mean “starting PRB/subchannel and BW of SL PRS”? Regarding shared RP, though we have reached consensus that TDM-based multiplexing from different UEs in a slot is precluded, and also it is very likely that the SL PRS BW is equal to the associated PSSCH, but there may have the case that in the same slot, SL PRS resources from different UEs are subchannel wise FDM-based, and the SL PRS BW will be provided by Tx UE’s higher layer for resource selection. Therefore, from the perspective to identify a unique SL PRS resource, I think it should be OK for shared RP either. |
| LGE | According to Moderator’s comment and proposal, SL PRS resource ID seems to indicate a speicifci SL PRS resource in a slot. We’re not sure if the same time/freq positioning of SL PRS resource in another slot has the same SL PRS resource ID or not.  In this case, is it true that SCI can only contain SL PRS resource ID and slot number/freq. position to indicate the reserved resources? It may work in case where only a single (M,N) is allowed in a resource pool. But if multiple (M,N) can be multiplexed in a slot, it will complicate SL PRS resource ID values.  If SL PRS resource ID means as discussed above, we do not support it. We prefer to introduce SL PRS configuration ID instead. SL PRS configuration ID should at leas contatin the comb size and the number of SL PRS symbols. That is, it represents the comb pattern.  Every information of the SL PRS resource location such as slot number, freq. position (e.g. subchannel index), comb RE offset and starting symbol number should be signaled separately by SCI. They are determined based on sensing in scheme 2 and network scheduling in scheme 1. It is much simpler concept and well aligns with the existing resource reservation singaling in SCI.  We suggest to delete the last bullet and add a new sentence.   * *~~A SL PRS resource is identified by a SL PRS resource ID that is unique within a slot of a dedicated or shared SL PRS resource pool.~~* * SL PRS configuration ID uniquely identifies at least the comb patterns (M,N) allowed in a resource pool.   + *FFS: details.* |
| CEWiT | Agree with comment that ‘SL PRS frequency domain allocation ’ is required for dedicated resource only.  We are not quite sure why parameter ‘ SL PRS with/without periodic reservation’ is excluded in updated proposal. This will be an additional parameter associated with SL-PRS. |
| Qualcomm | With removal of the ID, we think the main bullet should be update to say at least since parameters are still being discussed in other proposals:  *Parameters associated with a SL PRS resource include at least*  We’d like to reintroduce the time-domain information:  *SL PRS with/without periodic reservation, periodicity values if with periodic reservations, and number of SL PRS occasions, otherwise. FFS: details* |
| Nokia, NSB | OK in general.  Regarding ‘SL PRS frequency domain allocation’ in shared resource pool: SL PRS resource ID may also be used in measurement report to e.g. LMF (cf. proposal 4.2.1-v3 in measurement AI) where it may be of interest to LMF to know the frequency domain aspect of the measured resource considering different SL PRS BW sizes. Also we note that FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS is still being discussed (cf. proposal 2.4-5). Hence, we would like to retain "SL PRS frequency domain allocation" as part of SL PRS resource even for shared resource pool. Of course, we may need to further elabortate if ‘SL PRS frequency domain allocation’ mean starting subchannel and number of subchannels, etc. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in general.  For SL PRS frequency domain allocation, it may depend on the discussion on dedicated resource pool whether SL PRS BW can be smaller than dedicated resource pool BW. For shared resource pool, this may not be needed if this is equal to PSSCH BW. |

* 1. Sequence design for SL PRS

**Background:**

|  |
| --- |
| Sequence for DL PRS is defined using Gold sequence:  .  For DL PRS, the generator of the pseudo-random sequence *c(i)* is initialized as:  .  Sequence for SL-CSI-RS is defined using Gold sequence:  .  For SL CSI-RS, the generator of the pseudo-random sequence *c(i)* is initialized as:  . |

During RAN1 #112 meeting, the following agreements were made:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  SL PRS sequence is generated based on Gold sequence:  where c(i) is a pseudo-random sequence as defined in Clause 5.2.1 of TS 38.211.  **Agreement**   * For SL PRS sequence generation, the pseudo-random sequence c(i) initialization equation is defined as a function of at least: slot number, symbol number, and a parameter . * The pseudo-random sequence c(i) initialization equation is based on initialization equation as for DL PRS   **Agreement**  For SL PRS sequence generation, consider at least the following options to define the parameter , and select one option:   * + Option 1: is a higher layer configured parameter   + Option 2: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission   + Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission   + Option 5: is based on 12bits LSB of destination ID   + Option 6: is based on 8 bits of source ID + 4 zero bits   + Option 7: is based on the CRC field of the 2nd SCI associated with SL PRS transmission, if there is a 2nd SCI defined.   **Agreement**  Range of the parameter is: |

Three key opens on this topic are on: (1) determination of the parameter ; (2) SL PRS sequence generation - dependence on parameters other than slot number, symbol number, and a parameter ; and (3) the resulting equation for the sequence generation.

Inputs from submitted contributions to RAN1 #112bis-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Nokia [4] | *Proposal 1: The SL PRS sequence initialization parameter is a parameter provided by higher layer (Option 1).* |
| Futurewei [5] | *Proposal 1: For the definition of , down select Options 1-3 for further discussion. Clarify the intent of Option 1.* |
| HW-HiSi [6] | *Proposal 1: For SL-PRS sequence generation, support the following Option 3:*   * *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission* |
| vivo [8] | * *The of SL PRS is a higher layer configured parameter (i.e., Option 1 should be supported).* |
| OPPO [9] | *Proposal 1: For SL PRS sequence generation, is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission.* |
| Spreadtrum [11] | *Proposal 1: is based on 8 bits of source ID + 4 zero bits.* |
| CATT, GOHIGH [12] | *Proposal 1: The pseudo-random sequence generator shall be initialized with:*  *- where is the slot number, the SL-PRS sequence ID , and is the OFDM symbol within the slot to which the sequence is mapped.*  *Proposal 2: SL-PRS sequence ID is calculated from the CRC for the sidelink control information mapped to the PSCCH associated with the SL-PRS.*  *- where the quantity equals the decimal representation of CRC for the sidelink control information mapped to the PSCCH associated with the SL-PRS according to with and given by clause 7.3.2 in TS 38.212 Error: Reference source not found.* |
| Intel [13] | *Proposal 1*   * *For SL PRS sequence generation, at least Option 1 is supported:* * *Sequence ID can be (pre-)configured per UE as part of SL PRS resource configuration.* * *FFS: Option 2.* |
| SONY [14] | *Proposal 3: Support the generation is based on bits of source ID and 4 zero bits (also known as option 6).* |
| Panasonic [15] | [*Proposal 3: The*PAGEREF \_Toc131521783 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131521783)  [*Proposal 4: is either a higher layer configured parameter*PAGEREF \_Toc131521784 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131521784) |
| LGE [16] | *Proposal 1: SL PRS sequence ID used for SL PRS sequence initialization is determined based on the CRC field of the 2nd SCI associated with SL PRS transmission.* |
| Xiaomi [17] | *Proposal 1: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission* |
| China Telecom [18] | *Proposal 1: For the definition of the parameter , we support either option 1 (higher layer configured) or option 2 (12 bits CRC of PSCCH based).* |
| Sharp [19] | *Proposal 1: In addition to the agreed slot number, symbol number, and , RE offset is used as a parameter for SL-PRS sequence initialization.* |
| Samsung [20] | ***Proposal 2:*** *For SL PRS sequence generation,*  is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission. |
| CMCC [21] | *Proposal 1: For SL PRS generation, down-select between the following two options, and Option 1 is slightly preferred:*   * + *Option 1: is a higher layer configured parameter*   + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission*   *Proposal 2: The sequence ID of SL PRS should be higher layer configured per UE.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 1: RAN1 to further discuss and down-select among one of the following Options to generate the 12-bit SL-PRS sequence ID ():*   * *Option 1: Higher-layer configured parameter* * *Option 5: Based on 12 LSBs of destination ID.* |
| ZTE [23] | ***Proposal 2:*** *For pseudorandom-based SL PRS:*   * *Select one of the following options regarding SL PRS sequence configuration:*   + *Option1: SL PRS sequence ID is configured via high layer signaling*   + *Option 5+6: SL PRS sequence ID is based on both source ID and destination ID, e.g.* * *Reuse the formula of DL-PRS sequence generation* |
| CEWiT [24] | ***Proposal 1:*** *For initialization one of the following options can be supported:*   * *Option 1: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission.* * *Option 2: is based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured.* |
| IDCC [26] | *Proposal 1: For SL PRS sequence generation, Option 1 in RAN1#112 agreement is selected, i.e., the parameter is a higher layer configured parameter.* |
| Apple [27] | *Proposal 2: For PRS sequence generation,: is a higher layer configured parameter* |
| Ericsson [28] | [*Proposal 2 For SL PRS sequence generation,* PAGEREF \_Toc131753060 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753060)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753061 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753061)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753062 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753062)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753063 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753063) |
| Qualcomm [29] | *Proposal 6: n"ID,seqSL-PRS" is a higher layer configured (i.e. SLPP) parameter (Option 1)* |
| ASUSTeK [31] | *Proposal 1: For defining parameter , support one of option 2, 5, 6.* |
| MTK [32] | *Proposal 5-1: For the sequence ID value generation for SL-PRS, option 2 that is based on the CRC of PSCCH associated with the transmission is considered* |

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* *Defining the parameter*
  + *Options for defining the parameter:*
    - *Option 1 (higher layer parameter): Nokia, Futurewei (Options 1 – 3), vivo, Intel, Panasonic (for Scheme 1 RA), China Telecom, CMCC, Lenovo, ZTE, IDCC, Apple, Ericsson, Qualcomm* ***(13)***
    - *Option 2 (based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission): OPPO, CATT, Futurewei (Options 1 – 3), [Intel], Xiaomi, China Telecom, Samsung, CEWiT, ASUSTeK, MTK* ***(9)***
    - *Option 3 (based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission): HW-HiSi, Futurewei (Options 1 – 3), Panasonic (Scheme 2 RA), CMCC, CEWiT* ***(5)***
    - *Option 5 (based on 12bits LSB of destination ID): Lenovo, ASUSTeK* ***(2)***
    - *Option 6 (based on 8 bits of source ID + 4 zero bits): Spreadtrum, SONY, ASUSTeK* ***(3)***
    - *Option 7 (based on the CRC field of the 2nd SCI associated with SL PRS transmission, if there is a 2nd SCI defined): LGE* ***(1)***
    - *(New) Option 8 (based on both source ID and destination ID, e.g. ): ZTE* ***(1)***
  + *Options 1, 2, and 3 have the most support with Option 1 being favored by the majority.* 
    - *For Option 2, the main motivation cited is that such an approach is used for some existing SL signals like SL CSI-RS. Sequence generation latency is cited as another reason but the practical significance of this is unclear.*
    - *A concern raised relates to privacy concerns since PSCCH is expected to be decodable by any receiving UE, which can be addressed by Option 1.*
    - *Option 3 aims to combine Options 1 and 2, but it is not clear of the benefits compared to Option 1 as long as the higher layer parameter is UE-specific (see next point).*
* *Clarification on Option 1: whether the higher layer parameter is UE-specific or resource pool-specific.*
  + *One company proposes to clarify this point while several indicate that it should be a (transmitting) UE-specific higher layer parameter.*
* *Whether to include any parameter other than slot number, symbol number, and a parameter .*
  + *One company proposes to include SL PRS RE offset as an additional parameter*.
  + *It is cited that it would be desirable to have additional scrambling according to RE-offsets for SL PRS multiplexed via comb. However, with UE-specific nID value for SL PRS sequence generation, it is not clear if additional scrambling based on RE-offsets would be necessary. Further, benefits of additional scrambling for sequences multiplexed on different comb offsets may not be significant.*
* *Equation for SL PRS sequence generation.*
  + *Several companies propose use of the equation based on the DL PRS equation. It can be decided once use of input parameters to the equation is finalized.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.2-1

* *For SL PRS sequence generation, one of the following options is down-selected to define the parameter :*
  + *Option 1 (with clarification): is a higher layer configured parameter that is (pre-)configured in a UE-specific manner for a transmitting UE.*
  + *Option 2: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH.*
  + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support.  We prefer Option 2. |
| vivo | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support Option1 |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 |
| Sharp | For Option 1, it is unclear what “UE-specific” means here, and how a parameter can be UE specifically **pre**-configured. In our understanding the pre-configuration information is common to all UEs. |
| OPPO | * + - 1. If the ID is a higher layer configured parameter, how to configure the parameter, i.e., UE specific, link specific or something else, should be determined by another working group.       2. The benefit of Option 2 is that SL PRS can be used for SL RSRP measurement in sensing-based resource selection, as the bandwidth and/or number of symbols of PSCCH is limited, SL RSRP measured on PSCCH DMRS may not be accurate.       3. We do not see the benefit of Option 3, it does not provide additional protection on UE privacy comparing to Option 1, and if UE privacy is not a concern, it has not benefit comparing to Option 2, as SL PRS cannot be used for SL RSRP measurement in sensing-based resource selection.       4. The key point to make down-selection between Opiton1 and Option 2 is whether physical layer needs to protect UE privacy, and whether physical layer can protect UE privacy by scrambling SL PRS sequence. As UE privacy protection is not RAN1 expertise, we suggest to send an LS to SA3 and RAN2 to confirm the question above. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| LGE | We support option 7, but can accept FL proposal following the majority view.  Regarding option 1, we cannot understand why SCI decoding by other UE is problematic in terms of privacy. PSCCH in the shared resource pool doesn’t have any privacy-related information if the legacy 1st-stage SCI is used, except the zone-based location information, of which the decoding by other UE is already allowed in SL communication.  When a new SCI in PSCCH includes the source/destination ID in a dedicated resource pool, SCI decoding by other UE should not be a problem. It is because the source/destination ID doesn’t tell anything about UE information. It is just temporarily determined, and doesn’t provide any privacy-related information.  Decoding SCI by other UEs are the operation of legacy SL communication. We don’t think it causes an issue of privacy for SL positioning.  With this reasoning, if one of the options needs to be selected, we prefer option 2. It is exactly same as the method of the legacy SL communication. |
| CMCC | Support, and from privacy perspective, we support Option 1 and Option 3, and Option 1 is slightly preferred. |
| mtk | 1, prefer option 2  2, we can remove option 3 at least for progress, if still have debate between option 1 and option 2 |
| Samsung | For Option 1, there can be a case where ID is preconfigured, in this case the performance cannot be guaranteed.  We prefer Option 2 since this approach is applied in other SL RS and we suggest to add LSB after 12bits since CRS is 24bits. |
| Lenovo | Supportive of FL’s proposal with preference for Option 1. |
| ZTE | We support Option 1.  If option 2 is agreed, the information contained in SCI (e.g. 1st stage SCI) is publicly available even for unicast SL-PRS transmission and it may expose UE’s location information (relative distance and angle) to other UEs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | option 3.  For Option 1, with (pre)configuration (assuming for OOC) in UE-specific manner, does it mean that from Rx UE perspective, it requires additionally SLPP signaling from the Tx UE to the Rx UE? |
| Apple | Fine with proposal and prefer Option 1. |
| SONY | Our initial preference is Option 6. However, we are OK with Option 1. |
| Intel | Support the proposal. We prefer Option1 |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Qualcomm | We support higher configuration for the ID. However, could the feature lead clarify why (pre-)configuration is proposed instead of SLPP messaging?  We agree with Sharp’s comment on pre-configuration. While a pre-configuration unique for each UE is feasible in theory; in practice it is very difficult to achieve for V2X since a regional standards body usually approves the pre-configuration. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK. We prefer Option 1. |
| Ericsson | We support option 1. In our view, option 1 means the ID comes from the network via rrc or preconfig to the transmiting UE, and to the measuring UE via LPP/SLPP.  For option 2 and 3, we have a concern that the ID is conditioned to successful reception of PSCCH for the measuring UE. In our view, the measuring UE should only rely on SLPP/LPP. |
| Moderator | For Option 1, it is pointed out that while configuration via the serving gNB can work for in-coverage cases, pre-configuration option in out-of-coverage scenarios may not be possible to guarantee assignment of unique IDs across UEs. To address this, the sequence ID may be provided by a server UE via SLPP for OOC Tx UEs. Similarly, for in-coverage Tx UE, it can be provided by the LMF.  While some companies express their consideration on privacy, it is also explained (by LGE) why privacy should not be an issue even if the sequence ID is known based on decoding of the associated PSCCH. This implies that Option 2 may not lead to privacy issues in terms of knowing identity of a particular SL PRS transmitting UE. However, this may enable knowledge of presence of ***some UE*** at the identified location.  With these clarifications, the proposal is updated as below – main update is for Option 1 to clarify who would provide the ID. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.2-1  * *For SL PRS sequence generation, one of the following options is down-selected to define the parameter :*   + *Option 1: is a higher layer configured parameter that is provided to a transmitting UE by a location server.*   + *Option 2: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH.*   + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH.* |
| Moderator2 | Based on discussions during Wednesday GTW session, the proposal is updated as below.  To clarify, for Options 1 or 3, as explained in some comments during the discussion,   * following the behavior similar to SRSp transmissions, for a Tx UE, the ID should be (pre-)configured. * for an Rx UE, the ID should be provided via SLPP.   Also, for those with strong concerns regarding the privacy for Option 2, it would be good to understand exactly how LGE’s explanation above does/does not address the concerns. [High] FL2a Proposal 2.2-1  * *For SL PRS sequence generation, one of the following options is down-selected to define the parameter :*   + *Option 1: is a higher layer (pre-)configured parameter.*     - *For a receiving UE, the ID is provided by SLPP.*   + *Option 2: is based on 12 LSB bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS.*   + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer (pre-)configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 LSB bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS.*      - *For a receiving UE, the ID is provided by SLPP.* |
| CATT | Support.  We prefer Option 2. There is no privacy issue for Option 2 which had been explained during the GTW online, which is the legacy design which had been used in Rel-16 V2X. |
| LGE | Given clarification from FL, we think that Option 1 requires some latency in detecting SL PRS. This is because RX UE should receive the sequence ID from TX UE by SLPP. It is usually recognized that the higher layer signaling requires more latency than the lower layer signaling. This is because there could be reception fail and retransmission/HARQ process can happen. It may be necessary for RX UE to transmit confirmation message on the reception of SLPP.  Whereas, Option 2 provides more robustness in detection because it is carried by PSCCH. We have no concern on the processing time of Option 2 because there is no such issue in PSCCH decoding in SL communication. Option 2 provides faster and dynamic configuration of the sequence ID. Option 1 requires the sequence ID to be static in this sense.  Regarding the security issue of Option 2, as commented at the call, PSCCH decoding does not provide any privacy information. We’re not sure why knowing the existence of *some* UE at the estimated location is problematic. Location information (i.e. zone ID) can already transmitted by SCI, which can be decodable by any UE in SL communication. ‘Some’ UE means that there is no information on UE identification – it’s anonymous.  With reasons above, we support Option 2. |
| vivo | Based on the online discussion, we are okay with option 2. |
| ZTE | With LGE’s explanation and online discussion, we can go with Option 2.  Option 3 is clearly introduce more configuration and decoding complexity and we do not prefer. |
| Samsung | We support Option 2. |
| CMCC | Based on the discussion during online session, we shared views with QC that Option 1 provides benefits to guarantee the interference randomization on SL PRS sequences. Therefore, we still prefer Option 1 over Option 2. |
| OPPO | We support Option 2.  We believe Option 1 alone cannot protect UE privacy, as anyhow UE needs to transmit PSCCH DMRS, and in shared resource pool UE also needs to transmit PSSCH DMRS, both of the DMRS can be measured by un-intended UE. Even for the SL PRS generated according to Option 1, we cannot completely prevent un-intended UE to measure it if the UE wants to, because the cross-correlation of gold sequence is not bad. We should rely on higher layer to protect UE privacy.  Moreover, according to the updated proposal, Option 1 requires all in coverage UE entering RRC CONNECTED stage, and out of coverage UE may always use one pre-configured ID, we have not seen any benefit of Option 1 comparing to Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | We also support alt 2, which is more flexible and efficient as both Alt 1 and alt 3 assumes the same higher layer parameter is configured for TX UE and RX UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Question for clarification, for the added subbullet to both option 1 and option3, now at this moment, we are not sure it is necessary to have the (pre-)configured parameter for Tx UE and but providing the ID by SLPP to Rx UE. To our understanding, either they are both (pre-)configured or they are both provided by SLPP (we proposed by SLPP due to the privacy concern raised by some companies) instead of Tx UE from one and Rx from the other. By SLPP, the ID is coordinated between Tx and Rx UE. |
| Lenovo | Based on the updated discussions, we still feel that Option 1 is the way to go in order to control the overall SL-PRS interference. At the same time, we also acknowledge the reasoning provided by LGE on latency and robustness for Option 2. It is also evident that Option 3 may introduce additional complexity (in terms of combining higher-layer ID and CRC) as opposed choosing either Option 1 or 2. We support the updated FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | The latest Option 1 needs some updates to fully capture the discussion from the previous round and from GTW.  The transmitter UE will not get the parameter from (pre-)configuration. If that were the case, there would not be a need for the receiver UE to receive any additional messages since it would have access to the same (pre-)configuration. As was discussed in the previous round, it is very difficult to provide a pre-configuration that is unique to each UE in the system.  We would like to revert to the original option 1 since it allows for controlled interference and provided the receiver with a priori knowledge of which sequences can be received. We can also update the option to capture SLPP explicitly:   * + - *Option 1: is a higher layer configured parameter provided by SLPP.*   There are two additional issues with Option 2: privacy, which has been discussed, and security.  On privacy, any UE can now reliably locate the UE with high precision because all information needed to measure SL-PRS is now available, unencrypted, in L1 signaling. To LGE's comment on SCI-1A, in that case, the precision is lower and the UE, by transmitting SCI-1A is aware that others can know its location.  On security, without a shared secret , an attacker can transmit a tailored SL-PRS sequence in the next reserved period, leading to incorrect measurements at the target UE. This is not limited to periodic reservations only, as the attacker can transmit its SL-PRS in a reserved repetition or even as a first transmission.  In sidelink communication, a higher-layer security procedure secures (encrypts) any private messages. The equivalent for SL-PRS is scrambling using , and by selecting Option 2, RAN1 is preventing higher layers from adding this security. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support in principle. We prefer Option 1 as it allows better interference management.and agree with QC’s argument that the parameter is configured, not pre-configured. |
| Moderator | In this round, at least proponents of Options 1/3 seem to converge on using SLPP for providing the higher layer parameter. For in-coverage case, this should correspond to LPP. This is a departure from SRSp where sequence ID was determined by gNB but can certainly work if LMF (and server UE in OOC) can coordinate the sequence ID.  Thus, the proposal is updated as below. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.2-1  * *For SL PRS sequence generation, one of the following options is down-selected to define the parameter :*   + *Option 1: is a higher layer ~~(pre-)configured~~ parameter provided by LPP or SLPP.*   + *Option 2: is based on 12 LSB bits CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS.*   + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer ~~(pre-)configured~~ parameter from a configured ID list provided by LPP or SLPP and 12 LSB bits of CRC of PSCCH associated with the SL PRS.*      - *~~For a receiving UE, the ID is provided by SLPP.~~* |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support.  We prefer Option 2. |
| vivo | We are not sure the SL sequence ID can be provided by LPP. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal, but if we are going to make down-selection this meeting, we still prefert Option 2.  Firstly, we disagree that Option 1 can provide better interference control, in SL interference control has already been guaranteed by resource selection, and Option 2 with 12 bits CRC can also randomize the sequence ID used by different UEs, given that the benefit of Option 1 in terms of interference control is questionable.  Next, as to privacy or security, in our view even the SL PRS sequence ID is known to all UEs, other UEs may not be abable to located the transmitter precisely if it cannot receive the needed measurement report(s). Even the SL PRS sequence ID was NOT disclosed in L1 siganling, other UEs may also measure PSCCH DMRS and PSSCH DMRS to obtain measurement results with comparable precision. Also note that there are only 4096 SL PRS sequence IDs, it is also possible to identify which sequence is transmitted based on cross-correlation detection. As commented previously, privacy and security is not RAN1’s expertise, we should leave it to higher layer.  The drawback of Option 1 and Opion3 is that SL PRS cannot be used for SL RSRP measurement, which may negatively impact scheme 2 resource selection and SL PL based power control if the bandwidth of PSCCH is not wide enough. Note that in current SL communication, either PSCCH DMRS or PSSCH DMRS can be used for SL RSRP measurement based on (pre-)configuration. |
| mtk | 1, we slightly prefer option 2.  2, we also want to understand what is the privacy concern? A UE could be tracked through the measurement on the corresponding SL-PRS? |
| Futurewei | OK. We are not sure about the privacy concerns either. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | One clarification question: if SLPP is used for SL-PRS sequence ID configuration, does that mean there will be a “center UE” which coordinates SL-PRS resources among multiple UEs involved in SL positioning? |
| LGE | If FL’s intention is not downselection at this meeting, we’re ok with FL proposal. If it’s not, we still prefer Option 2 because of the shorter latency and more robustness as mentioned in the previous round.  On the security benefit commented by Qualcomm, we’re not still convinced how a eavesdropper, if any, find a specific target UE to attack with such a tailored SL PRS sequence, only with a physical layer signaling. Even source/destination ID cannot tell anything about what UEs are using those IDs, which are just used temporarilty for secured unicast between two UEs. Eavesdropper can only know the specific UE identification information only after it is able to hack the higher layer signaling, which is definitely not a topic of discussion in RAN1. |
| CEWiT | We see the point in QC’s explanation on Privacy and support option 1 or option 3. Options 3 we believe will provide more randomization rather than going with only option 1 because in option 1 case SL-pRS configuration should always come form master achor coordinating the SL-PRS configurations. |
| Samsung | We share the view with OPPO. We support option 2. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal and support Option 1.  To LGE, because of PRS transmissions from the UE, an attacker can physically identify the physical location of UE regardless of what the source and destination IDs are. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the proposal. |
| Philips | We support option 1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.2-2

* *For SL PRS sequence generation, no additional parameters other than the following input parameters are used: slot number, symbol number, and the parameter .*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| LGE | Support. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Apple | support |
| SONY | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Toyota | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| OPPO | OK |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Moderator | There appears to no concern for this proposal. Thus, the original version is repeated and is recommended for email approval. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.2-2  * *For SL PRS sequence generation, no additional parameters other than the following input parameters are used: slot number, symbol number, and the parameter .*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
| LGE | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Toyota | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
|  |  |

* 1. Mapping SL PRS to physical resources

**Background:** Related decisions from SI phase [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  With regards to the frequency and time a slot has the following characteristics:   * With regards to the value N (comb size) and the number M of SL-PRS symbols within a slot *excluding* the symbol(s) used for AGC training / RxTx Turnaround:   + At least the following values are considered as potential candidate values: N = {1,2,4,6,8,12}   + FFS: the values considered as potential candidate values for M   + FFS1: Whether to consider N>12 as a potential candidate value(s) * The symbols of a SL-PRS resource within a slot are consecutive symbols   + FFS: consecutive and/or non-consecutive symbols for shared resource pool (if supported) * FFS: RE-Offset sequence within a SL-PRS resource, including whether to have in the end of the SL-PRS pattern a symbol with the same RE-offset as the first symbol, for phase-tracking purpose |

The key opens include:

* Comb sizes and offsets for SL PRS
  + Supported comb sizes (values of N) in dedicated and shared resource pools
  + RE offset sequence as function of SL PRS symbols
* Frequency domain characteristics of SL PRS
  + SL PRS bandwidth in dedicated and shared resource pools
  + Granularity of SL PRS allocation in frequency domain
* Time domain characteristics of SL PRS, including AGC and gap symbols
  + Supported values of number of symbols (values of M) for SL PRS in dedicated and shared resource pools
  + SL PRS mapping to consecutive/non-consecutive symbols in time in shared resource pools
* SL PRS patterns
  + Supported (M, N) values in dedicated and shared resource pools
  + Fully staggered patterns
  + Support of partial staggering and effective comb sizes
  + Support of (M, N) patterns with M > N
  + Support of SL PRS repetitions
  + Repetition of first symbol of SL PRS as the last symbol of a SL PRS resource
* AGC and gap symbols

The following were agreed during RAN1 #112 meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For RE-offset sequence for SL PRS, the RE-offset sequences specified for DL PRS are considered as a starting point.   * FFS: Exact RE-offset sequences   **Agreement**  For SL PRS in shared or dedicated resource pools,   * at least comb sizes (N) 2, 4 are supported. * Comb size 6 is supported at least in dedicated resource pool   + FFS: comb size 6 in shared resource pool * Comb size 1 is supported at least in shared resource pool   + FFS: comb size 1 in dedicated resource pool * comb sizes (N) > 12 are not supported. * FFS: support of comb sizes (N) of 8, 12.   **Agreement**  For SL PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools,   * SL PRS patterns with full staggering are supported.   + FFS: whether (M,N)=(6,6) is supported * SL PRS patterns with partial staggering are supported at least for the following (M,N) pairs:   + (M, 2) with M = {1}   + (M, 4) with M = {2}   + FFS: constraints on maximum effective comb size   + FFS: support of partial staggering for other comb sizes * FFS: Support of SL PRS patterns with M > N at least with full staggering. |

Inputs from submitted contributions to RAN1 #112bis-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Nokia [4] | |  | | --- | |  |   *Error: Reference source not found*  Error: Reference source not found |
| Futurewei [5] | *Proposal 2: Consider increasing the range of M and N values and supporting the duplication of first SL-PRS symbol into the last SL-PRS symbol for large M values.*  *Proposal 3: Support multiple dedicated positioning resource pools within one SL BWP. In each of the dedicated RP SL-PRS occupies the entire BW.*  *Observation 1: In the shared resource pools SL-PRS BW may be less than the BW of the RP.* |
| HW-HiSi [6] | *Observation 1: For sidelink positioning, equivalent comb-3 is sufficient to resolve the sidelobe issue considering the communication range and synchronization condition between two UEs involved in the sidelink positioning.*  *Observation 2: The maximum number of SL-PRS resources within a slot for the dedicated resource pool should be more than 20 to match the maximum subchannels in a RP used for PSCCH transmission.*  *Proposal* 2*: Support the comb size of 12 with partial staggering mapping with (M,N)=(5,12).*   * *The RE offset sequence takes the first 4 entries and the fifth symbol repeats the first symbol.*   *Proposal 3: Support flexible number of SL-PRS symbols, i.e., M could be the value within {1, 2, …, 9}.*  *Proposal* 4*: For partial staggering, support to introduce repetition pattern to improve Doppler frequency shift estimation and compensation performance.*  *Proposal 5: For full staggering, support the pattern M > N, where M is the number of SL-PRS symbols and N is the comb size.*  *Proposal 6: Support full RB frequency domain pattern of SL-PRS within the dedicated resource pool.*  *Proposal 7: Support flexible bandwidth of SL-PRS within the share resource pool.* |
| Continental Automotive [7] | *Observation 1: With comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS, UEs in the same RP may transmit SL PRSs using the same comb size and RE-offset values, leading to potential interference in SL PRS transmissions and performance degradation. This necessitates some form of coordination between UEs on selection of these parameters.* |
| vivo [8] | *Observation 1:*   * *The backward compatibility cannot be guaranteed if comb-based multiplexing for SL-PRS is supported in the shared resource pool.* * *For the comb size of SL-PRS in the shared or dedicated resource pool*    + *Support comb size 6 in the shared resource pool with partial staggering;*   + *Comb size 12 can be supported with partial staggering.* * *With regards to AGC training*   + *One symbol preceding a SL-PRS resourcecan be used* * *With regards to Rx/Tx turnaround*   + *At least, one GP symbol is required at the end of slot*   + *FFS one GP symbol after an SL-PRS resource* * *For a dedicated resource pool, the bandwidth of SL-PRS can be the same or smaller than that of the resource pool* * *For a shared resource pool, the bandwidth of SL-PRS should be the same as the indicated bandwidth of SL PSSCH.* |
| OPPO [9] | [*Observation 1: As single BWP may be used for both SL communication and SL positioning, it is necessary to support flexible slot length for SL positioning as current SL communication to enable flexible co-existence between SL and Uu in licensed carrier.*](#_Toc131693933)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693935 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693935)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693936 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693936)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693937 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693937)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693938 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693938)  [*Proposal 6: RE-Offset sequence defined for Uu DL-PRS/SRS-Pos should be reused for SL PRS, with the exception that and* PAGEREF \_Toc131693939 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693939)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693942 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693942)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693946 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693946)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693947 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693947)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693948 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693948) |
| Spreadtrum [11] | *Observation 1: AGC training and Rx-Tx turnaround time are always needed for SL-PRS transmission.*  *Proposal 2: Comb size 6 should be supported in shared resource pool.*  *Proposal 3: Comb size 1 should be supported in dedicated resource pool.*  *Proposal 4: (M,N)=(6,6) should be supported in both shared resource pool and dedicated resource pool.*  *Proposal 10: For AGC training, one symbol preceding the set of SL-PRS symbols can be used*  *Proposal 11: For Rx/Tx turnaround, one symbol after the set of SL-PRS symbols can be used.* |
| CATT, GOHIGH [12] | *Proposal 5: For SL-PRS in shared or dedicated resource pools, symbol numbers of SL-PRS within a slot M={1, 2, 4, 6} should be supported.*  *Proposal 6: For SL-PRS in shared resource pools, comb size 6 should be supported.*  *Proposal 7: For SL-PRS in dedicated resource pools, comb size 1 should be supported.*  *Proposal 8: For SL-PRS in shared or dedicated resource pools, comb sizes of 8, 12 are not supported.*  *Proposal 9: For SL-PRS in shared or dedicated resource pools, comb sizes N={1, 2, 4, 6} should be supported.*  *Proposal 10: For SL-PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools, SL-PRS pattern with full staggering of (M,N)=(6,6) should be supported.*  *Proposal 11: For SL-PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools, there is no need to support other SL-PRS patterns with partial staggering, except for (M,N)=(1,2) and (2,4).*  *Proposal 12: For SL PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools, RE-Offset sequence within a SL-PRS resource across the symbols should follow the table below:*   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | | | | |  |  |  |  | | *1* | *0* | *0, 0* | *-* | *-* | | *2* | *0* | *0, 1* | *0, 1, 0, 1* | *0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1* | | *4* | *-* | *0, 2* | *0, 2, 1, 3* | *-* | | *6* | *-* | *-* | *-* | *0, 3, 1, 4, 2, 5* |   *Proposal 13: The symbols of a SL-PRS resource within a slot should be consecutive symbols for shared resource pool, in order to keep the unified design of SL-PRS resource pattern for both dedicated resource pool and shared resource pool.*  *Proposal 14: For the SL-PRS in dedicated resource pool, one AGC symbol is needed before the SL-PRS transmission/reception, and one GP symbol is needed after the SL-PRS transmission/reception.*  *Proposal 16: For dedicated resource pool, one AGC symbol should be always allocated before every SL-PRS transmission/reception or SCI+SL-PRS transmission/reception. And one GP symbol should be always allocated after every SL-PRS transmission/reception or SCI+SL-PRS transmission/reception.*  *Proposal 19: For a SL-PRS transmission, the first symbol is used for AGC handling. The duplication mechanism of first symbol is left to UE implementation.* |
| Intel [13] | ***Proposal 2***   * *For dedicated resource pool, the bandwidth of SL PRS is the same as that of the resource pool.* * *For shared resource pool, SL PRS transmission is associated with PSSCH and occupies same BW as the PSSCH.*   ***Proposal 3***   * *For dedicated resource pool* * *Comb size N with {2, 4, 6, 8, 12} is supported.* * *M > N is supported for SL PRS with fully staggered pattern, where M = N and is a positive integer.* * *Maximum effective comb size is 2 for SL PRS with partially staggered pattern.* * *For shared resource pool* * *(M, N) pairs with (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 4), (2, 2) are supported.* * *FFS: maximum value of M as 4.*   ***Proposal 4***   * *Granularity of time-domain resource allocation for SL PRS transmission is based on SL PRS resource.* * *Only consecutive symbols for a SL PRS transmission are supported for both dedicated and shared resource pools.*   ***Proposal 7***   * *Support AGC and guard symbol for Tx-Rx turnaround time for a SL PRS transmission in a dedicated SL PRS resource pool.* * *The first symbol of SL PRS transmission is repeated to generate AGC symbol* * *In case of TDM based multiplexing of SL PRS transmission from different UEs, AGC and guard symbols are inserted between SL PRS transmissions.* |
| SONY [14] | *Proposal 1: Support SL-PRS frequency domain with comb structure. The legacy comb-N structure in legacy NR positioning can be used as the baseline.*  *Proposal 2: Support the time-gap prior to and after the SL-PRS transmission. The first and second gap are used for AGC and Rx/Tx retuning.*  *Proposal 4: SL-PRS bandwidth within a resource pool is reconfigurable up-to the maximum resource pool bandwidth.*  *Proposal 5: For TDM-based multiplexing, the SL-PRSs can be configured using comb-1 structure with comb size N= 1, M≥1.* |
| Panasonic [15] | *Proposal 9: SL-PRS repetition (if >2) may be either to reuse the DL fixed time-gap concept for simplicity, or to design a one-to-one or one-to-many chain reservation by using SCI.*  *Proposal 10: AGC symbol is necessary for SL-PRS.* |
| LGE [16] | ***Proposal 3:*** *For a dedicated resource pool, the comb sizes N={1, 8, 10} are additionally supported.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For a dedicated resource pool, the fully staggered patterns (M,N)=(1,1), (6,6,), (8,8), (10,10) are additionally supported.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For a dedicated resource pool, there is no constraints on the maximum effective comb size for partially staggered pattern. Any even numbers M less than N are supported, including:*   * *(M,6) with M={2,4}* * *(M,8) with M={2,4,6}* * *(M,10) with M={2,4,6,8}*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For a shared resource pool, the comb sizes N={6, 8} are additionally supported.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *For a shared resource pool, the fully staggered patterns (M,N)=(1,1), (6,6), (8,8) are additionally supported.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *For a shared resource pool, there is no constraints on the maximum effective comb size for partially staggered pattern. Any even numbers M less than N are supported, including:*   * *(M,6) with M={2,4}* * *(M,8) with M={2,4,6}*   ***Proposal 9:*** *For the fully staggered comb pattern, it is supported that SL PRS symbols can be repeated to fill a slot or a TDM duration, with the same order of the comb RE offset of the original SL PRS symbols.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *For the partially staggered comb pattern, it is supported that SL PRS symbols can be repeated to fill a slot or a TDM duration, with the following ways.*   * *Opt 1. Simple repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS* * *Opt 2. Expansion toward the fully staggered SL PRS and its repetition*   ***Proposal 12:*** *One AGC symbol is located before every SL PRS resource.*  ***Proposal 13:*** *One TX/RX turnaround symbol is located after every SL PRS resource.*  ***Proposal 14:*** *AGC symbol is filled with:*   * *Opt 1. the copy of the last SL PRS symbol* * *Opt 2. the last symbol of the fully-staggered comb pattern corresponding the comb size* |
| Xiaomi [17] | *Proposal 2: SL PRS transmission with number of OFDM symbols from 2 to 9 shall be supported.*  *Proposal 3: SL PRS transmission with flexible bandwidth is supported in both dedicated resource pool and shared resource pool*  *-- PRS subchannel is defined as the frequency domain resource allocation granularity*  *Proposal 4: For shared SL resource pool, SL PRS are not transmitted in the OFDM symbol(s) of PSSCH DMRS symbol.* |
| China Telecom [18] | *Proposal 2: Support both comb size 8 and 12 in a dedicated resource pool to accommodate more comb-based multiplexing of SL-PRS.*  *Proposal 3: Support repetition of the RE-offset in the SL-PRS pattern, e.g., the time domain consecutive symbol number M is larger than the frequency comb size N.* |
| Sharp [19] | **Proposal 8:** The SL-PRS pattern with (M,N)=(6,6) is supported.  **Proposal 9:** Regarding AGC training and TX/RX turnaround, one symbol is used for AGC training, and one symbol is used for RX/TX turnaround.  **Proposal 10:** With regards to the bandwidth of SL-PRS transmission, at least for a dedicated resource pool, adopt Alt. 1 (i.e. the bandwidth of SL-PRS can be same or smaller than that of the resource pool). |
| Samsung [20] | ***Proposal 3:*** *For SL PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools,*   * *SL PRS comb sizes N = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported.* * *SL PRS symbol lengths M = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported.* * *(M, N) pair can be configured flexibly from supported N and M values.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *The first sub-carrier location of SL PRS in each symbol becomes (X mod N = 0) where*   * *X=(reference sub-carrier location + value for comb offset + value for staggered pattern in symbol)* * *N=SL PRS comb size*   ***Proposal 5:*** *The bandwidth of SL PRS can be same or smaller than that of the resource pool.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For shared resource pool(s) with SL communication, SL PRS is transmitted in the existing slot structure with the following principle as*   * *SL PRS can be transmitted in symbols for PSSCH.* * *SL PRS is not transmitted in symbols for 2nd SCI.* * *SL PRS is not transmitted in symbols for PSCCH* * *SL PRS is transmitted in consecutive symbols*   ***Proposal 7:*** *For dedicated resource pool(s) for SL-PRS, new PHY structure is considered for SL PRS transmission including at least*   * *One AGC symbol before first symbol, One GAP symbol after last symbol* * *PSCCH (contain the 1st stage SCI)* * *SL PRS symbols* * *PSSCH (only contain the 2nd stage SCI)* |
| CMCC [21] | *Proposal 9: A SL-PRS slot should at least consist of SL PRS and its associated PSCCH, and it includes:*   * *PSCCH occupies 2 or 3 symbols.* * *The 1st symbol of SL-PRS should be used as the AGC symbol, which is the duplication of the 2nd symbol of SL-PRS.* * *A GAP symbol for Rx-Tx turnaround is also required immediately after the last symbol of SL-PRS.*   *Proposal 10: For SL-PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools:*   * *Comb size 6 is supported in shared resource pool.* * *Comb size 1 is supported in dedicated resource pool.* * *Comb size 8 is supported.*   *Proposal 11: For SL PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools:*   * *At least a maximum effective comb size [6] can be supported.* * *SL PRS patterns with partial staggering are further supported for the following (M,N) pairs:*   + - *(M, 6) with M = {1, 2}*     - *(M, 4) with M = {1}*     - *(M, 8) with M = {2}*   *Proposal 12: RAN1 does not consider non-consecutive symbols SL-PRS for shared resource pool.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 6: Support the following options of SL-PRS comb sizes (N) in the following cases:*   * *For a dedicated resource pool, support N = {1,8,12}* * *For a shared resource pool, support N= {6} and do not support N= {8,12}*   *Proposal 7: At least for a dedicated resource pool, support at least M=6 for a fully staggered SL-PRS, i.e. (M, N) = (6, 6). Additional M=8 may also be supported pending support of N=8 for a dedicated resource pool.*  *Proposal 8: RAN1 to further consider M>N SL-PRS fully staggered patterns, e.g., M= {10,11,12} depending on the maximum supported comb size, start symbol in a slot and slot structure configuration, e.g., number of AGC, PSCCH and Tx-Rx turnaround symbols.*  *Proposal 11: Mini-slot of various symbol length of SL-PRS e.g., 2, 4, and 6 can be further studied at least for dedicated resource pools. FFS the applicability to shared resource pools.*  *Proposal 12: In the case of a dedicated resource pool, the bandwidth of SL-PRS shall be the same as that of the resource pool.* |
| ZTE [23] | ***Proposal 3:*** *For SL PRS in shared or dedicated resource pools, with regards to the value N (comb size) and the number M of SL PRS symbols of a SL PRS resource within a slot excluding the symbol(s) used for AGC training / Rx-Tx Turnaround,*   * *Comb sizes (N) {1, 2, 4, 6, 8 ,12} are supported* * *The number of SL PRS symbols can be {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12}*   + *One symbol SL PRS excluding the AGC-symbol and Gap symbol should be supported* * *SL PRS pattern with full staggering are supported*   + *(M, N) = (1, 1), (2, 2), (4, 4), (6, 6), (8, 8), FFS: (12, 12)* * *SL PRS pattern with partial staggering are supported*   + *(1, 2), (1, 4), (2, 4), (1, 6), (2, 6), (1, 8), (2, 8), (4, 8), (1, 12), (2, 12), (4, 12)* * *The detailed RE offset sequence for SL PRS can be:*  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **N:comb size** | **M: Number of symbols for SL PRS** | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 12 | | 1 | 0 | 0,0 | 0,0,0 | 0,0,0,0 | 0,0,0,0,0,0 | 0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 | 0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 | | 2 | 0 | 0,1 | - | 0,1,0,1 | 0,1,0,1,0,1 | 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1 | 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1 | | 4 | 0 | 0,2 | - | 0,2,1,3 | - | 0,2,1,3,0,2,1,3 | 0,2,1,3,0,2,1,3,0,2,1,3 | | 6 | 0 | 0,3 | - | - | 0,3,1,4,2,5 | - | 0,3,1,4,2,5,0,3,1,4,2,5 | | 8 | 0 | - | - | 0,4,2,6 | - | 0,4,2,6,1,5,3,7 | 0,4,2,6,1,5,3,7,0,4,2,6 | | 12 | 0 | 0,6 | - | 0,6,3,9 | - | - | 0,6,3,9,1,7,4,10,2,8,5,11 |   ***Proposal 4:*** *At least for the dedicated SL PRS resource pool, and assuming a SL PRS resource with contiguous symbols,*   * *With regards to AGC training*   + *One symbol preceding a SL PRS resource can be used*   + *AGC symbol is a duplication of the expected symbol next to the final symbol of fully/partially staggered SL PRS* * *With regards to Rx/Tx turnaround (gap symbol)*   + *One symbol after a SL PRS resource can be used*   ***Proposal 5:*** *For shared resource pool, with regards to SL PRS bandwidth configuration, down-select between the following two options:*   * *Option 1: SL PRS bandwidth is indicated in SCI;* * *Option 2: SL PRS bandwidth is up to higher layer configuration in a resource pool.* |
| CEWiT [24] | ***Proposal 2:*** *In shared resource pool, SL PRS with Comb size 6 should be supported.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *In dedicated resource pool, SL PRS with Comb size 1 should be supported.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For SL PRS in shared and dedicated resource pools Full staggering with (M, N) = (6,6) is supported. The effective comb size for the SL PRS with partial staggering should be restricted to 4.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For SL-PRS in shared and dedicated resource pool full staggering with M>N is supported for the following combination {2,1}, {4,1}, {4,2}, {6,1}, {6,2}, {8,2}, {8,4}.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *SL-PRS Frequency offsets are given in the following table.*   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *SL-PRS symbols (M)*  *k-comb (N)* | *0* | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | | *1* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | | *2* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | | *4* | *0* | *2* | *1* | *3* | *0* | *2* | *1* | *3* | | *6* | *0* | *3* | *1* | *4* | *2* | *5* | *0* | *3* | |
| Fraunhofer [25] | *Observation 2: Splitting the SL-PRS into two parts with a gap between the two parts (fragmented spectrum) may allow a SL-PRS allocation also, if a contiguous set of sub-channels is not available and causes only a minor degradation of the performance.*  *Proposal 3: Consider non-contiguous frequency allocation of the SL-PRS according to the sub-channel structure of the SL resource pool.* |
| IDCC [26] | *Proposal 3: In a dedicated resource pool for SL-PRS, support one AGC symbol at the beginning of each sub-slot.*  *Proposal 4: In a dedicated resource pool for SL-PRS, support one GAP symbol at the end of each slot.*  *Proposal 5: One GAP symbol between two sub-slots in a slot is configurable in a dedicated resource pool for SL-PRS.* |
| Apple [27] | *Proposal 3: For supportable bandwidths, lower the minimum number of PRBs from 24 (as specified for DL-PRS) to enable support for UEs with smaller bandwidths.*  *Proposal 4: Based on the agreements made in RAN1 #112, the following comb sizes should be considered:*   * *For shared resource pools, given the limited # of slots with transmission of other channels, comb size 6 should not be supported.* * *For a dedicated resource pools, comb size 1 can be supported.* * *For a dedicated resource pool Comb size N = 8 and 12 can be supported. These sizes are not supported for the shared resource pool.*   *Proposal 5: Based on the agreements made in RAN1 #112, the following staggering patterns should be considered:*   * *For SL pattern with full staggering, (M,N) = (6,6) is supported* * *For SL PRS patterns with M>N should be supported with full staggering*   *Proposal 6: For shared resource pools, non-consecutive symbols should be allowed to enable the PRS avoid resources with higher priority signals e.g. DMRS.*  *Proposal 7: The end of the SL-PRS pattern should be a symbol with the same RE-offset as the first symbol, for phase-tracking purposes.*  *Proposal 8: A new AGC symbol should be placed in front of the SL-PRS symbol to allow for AGC training and for RxTx Turnaround.* |
| Ericsson [28] | [*Observation 1 Partially staggered comb patterns have a TOA range of at least 200m for comb 12, up to 1.5km for comb 2 with the largest SCS, which is well in range for the use cases in sidelink positioning.*](#_Toc131686646)  [*Observation 2 Large comb sizes with partial staggering are compatible with the use cases for sidelink PRS.*](#_Toc131686647)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753064 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753064)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753065 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753065)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753066 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753066)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753067 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753067)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753068 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753068)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753069 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753069)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753070 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753070)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753071 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753071)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | *Symbol number within the downlink PRS resource* | | | | | | | | | | | | | *0* | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* | *9* | *10* | *11* | | *2* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | | *4* | *0* | *2* | *1* | *3* | *0* | *2* | *1* | *3* | *0* | *2* | *1* | *3* | | *6* | *0* | *3* | *~~1~~ 2* | *4* | *1 ~~2~~* | *5* | *0* | *3* | *~~1~~ 2* | *4* | *1 ~~2~~* | *5* | | *12* | *0* | *6* | *3* | *9* | *~~1~~ 2* | *7* | *4* | *10* | *1 ~~2~~* | *8* | *5* | *11* |   [PAGEREF \_Toc131753072 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753072)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753087 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753087)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753089 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753089)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753090 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753090) |
| Qualcomm [29] | *Proposal 2: In the shared resource, the existing slot structure is reused for transmission with SL-PRS, including the AGC symbol, PSCCH, PSSCH, and the gap symbol.*  *Proposal 5: SL-PRS is mapped on contiguous symbols only and is not mapped on symbols with PSSCH DMRS, i.e. SL-PRS can only be mapped on one set of contiguous symbol either before, between, or after PSSCH DMRS.*  *Proposal 7: Comb-6 is not supported in the shared resource pool.*  *Proposal 8: Support SL-PRS transmission on 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10 symbols.*  *Proposal 9: Support SL PRS patterns with M > N with full staggering.*  *Proposal 10: SL-PRS reuses existing RE offset sequences from DL-PRS.*  *Proposal 11: A symbol for AGC training and a gap duration are included before and after transmissions containing SL-PRS, respectively.* |
| NEC [30] | *Proposal 1: At least for dedicated resource pool, the bandwidth of SL-PRS can be same or smaller than that of the resource pool.*  *Proposal 2: With respect to the number of SL-PRS symbols within a slot excluding the AGC and GP symbol(s), the candidate values M={1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12} should be supported.*  *Proposal 5: An AGC/switching symbol before/after each separate SL-PRS in a slot should be supported, namely each separate SL-PRS should has corresponding AGC symbol and switching symbol respectively.* |
| MTK [32] | *Proposal 2-1: M (symbol number) > N (comb size) is not supported*  *Proposal 2-2: (M,N) = (6,6) is not supported*  *Proposal 2-3: Comb size 1 in dedicated resource pool is not supported*  *Proposal 2-7: Prefer to also support comb size 8, since SRS for positioning supports this comb size, and also comb size 2, 4 and 8 form the hierarchy*  *Proposal 2-8: Support comb-6 with 2 symbols to obtain an equivalent comb-3 structure*  *Proposal 2-9: SL-PRS is also applied with the RE offset sequence for the DL-PRS, and the SL-PRS has the own symbol number set different from that for DL-PRS*  *Proposal 4-1: If AGC symbol for SL-PRS is configured in the dedicated resource pool, the AGC symbol also transmits SL-PRS, and the corresponding RE offset is the same as that in the last symbol in a SL-PRS resource* |

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* + 1. Comb sizes and offsets for SL PRS

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* ***Supported comb sizes (values of N) in dedicated resource pools (2, 4, 6 already agreed; FFS: 1, 8, 12)***
  + *1:* 
    - *Yes: Nokia, OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, LGE, Samsung, CMCC, Lenovo, ZTE, CEWiT, Apple, Ericsson*
    - *No: MTK*
  + *8:*
    - *Yes: Nokia, OPPO, Intel, LGE, China Telecom, Samsung, CMCC, Lenovo, ZTE, Apple, MTK*
    - *No: CATT*
  + *10:* 
    - *Yes: LGE*
  + *12:*
    - *Yes: HW-HiSi (w/ partial staggering), vivo (w/ partial staggering), OPPO, Intel, China Telecom, Samsung, Lenovo, ZTE, Apple, Ericsson*
    - *No: Nokia, CATT*
* ***Supported comb sizes (values of N) in shared resource pools (1, 2, 4 already agreed; FFS: 6, 8, 12)***
  + *6:* 
    - *Yes: Nokia, vivo (w/ partial staggering), OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, LGE, Samsung, CMCC, Lenovo, ZTE,* *CEWiT, Ericsson*
    - *No: Apple, Qualcomm*
  + *8:*
    - *Yes: Nokia, OPPO, LGE, Samsung, CMCC, ZTE, MTK*
    - *No: CATT, Lenovo, Apple*
  + *12:*
    - *Yes: HW-HiSi (w/ partial staggering), vivo (w/ partial staggering), OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson*
    - *No: Nokia, CATT, Lenovo, Apple*
  + *The primary concern expressed regarding the support of larger comb sizes, especially for shared resource pools, relate to potential challenges for Tx UE implementation of large power boosting values, e.g., relative to a symbol with PSSCH. Current PUSCH DMRS specifications expect a power boosting amount of 4.77 dB. For N = 6 and above, the power boosting amount may increase to 7.78 dB and beyond. In such a case, additional transient time may also be necessary for a Tx UE – this may require further inputs and confirmation from RAN4.*
    - *Alternatively, instead of aligning Tx power per symbol, Tx PSD may be aligned between a PSSCH and SL PRS transmission in shared resource pool, in which case, additional AGC symbol may be necessary, thereby reducing overall efficiency considering limited time domain resources in a slot for shared resource pools.*
* ***On RE offset sequence***
  + *Several companies indicate that for SL PRS, RE offset sequence should be defined as a function of SL PRS symbol index within a resource and not symbol index with respect to slot boundary. Accordingly, such a proposal is made below. Further details of RE offset sequence may be discussed once details of time domain mapping of SL PRS are clearer.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.1-1

* *For SL PRS in dedicated resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 2, 4, 6, the following values are also supported:*
  + *N = 1, 8, 12*
  + *FFS: for one or both of N = 8, 12, whether they are limited to partially staggered patterns only.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We support N=1 and are OK with N=8, but we don’t think N=12 is really needed. If the majority want N=12, we can live with the proposal. |
| vivo | We have some concerns about the resource efficiency of N=1. In this case, FDM cannot be supported, the overhead of AGC and GP symbols will be large for SL transmission considering only TDM-based multiplexing can be supported for N=1. |
| Fraunhofer | Support N=1 and 8. We see minor gain in supporting N=12 compared to N=8. |
| Xiaomi | We think comb size 2, 4, 6 would be enough and do not think additional value is necessary. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | N={1,8} is supported in a dedicated resource pool.  Regarding N=12, if SCI is always transmitted together with SL PRS in a slot, we don’t support N=12. We don’t see the benefit of partial staggering with N=12, compared to full staggering with N<12. Therefore, supporting N=12 is dependent on the decision on whether or not SCI is always transmitted together with SL PRS in a slot.  It’s not clear why power boosting is problematic only for SL PRS, whereas N={8,12} is already supported in SRS for positioning. If any comb size is used for SL PRS, other carriers except SL PRS RE are zero value, which is different from the case of DMRS transmission, where up to 6dB PSD difference between data and RS is recommended. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| mtk | 1, we don't prefer comb size 1. If we say after a resource, the GP symbol is needed then the overhead to support comb size 1 is quite large.  2, Basically, we also want to understand why there is a need to support so many comb size? Comb-2, comb-4 and comb-8 could form hierarchy and has the chance to be FDM in the same symbols. We are fine to additionally support comb-8 but we don't prefer comb-1 and comb-12 |
| Samsung | Why we need to differentiate the supported N value between the shared and dedicated resource pool? We think that N = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported for any resource pool and leave for configuration to decide. |
| Lenovo | Support of FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | Support.  We see N=1 is beneficial for low-latency service.  The support of N=12 can increase the multiplexing capacity and larger power boosting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For dedicated pool, we prefer comb 12 over comb 8 given the potential multiplexing capability. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Apple | OK |
| Intel | Considering the case when PSCCH and SL PRS are multiplexed in a TDM manner in a dedicated resource pool, maximum number of symbols for SL PRS transmission in a slot is 9. In this case, comb size of 12 can only work for partially staggered pattern. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with N=1, but not the other values.  N=8 could lead to unequal number of REs with SL-PRS across OFDM symbols, depending on the allocation size.  N=12 cannot be used as fully staggered and the benefit/performance are not clearly explained. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with N being 1 or 8. We do not see the necessity for N=12 since the sum of numbers of symbols of PRSs in mini-slots, number of PSCCH symbols, numbers of AGC and GP symbols around mini-slots/PSCCH cannot exceed 14. |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Ericsson | We think comb 12 is useful for the purpose of multiplexing. For comb 1 and comb 8, we don’t think these are adding much to the already agreed comb sizes. |
| CEWiT | We support Comb sizes {1,2,4,6}. We are okay with 8 with full staggered but echo the QC’s concern. We do not see the importance of 12 because in many cases we can configure only with partial stagger pattern and may not provide any added value compared other comb sizes like 6 or 8.  We support 1 because in some cases like slow moving UEs in confined environment like factories, for better latency profile (achieving lesser latency) comb size 1 can be used. |
| Moderator | Summary of company views:   * N = 1:   + Yes: 15 companies   + No: 4 companies (concern is OH when accounting for AGC, gap symbols) * N = 8:   + Yes: 15 companies   + No: 3 + HW-HiSi (prefers N = 12 over 8) (Primary concern: N = 8 leads to potentially inefficient multiplexing *depending on resource pool size* in frequency and less convinced on need for large multiplexing order) * N = 12:   + Yes: 11 + CATT (can live with it)   + No: 4 companies (Primary concern: N = 12 is not likely possible for fully staggered patterns while high multiplexing order is not necessary)   Given the situation, the original proposal is repeated but as a working assumption. It may be good to resolve this over GTW. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.1-1  * *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in dedicated resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 2, 4, 6, the following values are also supported:*   + *N = 1, 8, 12*   + *FFS: for one or both of N = 8, 12, whether they are limited to partially staggered patterns only.* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal as a working assumption. |
| LGE | We support N=1, 8 but not 12.  We’re not still convinced on the benefit of comb size 12 only with partial staggering compared to smaller comb size with full staggering. |
| vivo | We still have some concerns about N=1, the ratio of AGC and/or GP may exceed 50%. For example, if (1,1) is supported, and AGC and/or GP is accompanying each resource (1AGC+1 PRS+1GP,1), the resource efficiency is 33% |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We pefer that N = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported for any resource pool and leave for configuration to decide. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer 12 over 8 considering the number of PSCCHs capacity and the equivalent number of SL-PRS could be multiplexed. Ok with WA but delete *for one or both of N = 8, 12.* Fine to have FFS whether they are limited to partially staggered patterns only. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Qualcomm | Not support  As mentioned in Round 1, Comb-8 might not have the same number of SL-PRS REs in each symbol and Comb-12 cannot be realized in a fully staggered manner.  There have not been evaluation for such large comb sizes demonstrating that multiplexing that many UEs would work under SL synchronization and power differences due to near/far UEs.  [Moderator] For comb-8 and # of SL PRS REs in each symbol, this can be controlled by the choice of BW. If the available BW values are not suitable for a resource pool, comb-8 may not be used. |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Not convinced that N=12 is beneficial, but we can accept this. |
| Moderator | Given that benefits of comb-12 have not been established so far, let’s try with comb-12 as FFS. Proponents of comb-12 can still try to make a case for it, possibly with evaluations.  Hopefully those with concerns regarding comb-8 can compromise – the issue of alignment to PRB structure can be addressed with proper configuration of the SL PRS BW and when not possible, it may not be used. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.1-1  * *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in dedicated resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 2, 4, 6, the following values are also supported:*   + *N = 1, 8~~, 12~~*   + *FFS: N = 12*   + *FFS: ~~for one or both of N = 8, 12,~~ Whether ~~they~~ N =8 and N=12 (if supported) are limited to partially staggered patterns only.* |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| CATT | Support.  We are fine to put N=12 into the FFS. The benefit of N=12 need further clarifications. |
| vivo | Sorry, we still have some concerns about the proposal, especially for value 1.  In addition, based on the same RE power discussion in CA, we also think N=8 may arise another problem since the RE number may be different for different RB |
| OPPO | OK |
| mtk | We actually think that is it needed to add some many comb sizes just for flexibility?  The existing agreed ones have been okay from our view. We are pretty okay **without** N = 1, 8, 12 |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Xiaomi | We can accept the majority view. |
| ZTE | Comb size N = 12 with 1-symbol PRS has been agreed even for Uu DL case where the location distance is usually farther than SL. Why N=12 cannot be used for SL? Support of N=12 with partial staggered pattern doesn’t cause any issue but introduce larger capacity if multiple anchor UEs can be comb-based multiplexed. |
| LGE | We support the full staggering for N=8, but can accept it as FFS. Support FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | Same view as ZTE. Comb 12 is efficient from the range and multiplexing perspective. |
| CEWiT | Okay with proposal for progress. But okay if 8 is also moved into FFS. |
| Qualcomm | Not support.  We would like to move comb-8 to the FFS as well. The benefits and its implications on performance, in particular the unequal number of REs per symbol, have not been studied. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.1-2

* *For SL PRS in shared resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 1, 2, 4, larger values of N are NOT introduced.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Do not support.  We prefer to keep the same candidate values of N for dedicated RP and shared RP. |
| Fraunhofer | N=6 can be applicable for shared resource pools |
| Xiaomi | Agree |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | According to our analysis, maximum 8 symbols can be used for SL PRS when 2 PSCCH symbols are used and the number of PSSCH DMRS symbols is 2 or 3. Therefore, we support N=8 in a shored resource pool. |
| CMCC | We can live with the proposal. |
| mtk | Comb-1, 2, 4 are sufficient for shared resource pool. Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Why we need to differentiate the supported N value between the shared and dedicated resource pool? We think that N = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported for any resource pool and leave for configuration to decide. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo | Ok with FL’s proposal |
| ZTE | We prefer to additional support N=6, for shared resource pool it is possible that a slot only contains SL-PRS, PSCCH, PSSCH not carrying SL data but only including 2nd stage SCI, there will be enough room for comb size 6 in a slot of shared resource pool.  Moreover, N={8,12} and limited it to only partial staggering pattern is also feasible. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Apple | Support |
| Intel | Support. For shared resource pool, limited number of symbols of SL PRS transmission is preferred. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | N = 6 and 8 can also be considered. |
| Toyota | We are ok with the proposal but would be ok to also add 6 and 8. |
| Ericsson | We think the supported comb sizes can be the same for both both dedicated and shared pools. |
| CEWiT | Do not support this proposal and prefer to have same comb sizes for both shared and dedicated resource pool. |
| Moderator | 13 companies support the FL proposal.  4 companies want same values of N for dedicated and shared resource pools, implying support of values of N > 4.  N = 6 is also suggested by at least 4 companies.  N = 8 is also suggested by at least 4 companies.  Other than the consideration on support of fully staggered patterns, one additional concern expressed for support of larger comb values is impact to UE power boosting if same symbol power is required between a PSSCH symbol and SL RPS in shared resource pool.  Another important point to note is that, unlike dedicated resource pools, for the case of shared resource pool, larger comb sizes are likely not helpful for multiplexing.  Considering this, the proposal is updated to include N = 6, N = 8 as a working assumption as a potential compromise. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.1-2  * *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in shared resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 1, 2, 4, the following are supported: N = 6, N = 8.* |
| CATT | Support the proposal as a working assumption.  We prefer to keep the same candidate values of N for dedicated RP and shared RP. |
| LGE | We’re fine with working assumption for N=6, 8.  Regarding power boosting, we’re not sure why a larger comb size in a shared resource pool is only problematic, while PSCCH can be more power boosted that SL PRS in a dedicated resource pool for wide bandwidth.  As for the multiplexing issue, we don’t support TDM or code-based multiplexing in a shared resource pool, so the multiplexing issue should not be a problem.  [Moderator] It is not agreed that PSCCH is power boosted to same symbol level as SL PRS in a dedicated resource pool – there are multiple companies proposing separate AGC symbols for PSCCH and SL PRS in a dedicated resource pool for this purpose. However, for shared resource pool, a popular option is to have same symbol power and BW between PSSCH and SL PRS, and this is when the issue of boosting due to high comb order becomes relevant.  There is no issue with multiplexing – it is that multiplexing and thereby SL PRS user capacity may not be increased with larger comb sizes in shared resource pools. |
| ZTE | Ok with working assumption. |
| Samsung | We pefer that N = {1,2,4,6,8,12} are supported for any resource pool and leave for configuration to decide. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| NEC | We are OK wih working assumption. |
| Lenovo | Ok to support |
| Qualcomm | Not support.  A larger comb size has implication on UE implementation and as mentioned by the FL is not useful in the shared resource pool. Therefore, we cannot support this proposal.  [Moderator] With a working assumption we can revisit this if there is a serious problem to UE implementation. Towards this, we could also consider asking RAN4 for guidance under the assumption of same BW and symbol power for PSSCH and SL PRS in a shared resource pool, and based on their feedback the decision could be revisited. |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Intel | We can be fine to support N = 6 and 8 as working assumption. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator | To address the concern from QC, we could consider to send an LS to RAN4 to request guidance on whether there may be serious issues with UE implementation with large comb sizes like 6 or 8 for shared pool case. The proposal is updated now to include this. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.1-2  * *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in shared resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 1, 2, 4, the following are supported: N = 6, N = 8.* * *Send an LS to RAN4 requesting feedback on potential impact to UE implementation for comb sizes N = 6 or 8 for shared resource pool if a transmitting UE is expected to maintain same Tx power in a symbol with PSSCH and SL PRS with same overall bandwidth by power boosting of the SL PRS REs.* |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| CATT | Support.  We are fine to send a LS to RAN4 for checking the potential issues on larger comb size in shared RP. |
| vivo | For comb 8, if the RB number is not multiple of 2 PRB, the power of PRS will be different from the power of PSSCH.  So, maybe we can remove the N=8 at this stage, and wait for more conclusion in RAN1 other than sending LS directly |
| Futurewei | OK |
| ZTE | We agree sending an LS to RAN4 to check the feasibility of the larger comb sizes. In such case, It is better to check all values including N=12. If feasible from RAN4 side, then no need to differentiate the size values between dedicated and shared pools. |
| LGE | Support. We’re ok to ask RAN4 experties on power boosting issue for large comb size. |
| Ericsson | We prefer unified comb sizes between dedicated and shared pools. |
| CEWiT | Okay with working assumption but prefer limit to comb size 4. |
| Qualcomm | Not support.  The question is not only about feasibility, but also benefit in the shared resource pool. In our view, and as noted by the feature lead in the previous round, there is no benefit to supporting these larger comb sizes. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal and sending LS to RAN4. |

* + 1. Frequency domain characteristics of SL PRS

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* ***SL PRS bandwidth in dedicated resource pools***
  + *Multiple companies propose that SL PRS bandwidth is same as resource pool bandwidth for dedicated resource pools. This is primarily motivated by performance considerations. Given a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, using the max available SL PRS bandwidth can be seen as critical to achieve good localization/ranging accuracy.*
    - *Supported by: HW-HiSi, OPPO, Intel, Lenovo,*
  + *On the other hand, several companies also propose consideration of flexible bandwidth allocation that may be smaller than resource pool bandwidth in dedicated resource pools.*
    - *Supported by: vivo, SONY, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, NEC,*
  + *Given the limited number of clear preferences expressed in tdocs, further inputs and discussions would be necessary to resolve this issue.*
* ***SL PRS bandwidth in shared resource pools***
  + *Many companies propose that SL PRS BW can be smaller than resource pool BW.*
    - *Supported by: HW-HiSi, SONY, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, ZTE, Futurewei*
  + *Some companies further propose that SL PRS BW is same as the BW indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is present in a shared resource pool.*
    - *Supported by: vivo, CATT, Intel*
  + *Given the limited number of clear preferences in tdocs, further inputs and discussions would be necessary to resolve this issue.*
* ***Granularity of SL PRS allocation in frequency domain***
  + *One company (OPPO) proposes that minimum BW of SL PRS should be 20 MHz.*
  + *One company (Xiaomi) proposes that subchannels defined for a resource pool are used to define granularity of SL PRS resource allocation in frequency domain*
    - *Note: For R16 SL, subchannelSize can be {10,12,15,20,25,50, 75,100} PRBs*
  + *One company (Apple) proposes that SL PRS BW with smaller than 24 PRBs minimum BW and granularity smaller than 4 PRBs should be considered.*
    - *Note: For DL PRS, 24 PRBs is the minimum BW with granularity of 4 PRBs*
  + *In addition, one company (Fraunhofer) proposes to consider non-contiguous frequency allocation for SL PRS according to the subchannel structure of the SL resource pool in case of fragmented bandwidth.*
  + *This issue may be visited once further progress once the resource allocation aspects for SL PRS become clearer.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.2-1

* *For dedicated resource pools, RAN1 to down-select between:*
  + *Alt 1: SL PRS bandwidth is same as resource pool bandwidth.*
  + *Alt 2: SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth.*

*Please provide clear justifications in defense of your preference.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt 1/Alt 2** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt 2. | This issue is also discussed in AI 9.5.1.3. We prefer to discuss this issue only in one AI. |
| vivo | Alt2 | For different UEs and different requirements, the bandwidth can be different and different with resource pool bandwidth. In this case, considering the diversity of UE, we should not restrict UE only can transmit SL PRS with the same bandwidth of resource pool. |
| Fraunhofer | Alt2 | The bandwidth configuration is selection is a tradeoff mainly between the required target accuracy, resource utilization and coverage. An additional note can serve for additional clarification: No further specifications resulting from SL-PRS configuration smaller than the resource pool are expected in Rel-18. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2 | To adapt to different positioning/ranging requirement and more efficient resource usage. |
| OPPO | Alt1 | Use of maximum bandwidth can increase the possibility of achieving the target accuracy, and as TDM is allowed within a slot, there is no strong motivation to further increase the system capacity by FDM. |
| Panasonic | Alt 2 |  |
| LGE | Alt 2 | To accommodate various SL positioning service requirements in a dedicated resource pool, SL PRS BW needs to be flexible. |
| CMCC | Alt. 1 | Alt. 1 guarantees higher positioning accuracy. Proponents of Alt. 2 argue that it can leave configuration flexibility of the SL PRS BW to be smaller than that of the resource pool, to our understanding, however, it may scatter the resources and further reduce the resource utilization efficiency. |
| mtk | Alt 1 | If the transmission BW < resource pool BW, then we have concern on the resource usage efficiency.  Also, there is difference between transmission BW and measurement BW. A RX UE could depend on its capability not to measure wider SL-PRS. But another RX-UE may be good enough to be able to measure wider SL-PRS.  If a UE has then intention to transmit with smaller BW than RP BW, why not transmit at another RP with smaller BW to be defined? |
| Samsung | Alt 2 | For flexibility |
| Spreadtrum | Alt. 2 | SL PRS bandwidth is pre-configured by high layer. |
| Lenovo | Alt.1 | Prefer Alt. 1 due to positioning performance degradation with Alt.2, however if BW is smaller can live with Alt.2 for better flexibility at the expense of lower resource of efficiency in dedicated RP. |
| ZTE | Alt.1 | We prefer to only have one bandwidth configured for a dedicated resource pool (similar as the bandwidth of DL PRS within a single PFL is the same).  Also, this topic is discussed in 9.5.1.3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 1. | Having a flexible SL-PRS bandwidth transmission in the dedicated pool will complicate the comb-level FDM scheme, and thus we support fixed bandwidth design.  For example, if we allow flexible BW allocation, the following pattern transmitted by two UEs can be possible.  PRS UE 1  PRS UE 2 |
| NEC | Alt. 2 | According to the different requirement on positioning accuracy, it’s not necessary to restrict the SL PRS bandwidth to resource pool bandwidth, even FDM SL PRS multiplexing is not applied. |
| Apple | Alt 2 | To allow for UEs of different BWs |
| SONY | Alt 2 |  |
| Intel | Alt. 1 | Share similar view as OPPO. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1 |  |
| Continental Automotive | Alt 2 | For different positioning services, using multiple SL PRS resources with different bandwidths would be preferable to ensure efficient utilization of the RP. |
| Qualcomm |  | We see justification for both alternatives.  Alt 1: would simplify TDM and especially comb-based multiplexing. There are proposals from other companies to have one M,N configuration per resource pool for this reason.  Alt 2: Could improve resource utilization when not all UEs need the same accuracy requirements. However, comb-based multiplexing and TDM become very problematic (practically infeasible)  If multiple dedicated resource pools end up being supported, that would address some of the limitations of Alt 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 2 | Positioning requirements span a wide range, and hence the SL PRS bandwidth requirements may differ from one UE to the other. In this case, flexible SL PRS bandwidth allocation allows FDMed SL PRS transmissions to increase resource utilization. |
| Toyota | Alt 2 | It is more resource/spectral efficient that the SL PRW BW does not always take the full resource pool BW depending e.g. on the accuracy required. |
| Ericsson | Alt2 |  |
| Moderator |  | Summary of company views:  Alt 1: 8 companies (in consideration of performance and simplicity to handle comb- and TDM-based mux of SL PRS).  Alt 2: 15 companies (flexibility – full resource pool BW may not be needed by all UEs, depending on use-case and target accuracy).  See justification from either side; with multiple dedicated RPs, some of the concerns of Alt 1 can be addressed: 1 company.  One detail to consider further for Alt 2 is on how any “remaining resource” may be utilized – i.e., to support FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS (at PRB/subchannel level) within a dedicated resource pool and if FDM is not supported, the decision could be revisited.  Given the situation, the following is proposed: [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth.* |
| Moderator 2 |  | Based on discussions during Wednesday GTW, let us consider the following updated proposal.  Companies are requested to share their views on details of the higher layer configuration considering the proposal below.  First, it should be clear that for a receiving UE, the SL PRS BW information would be conveyed over SLPP as against via SCI.  Further, for a Tx UE, it should be (pre-)configured.  Further, since the SL PRS should fit within a given SL PRS resource pool, one or more SL PRS bandwidth values should be (pre-)configured to a Tx UE on a per resource pool basis. [High] FL2a Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers for a receiving UE via SLPP.*   + *For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.*   + *[One or more] SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured to a transmitting UE on a per resource pool basis.* |
| CATT |  | OK with the proposal in principle.  We prefer to remove the SLPP in the proposal, because maybe RRC will be involved for the pre-configuration of bandwidth.  In addition, we prefer to remove the “*transmitting*” and “*receiving*” in the proposal, because the serve UE may provide the bandwidth value to both the transmitting UE and receiving UE.  Our preferred revision as follows, [High] FL2a Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers ~~for a receiving UE via SLPP~~.*   + *For a ~~transmitting~~ UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.*   + *[One or more] SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured to a ~~transmitting~~ UE on a per resource pool basis.* |
| LGE |  | Do not support.  We change our position after hearing the FDM issue on GTW. Allowing a flexible SL PRS BW make the operation more complicated and generate subsequent issues (we already have FFS). In addition, it can be possible to waste a spectrum if the configured BW does not fit the entire BW among UEs. This will cause subsequent issues even if we succeed in finding a solution.  On the other hand, we see no big difference between original Alt 1 and 2 if the BW configuration is static. It is practically equivalent to multiple resource pools having different BWs. As some company mentioned, Alt 1 is simpler and efficient for SL PRS multiplexing.  We support the original Alt 1. |
| vivo |  | Based on the FL update proposal, it is equal to the original Alt2. Based on discussions during Wednesday GTW, our understanding is the bandwidth can be configured per resource, and then it can be indicated by resource ID other than FDRA. |
| ZTE |  | We still prefer to only have one bandwidth configured for a dedicated resource pool. |
| CMCC |  | Our first preference is still to support Alt. 1, but for making progress, we are OK to have per RP level (pre-)configure a set of supported SL PRS BW candidates. From our perspective, limiting the configuration flexibility is beneficial from resource selection point of view to ensure a high resource utilization efficiency and reduce potential resource collision.  Note that if we introduce SL PRS BW flexibility to be smaller than the BW of a RP, then the starting PRB (or subchannel) of a SL PRS BW is additionally introduced. We think that too much flexibility should be avoided from starting PRB/channel perspective as well, and therefore propose to consider SL PRS starting PRB to be (pre-)configured.  Having said that, we suggest the following updates (to us, the proposal is just the allowed SL PRS BW configuration in a RP, we don’t see the need to say how SL PRS BW is obtained from Tx and/or Rx UE perspective): [High] FL2a Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth ~~where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers for a receiving UE via SLPP~~.*   + *~~For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.~~*   + *[One or more] SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured ~~to a transmitting UE on a~~ per resource pool basis.*   + *For a SL PRS bandwidth value smaller than that of the pool, one or more starting PRB/subchannel can be (pre-)configured per resource pool basis.* |
| OPPO |  | We tend to agree with LGE’s comments, if SL PRS bandwidth is (pre-)configured and even the starting PRB for SL PRS is also (pre-)configured as proposed by CMCC, the distinction between Alt 1 and Alt 2 are almost disappear, we are wondering how much gain in terms of resource efficiency can be achieved with Alt 2 comparing to configuring multiple dedicated resource pools. |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer to CATT version. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | As LGE also analyzed, if configured then it is effectively equivalent to multiple pools, i.e., Alt with multiple pools which has been agreed. |
| Lenovo |  | Based on the latest discussions, it seems that flexibility may introduce more complexity in terms having multiplexing multiple UEs with different BWs in a single pool. Share HW’s and LGE’s view on the last sub-bullet. |
| Qualcomm |  | The proposal looks like a compromise between Alt 1 and Alt 2 from the previous round. It can allow smaller BW than the resource pool for FDMing for example, or restrict to full RP-BW only, based on application. It is different from having multiple resource pool in that the partitioning is not semi-static. If that is the intention, we propose the following to make it clear that there could be limited set of bandwidth values and higher layers select one of them.   * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers for a transmitting UE and for a receiving UE via SLPP.*   + *~~For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.~~*   + *[One or more] Allowed SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured ~~to a transmitting UE~~ on a per resource pool basis.* |
| Toyota |  | We agree with the proposal, and would also be ok with the proposal of update from CMCC. We also agree with the comment from Qualcomm on the improvement of resource utilization when not all UEs need the same accuracy requirements. |
| Intel |  | We share similar view as other companies that as we already agreed multiple resource pools for SL PRS, it is equivalent to FDM’ed SL PRS resources if (pre-)configured. We still prefer Original Alt. 1 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | OK in general. We share CATT’s view that ‘via SLPP’ can be removed from the proposal. Higher layer specific discussion can be taken up in RAN2. |
| Moderator |  | The version suggested by QC may offer a good compromise. The proposal is updated accordingly with addition of LPP for the in-coverage case (it would be reasonable to expect the LMF to do this job for when in-coverage than a server UE). [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers for a transmitting and receiving UE via LLP or SLPP.*   + *~~For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.~~*   + *[One or more] allowed SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured ~~to a transmitting UE~~ on a per resource pool basis.* |
| InterDigital |  | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Toyota |  | Ok with this. |
| CATT |  | We prefer to discuss the configurable SL PRS bandwidth and leave the details for FFS, for example, whether RRC can be used for the (pre)-configuraton of bandwidth, whether pre-configuration is allowed and whether the bandwidth of SL PRS should be per-RP or per-UE.  Our preferred revision as follows, [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers for a transmitting and receiving UE ~~via LLP or SLPP.~~*   + *FFS on the details of higher layers siganllings*   + *~~For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.~~*   + *~~[One or more] allowed SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured to a transmitting UE on a per resource pool basis.~~* |
| vivo |  | We also prefer to remove the part “*s for a transmitting and receiving UE via LLP or SLPP.*”, otherwise, we would like to know how other sensing UE can know the bandwidth. In our view, the main bullet and sub-bullet are contradictory, if the (pre-)configured is per resource pool, why do we need to use the SLPP to indicate other than SCI or SL PRS resource ID?  In addition, we think the bracket in the sub-bullet must be removed, otherwise, there is no progress compared previous agreement. |
| OPPO |  | We are willing to make some compromise for progess on this issue, but to us the proposal above is original Alt 2 actually, although the number of allowed bandwidth may be limited, it does not help in terms of complexity reduction, rather it introduces some new issues as it is also different from current sub-channel based bandwidth determination.  If original Alt1 is not acceptable to the group, we propose to directly use current sub-channel based mechanism, same as shared resource pool. |
| mtk |  | We still don't see it is needed to support several BW within a dedicated RP. |
| Futurewei |  | We still do not see the reason to have smaller BW for dedicated RP. Is the assumption that transmitting and receiving UEs are always provided with the same BW by the SLPP? What happens if not? |
| Xiaomi |  | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE |  | We support the original Option 1. For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth is the same as resource pool bandwidth where the SL PRS bandwidth is provided by higher layers.  Prefer to remove “*s for a transmitting and receiving UE via LLP or SLPP.*” We think bandwidth of SL-PRS should be part of resource pool configuration. |
| LGE |  | **We still prefer the original Alt 1** due to the reasons explained in the previous round.  If the group stands strongly for FL proposal, then we thinkg we should remove LPP or SLPP. From our opinion, if multiple SL PRS BWs are (pre-)configured in a resource pool, TX UE can select the SL PRS BW required for SL PRS transmission based on the SP positioning QoS requirement. Then TX UE can send SCI to inidicate the reserved SL PRS resources including the BW. All these operations are align with the SL communication operation.  If the group stands strongly for FL proposal, we suggest the following modification. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.2-1  * *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth*    + *where the SL PRS bandwidth is ~~provided~~ selected by TX UE’s higher layers ~~for a transmitting and receiving UE via LLP or SLPP~~ and signaled to RX UE via SCI.*   + *~~For a transmitting UE, the SL PRS BW can be (pre-)configured.~~*   + *[One or more] allowed SL PRS bandwidth value(s) can be (pre-)configured ~~to a transmitting UE~~ on a per resource pool basis.* |
| Ericsson |  | We do not agree to configure the transmitting UE via LPP. It should be done either by gNB in coverage or via pre-configuration out of coverage. For the receiving UE, LPP/SLPP is fine. |
| Samsung |  | For flexibility, we suppored the case where SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth  However, now we think that motivation is not so clear. |
| Qualcomm |  | We support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB |  | OK in general. But, does this exclude the possibility where UE’s own higher layer autonomolusy determines the bandwidth of SL PRS and indicates this to Rx UEs via e.g. SLPP? To further study the details, we prefer the revision proposed by CATT.  Typo LLP -> LPP.  Also, we wonder whether LPP/SLPP is always required? Of course, such higher layer signaling can be useful to exchange information about requested/supported SL-PRS bandwidth(s). But to indicate the actually used bandwidth it may not be required: E.g. if only one SL PRS bandwidth value is (pre-)configured in a resource pool then there should be no need for such signaling. Even if multiple bandwidth values are allowed, the SCI anyway needs to indicate the bandwidth to allow sensing-based resource selection to work. |
| Intel |  | The benefit of having SL PRS BW smaller than resource pool bandwidth is still not clear to us. When considering FDM’ed multiplexing of SL PRS in different sub-channels, the design/signaling can be complicated. For instance, it may not be reasonable to consider different Tx UEs may transmit SL-PRS in partially overlapped PRBs. We still prefer the original Alt. 1 to simplify the design. |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.2-2

* *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is present in a shared resource pool.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support.  This issue is also discussed in AI 9.5.1.3. We prefer to discuss this issue only in one AI. |
| vivo | OK |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sharp | The last part of the sentence, “*if/when PSSCH is present in a shared resource pool*”, is unclear to us. Was it assumed that both cases are supported: SL-PRS not multiplexed with PSSCH, and SL-PRS multiplexed with PSSCH? |
| OPPO | “*if/when PSSCH is present in a shared resource pool*” should be removed, as the bandwidth of SL PRS has to be indicated as the bandwidth for PSSCH to ensure back-ward compatibility. |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | In a shared resource pool, PSSCH should be transmitted at least for carrying the 2nd-stage SCI for backward compatibility. As a consequence, SL PRS BW should always be same as PSSCH. PSSCH BW can be configured as equal as or smaller than the resource pool BW. So we don’t need the first part of the sentence. [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.2-2  * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth ~~can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and~~ is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH ~~if/when PSSCH is present~~ in a shared resource pool.* |
| CMCC | OK. |
| mtk |
| Samsung | This proposal needs further clarification. Whether the PSSCH is from same transmitter UE with SL PRS or this PSSCH can be from any UE in the RP? Whether the PSSCH is the a given PSSCH that transmitted together with SL PRS (e.g. in same slot)? Based on our understanding, we suggest the following update as:   * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE ~~is present in a shared resource pool.~~* |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| ZTE | As long as the frequency resource assignment is larger than or can cover the frequency range of SL PRS, there should be no backward compatibility issue. It is feasible to configure the bandwidth of SL PRS in a shared resource pool. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Apple | Support |
| SONY | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with LGE’s update. |
| Futurewei | Suport |
| Continental Automotive | We believe that the PSSCH would always be present in a shared RP, so the latter part is not necessary. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal and are ok with LGE’s changes. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Toyota | The last part of the proposal “*if/when PSSCH is present in a shared resource pool*” seems unclear. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal. In our understanding, it is possible to transmist the SL PRS in the shared pool without always having an associated PSSCH, therefore we do not agree with LGE’s changes. |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback it seems that we cannot agree on always having SL PRS BW same as PSSCH BW since it is still open if we can have slots without PSSCH for a shared resource pool.  The wording update suggested by Samsung is certainly good and is used below. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-2  * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE.* |
| CATT | Support in principle. |
| LGE | The original intention of the proposal was to make SL PRS BW as same as PSSCH BW. In that sense, it makes sense to say that SL PRS BW can be smaller than RP BW. But if we should consider the case when PSSCH is not transmitted (though not determined) with SL PRS in a same slot, we need to separate those two concept.  As we didn’t have any discussion with this respect, we suggest to remove the first clause of the main bullet. If we agree FL proposal as is, it automatically means that SL PRS BW can be smaller than RP BW when PSSCH is not transmitted with SL PRS in a same slot. This is a new topic we need to discuss after decision on PSSCH transmission.   * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth ~~can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and~~ is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE.* |
| vivo | Okay with FL proposal, but for us, the condition may not be needed since 2nd SCI always transmitted and the 2nd SCI is transmited in PSSCH |
| ZTE | We are ok with this proposal for the sake of progress. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| NEC | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with vivo that the if/when condition is not necessary and prefer to remove it. However, we’re ok to discuss that part separately. |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Can accept, but we have doubts about the condition “if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE”: Even if PSSCH is not transmitted, the SL-PRS should be within the frequency allocation indicated in the 1st stage SCI, for compatibility with legacy UEs. |
| Sharp | Agree with QC. |
| Moderator | As observed earlier, we cannot agree on always having SL PRS BW same as PSSCH BW since it is still open if we can have slots without PSSCH for a shared resource pool. Thus we have to keep the “if/when” condition for now. Hope this can be acceptable to all.  The simplification suggested by LGE is implemented below. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.2-2  * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth ~~can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and~~ is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE.* |
| CATT | If there are slots only transmit SL PRS and without PSSCH for SL data in a shared RP, according to the following agreement achieved in 9.5.1.3 at this meeting, 2nd stage SCI will be used for SL-PRS indication. Since PSSCH will carry 2nd stage SCI, then the PSSCH for 2nd SCI will also transmitted even for the slots without PSSCH for SL data. Therefore, it seems that “if/when” is not needed.  **Agreement**  With regards to the SCI signaling in a shared resource pool, in addition to SL PRS transmission, the UE transmits   * Opt. 1: SCI1-A & a 2nd stage SCI format are used for SL-PRS indication   + FFS: Details including a new or existing 2nd stage SCI |
| vivo | Same view as CATT |
| OPPO | OK |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Xiaomi | support |
| ZTE | ok |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LGE | Support |
| Samsung | We share the view with CATT. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with CATT |
| Nokia, NSB | We share CATT’s view. |
| Intel | We share similar view as CATT. |

* + 1. Time domain characteristics of SL PRS

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* ***On supported values of number of symbols (values of M) for SL PRS in dedicated and shared resource pools****,* 
  + *Views are divergent and summarized as below (From RAN1 #112, already-agreed values of M include: {1, 2, 4}):*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {1, 2, 4, 6, 8}, and additional values of M from within {1, …, 8} may also be supported depending on further progress on resource allocation and SL-PRS multiplexing: Nokia*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {1, 2, …, 9}: HW-HiSi*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {1,2,4,6,8,12}: Samsung*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12}: ZTE*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {2, 4, 6, 9, 10}: Qualcomm*
    - *M can be flexibly set from one of {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12}: NEC*
    - *For partially staggered patterns, M can be flexibly set as even-number less than N: LGE*
    - *It should be noted that there are couplings between supported values of M with the decisions on support of M > N for fully staggered patterns and on support of fully staggered patterns like (6,6), etc.*
    - *Considering the above, it is suggested that the group aims to progress on those aspects first before revisiting supported values of ‘M’.*
* ***On SL PRS mapping to contiguous/non-contiguous-in-time symbols in shared resource pools***
  + *SL PRS may be mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only: CATT, Intel, Samsung, CMCC, Qualcomm.*
  + *SL PRS may be mapped to non-contiguous-in-time symbols: OPPO, Apple.*
  + *Given the limited number of clear preferences in tdocs, further inputs and discussions would be necessary to resolve this issue. Accordingly, the following proposal is made.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.3-1

* *For shared resource pools, RAN1 to down-select between:*
  + *Alt 1: SL PRS may be mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*
  + *Alt 2: SL PRS may be mapped to non-contiguous-in-time symbols.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt 1/Alt 2** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt 1 |  |
| vivo | Alt 1 |  |
| xiaomi |  | For either alt 1 or alt 2, it shall be clarified that SL PRS shall not be mapped to DMRS symbols. |
| OPPO | Alt 2 | PSSCH DMRS symbols have to be inserted into a slot if PSSCH DMRS is configured for SL RSRP measurement in the shared resource pool, in this case, OFDM symbols for SL PRS are not contiguous. |
| Panasonic | Alt 2 |  |
| LGE | See comments | We think that PSSCH DMRS should be transmitted in a shared resource pool for backward compatibility. With the same reason, we think that SL PRS should not be transmitted on DMRS symbols in a slot. Therefore, Alt 1 should allow noncontiguous SL PRS transmission due to PSSCH DMRS. We don’t support noncontiguous SL PRS transmission in other case. [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.3-1  * *For shared resource pools, RAN1 to down-select between:*   + *Alt 1: SL PRS may be mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*     - *Mapping to non-contiguous SL PRS symbols due to PSSCH DMRS is allowed*   + *Alt 2: SL PRS may be mapped to non-contiguous-in-time symbols.* |
| CMCC | Alt. 1 |  |
| mtk | Alt 2 | Maybe it could be similar to LTE PRS that it doesn't map to the symbols having CRS |
| Samsung | Alt 1 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Alt. 1 |  |
| Lenovo | Alt 1 |  |
| ZTE | Alt.1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | We think the key issue is not whether SL PRS is contiguous or not. Before the discussion of this issue, we should first make decision on how to set the transmission power for SLPRS and PSSCH/PSCCH. If the transmission power is the same, there would be no limitation on whether it’s contiguous or not in our understanding. |
| NEC | Alt 2 | Similar to CSI-RS in SL, the SL PRS should not be mapped to a DMRS symbols. |
| Apple | Alt 2 | To allow for transmission of DMRS symbols. If Alt 1, then the frame structure is such that (a) complete separation of PSSCH and SL-PRS or (b) a new rule on the interaction between the DMRS and SL-PRS. |
| SONY | Alt 1 |  |
| Intel | Alt. 1 |  |
| Continental Automotive | Alt. 2 | We echo some of the comments by Huawei above. Additionally, we think that setting transmission powers for SL PRS higher than that of PSSCH/PSCCH may lead to unwanted interference to Rel-16/17 SL communication UEs, affecting backward compatibility. However, if SL PRS transmission power is lower than that of PSSCH/PSCCH, we do not see an issue with non-contiguous-in-time symbols. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1 |  |
| InterDigital | Alt 1 |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1 |  |
| Ericsson | both | This depends on whether the PSSCH is present. |
| CEWiT | Alt 1 |  |
| Moderator |  | Summary of company views:  Alt 1: 13 companies  Alt 2: 6 companies  Several companies acknowledge that this is dependent on presence of PSSCH in the slot and also on assumption on Tx power between PSSCH and SL PRS.  At present, we may be able to agree on not mapping SL PRS to PSSCH DMRS symbols and continue further discussions on contiguous/non-contiguous mapping of SL PRS symbols.  Thus, the proposal is modified as below. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.3-1  * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS may not be mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS transmitted by the same UE.*   + *FFS: SL PRS may be mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
| LGE |  | As we don’t have any agreement on PSSCH DMRS transmission when SL PRS is transmitted in a slot, we need to make the proposal as conditional.   * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS may not be mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS, if transmitted by the same UE.* |
| vivo |  | We support the intention of the proposal, but “may not be” is unclear, so, we propose to change the main bullet as follows   * *For shared resource pools, multiplexing SL PRS with PSSCH DMRS symbols of the UE at the same symbol is not supported* |
| ZTE |  | Both sentences in the bullet and subbullet use “may”. In such case, is this proposal really necessary? |
| CMCC |  | Support. |
| NEC |  | We share the similar view of vivo. |
| Lenovo |  | Ok to support |
| Intel |  | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Support in principle, but as mentioned by vivo “may not” is ambiguous and should be avoided. |
| Moderator |  | The wording is updated based on feedback above. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.3-1  * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS ~~may not be~~ is not mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS if transmitted by the same UE.*   + *FFS: SL PRS ~~may be~~ is mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
| Moderator |  | Based on the email discussions on the RAN1 reflector, the proposal is updated as below. Please indicate below if you have strong concerns with this version.  **[High] FL3a Proposal 2.3.3-1**           *For shared resource pools, SL PRS, multiplexed in a PSSCH transmission from the same UE (if supported), ~~may not be~~ is not mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS ~~if transmitted by the same UE~~.*  o    *FFS: SL PRS ~~may be~~ is mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.* |
| Samsung |  | OK |
|  |  |  |

* + 1. SL PRS patterns

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* ***On support of fully staggered patterns (already-agreed (M, N) = (1,1), (2, 2), (4, 4))***
  + *Support of (M, N) = (6, 6)*
    - *Yes: Nokia, Spreadtrum, CATT, LGE, Lenovo (at least for dedicated resource pool), Sharp, Apple, Samsung, Ericsson*
    - *No: MTK*
  + *Support of (M, N) = (8, 8)*
    - *Yes: Nokia, LGE, Lenovo (at least for dedicated resource pool), ZTE, Samsung*
  + *Support of (M, N) = (10, 10)*
    - *Yes: LGE, Lenovo (FFS)*
  + *Support of (M, N) = (12, 12)*
    - *Although some companies have proposed this option, it may be better to revisit this once further clarity is achieved on multiplexing of SL PRS with other signals/channels in a slot.*
* ***Support of partial staggering and effective comb sizes***
  + *Multiple companies have expressed their preferences on particular choices of (M, N) pairs for partially staggered patterns. However, it is suggested to first address the question of whether there should be a limit on the effective comb size (post-de-staggering) and if so, the corresponding value.*
  + *Companies’ views on max effective comb size for partially staggered patterns are rather divergent and further discussions would be needed.*
    - *Max effective comb size = 2*
      * *Supported by: Intel*
    - *Max effective comb size = 3*
      * *Supported by: HW-HiSi, MTK*
    - *Max effective comb size = 4*
      * *Supported by: CEWiT*
    - *Max effective comb size = 6*
      * *Supported by: CMCC*
    - *No explicit limit*
      * *Supported by: LGE, Ericsson*
    - *Given the limited number of clear preferences in tdocs, further inputs and discussions would be necessary to resolve this issue.*
* ***On support of (M, N) patterns with M > N***
  + *Support of (M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering*
    - *Supported by: HW-HiSi, China Telecom, OPPO, Intel (with M = N and is a positive integer), LGE, [Lenovo], Qualcomm,*
    - *Not supported by: Ericsson, MTK*
  + *Support of (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering*
    - *Options to extend beyond N symbols include:*
      * *(1) Simple repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS*
      * *(2) Expansion toward the fully staggered SL PRS and its repetition*
    - *Supported by: LGE*
    - *Not supported by: Ericsson, MTK*
* ***On support of SL PRS repetitions*** 
  + *Depending on the design of patterns with M>N with full and partial staggering and on decision regarding mapping of a SL PRS resource of M symbols to contiguous vs. non-contiguous symbols, the design of SL PRS repetitions may either be supplementary or redundant.*
  + *Thus, it is recommended to visit potential options for SL PRS repetitions once progress is made on support of (M, N) with M > N.*
* ***Repetition of first symbol of SL PRS as the last symbol of a SL PRS resource***
  + *Supported by: HW-HiSi, Futurewei, Apple*
  + *May be realized by M>N patterns per (pre-)configuration: OPPO*
  + *Not supported by: Ericsson (“Doppler or tracking is handled with multiple SL PRS resource instances”)*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-1

* *At least for dedicated SL PRS resource pools, in addition to already-agreed (M, N) = (1,1), (2, 2), (4, 4), fully staggered patterns with (M, N) = (6, 6) are supported.* 
  + *FFS: (M, N) = (8, 8), (10, 10), (12, 12).*
  + *FFS: Applicability to shared resource pools.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support.  We think this issue is related to the candidate values of M and N.  We had better firstly to determine the candidate values of M and N, then to discuss the fully staggered patterns. |
| vivo | We think (1,1) has not been agreed for dedicated resource pool.   * Comb size 1 is supported at least in shared resource pool   + FFS: comb size 1 in dedicated resource pool |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | We support (M,N)=(6,6) and (8,8) for both a shared and a dedicated resource pool, based on our responses to FL1 Proposal 2.3.1-1 and 2.3.1-2. We’re ok with leaving (10,10) and (12,12) for FFS. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| mtk | 1, the reason in Rel-16 to define full staggered pattern is to consider wider distance between UE and TRP. We still have problem to understand why full staggered pattern is needed for the short range transmission like SL?  2, comb-10? That is crazy. And what is the reason that symbol number needs to be equal to comb size? |
| Samsung | We prefer *(M, N) = (8, 8), (10, 10), (12, 12)* are supported and it is also applied in shared resource pool. |
| Lenovo | Supportive of FL’s proposal, with inclusion of at least *(M,N)=(8,8)* |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the dedicated SL PRS RP, the available symbols for SL-PRS spans from 1 to 9 according to our analysis. Hence, we support the flexible configuration of M, rather than only a few candidate values. If there are 7 available OFDM symbols, why do we only use 6 of them rather than 7 of them? Why must we leave 1 symbol there for wasting?  In general, for comb 6, not only (6,6) should be agreed, any combinations as (7,6), (8,6),(9,6)… should also be agreed subject to the slot structure. |
| Apple | Support |
| Intel | We support the proposal. However, it is not clear (10, 10) and (12, 12) are possible considering the maximum number of symbols for SL PRS in a dedicated resource pool can be 9. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal and prefer to remove FFS points. |
| Nokia, NSB | We share CATT’s view that candidate values of M and N must be agreed first. |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Ericsson | Prefer to first lock in the new values for comb sizes. |
| CEWiT | Support with removal of first FFS. Second FFS should be agreed as we support same comb sizes across dedicated and shared resource pools. |
| Moderator | An updated proposal is to be provided depending on decisions on comb sizes. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-2

* *For partially staggered patterns, the max effective comb size is determined based on down-selection from the following alternatives:*
  + *Alt 1: Max effective comb size = 2*
  + *Alt 2: Max effective comb size = 3*
  + *Alt 3: Max effective comb size = 4*
  + *Alt 4: Max effective comb size = 6*
  + *Alt 5: No explicit limit*

*Please provide clear justification for your preference considering detection accuracy for target positioning ranges and other factors.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt 1/Alt 2** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt 5 | There is no need to set such limitation. |
| vivo | Alt 4 | Based on my understanding, the larger combsize will reduce the effective distance of measurement. But, even with combsize=6, the effective distance can be 1/12 \*33.35us\*C =833m if scs is 30khz. In addition, 1-symbol PRS has been agreed upon in NR. For SL, the larger effective comb size can be supported since the distance of SL will be smaller than NR. |
| OPPO | Alt 5 | In SL positioning the target positioning range may be quite divergent, the effective comb size could be (pre-)configured according to the target positioning range under the deployment scenario. |
| LGE | Alt 5 | We don’t see any clear technical reason and benefit of limiting a max effective comb size. Even with a single symbol with N=12, a sufficient range for SL positioning can be achieved even with SCS=120kHz (see Example below). Therefore we support Alt 5.  Example.  SCS=120kHz, Tsym=125us, comb size N=12  Effective Tsym without repetition=Tsym/N=10.4us (larger than Tg=8.33us!)  Range that can be estimated= Tsym/N\*(light speed)=3125m |
| CMCC |  | We prefer Alt. 4, but we are open to other alternatives.  For a typical use case of sidelink positioning, such as V2X, the communication distance between UEs can be 2.5 times of the relative moving speed (i.e., 2~300 meters), and the maximum delay spread for a highway or outdoor scenario can be up to several hundreds of ns, therefore, we think that a maximum effective comb size 6 with a minimum ambiguity window of 833 m can be supported without ambiguity of timing measurements. |
| mtk |  | 1, it is agreed to support comb-4 with 2 symbols, then it is equivalent to comb-2  2, it is agreed to support comb-6. To follow the RE offset pattern defined for DL-PRS, then 2 symbols for comb-6 would be equivalent to comb-3. We are fine with this  3, if we consider to define one symbol pattern, then to have a GP symbol followed up would increase overhead a lot. One way is to allow one symbol pattern to be TDMed with a set of consecutive symbols, and after that there is a GP symbol for this set of symbols for SL-PRS |
| Samsung | Alt 5 | For flexibility. We expect that the pattern will be configured properly depending on the positioning scenario. |
| Lenovo | Alt. 5 | Allows for implementation flexibility |
| ZTE | Alt. 5 | Flexibly configured based on different requirement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 5 | Agree with CATT |
| Intel |  | We are fine without explicit limit. |
| Futurewei | Alt 5 |  |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1 | Resource allocation in sidelink is not as flexible as resource allocation in Uu. In any transmission, the UE should take advantage of the resources available to achieve the best result possible. The benefit of allowing a very large comb size in sidelink positioning has not been clarified. If the intention is to support multiplexing of many UEs in a small number of symbols, synchronization and power differences would also need to be factored in as sources of error. A smaller effective comb size would alleviate once source of measurement error.  For 120 kHz, the symbol duration is ~125 / 14 = 8.9 us. With that, the maximum range is ~111m. For 30 kHz, that’s 833m as noted by others. These calculations do not include other sources of error, e.g. synchronization. The system should operate reliably when some UEs are synchronized directly to GNSS and other are indirectly synchronized to GNSS. Similarly, it should operate reliably when some UEs are directly synchronized to one gNB, other UEs are directly to another gNB, and other UEs are synchronized indirectly to gNB.  In DL-PRS, the effective comb-size until Rel-18 is 1. For uplink, it was 2. In Rel-18, partially staggered patterns are introduced with a restriction that the search window is small enough to avoid peak ambiguity. This is in a system with more precise synchronization than sidelink and there is no search concept defined or discussed for SL positioning. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 5 | Agree with CATT |
| Toyota | Alt 5 | Alt 5 gives the best flexibility. |
| Ericsson | Alt 5 | We agree with CATT. Regarding the range offered by the effective comb size, it should be up to the configuration at run time. There are many use cases where ranges are rather short and, as mentioned in the comments above even large comb sizes have ranges in at least hundred of meters. |
| Moderator |  | An updated proposal is to be provided depending on decisions on comb sizes. |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-3

* *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.* 
  + *FFS: Any additional constraints (e.g., M = k\*N, with k a positive integer).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| LGE | Support the main bullet.  We think the remaining issue is how to define M-N symbols. Applying a constraint such as M=k\*N is just one example. There could be cases where M cannot be divided by N depending on the number of available symbols and comb size. In this regard, we propose to change FFS to more general wording. [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-3  * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*    + *FFS: how to construct M-N symbols ~~Any additional constraints (e.g., M = k\*N, with k a positive integer)~~.* |
| CMCC | Support. |
| mtk | For M > N, the case could be considered may be M = N+1, for example comb-4 with 5 symbols. Then such pattern could also be used to estimate the frequency/Doppler offset |
| ZTE | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support, M >N with flexible value of M.  Do not support additional constraints. The constraints of *M = k\*N is not useful. The value of M is up to configuration and available number of OFDM symbols of SL BWP spanning from 7 to 14.* |
| Apple | Support |
| Intel | Support. |
| Futurewei | Support with LGE modifications |
| Qualcomm | Support and prefer to remove the FFS.  Since SL does not have symbol-level resource allocation granularity, there is a need to fill all symbols. The simplest method to achieve this is to allow repetition. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Toyota | Ok with this. |
| Ericsson | For the sake of compromise, we can accept the proposal, but we do not see much benefit in it. |
| OPPO | OK, but we do not think the FFS is necessary, M and N can be left to (pre-)configuration. |
| CEWiT | Support with LGE. |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, it seems we can simply agree on the main bullet without any further constraints – implying that the pattern is repeated in additional remaining symbols. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.3.4-3  * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
| LGE | The proposal itself does not represent anything about the implication mentioned by FL. If it is intended, we need to clarify the point in the proposal. |
| Moderator | Based on suggestion from LGE, additional clarification is added below. [Medium] FL2a Proposal 2.3.4-3  * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*    + *In the last (M-N) symbols, the SL PRS symbols are repeated with same order of comb offsets as in the first M symbols.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
| Moderator | Typo corrected below. Should be stable now. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 2.3.4-3  * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*    + *In the last (M-N) symbols, the SL PRS symbols are repeated with same order of comb offsets as in the first ~~M~~ N symbols.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
|  |  |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-4

* *Regarding (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering, the following options are considered further:* 
  + *Option 1: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS*
  + *Option 2: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by expansion toward the fully staggered SL PRS and its repetition*
  + *Option 3: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is not supported*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Option 1 | It is the UE implementation issue. UE can realize it by repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS. |
| vivo | Option 3 | The benefit of intra-slot repetition of partial staggering is unclear. |
| LGE | Option 1, 2 | We support both option 1 and option 2. Option 1 is beneficial for e.g. phase tracking purpose. Option 2 is beneficial for higher positioning accuracy due to full span of SL PRS in frequency domain. |
| mtk | Option 3 | 1, To repeat a partial staggered pattern, why not make it as full staggered?  2, “repeat” could improve received SNR through interpolation in time domain (between symbols). For full staggered pattern, a larger IFFT size could be used to also improve received SNR. It means both could be quite equivalent from performance point of view. Then we don't really need to define the repetition of partial staggered pattern |
| ZTE | Option 3 | We also failed to understand the benefit of repeating partial staggering pattern. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | The benefit of repetition with partial staggering is not clear and performance has not been studied and compared to full staggering. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 3 | So far we are not convinced of the benefit of partial staggering instead of full staggering in this case |
| Ericsson | Alt2 | If M>N is supported, we should be able to “fill-up” the slot with PRS when possible, using either repetition if place allows or extension by partial staggering otherwise. |
| OPPO | Option 3 |  |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.3.4-4  * *Regarding (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering, the following options are considered further:*    + *Option 1: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS*   + *Option 2: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by expansion toward the fully staggered SL PRS and its repetition*   + *Option 3: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is not supported* |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option-1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 |  |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 2.3.4-4  * *Regarding (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering, the following options are considered further:*    + *Option 1: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by repetition of the partially staggered SL PRS*   + *Option 2: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is realized by expansion toward the fully staggered SL PRS and its repetition*   + *Option 3: (M, N) patterns with M > N with partial staggering is not supported* |
| LGE | Option 1 & 2 | We support both option 1 and 2 based on the reasons commented in the previous round. |
|  |  |  |

**[Low] FL1 Proposal 2.3.4-5**

* *Repetition of the RE-offset of the first SL-PRS symbol in the last SL-PRS symbol to further facilitate phase-tracking/Doppler estimation (to be down-selected from amongst the following):*
  + *Alt A: is explicitly supported for all (M, N) SL PRS patterns*
  + *Alt B: may be realized based on proper SL PRS resource configuration (e.g., with proper choice of M>N) and/or may be realized using repetitions of SL PRS resources (if supported)*
  + *Alt C: is not supported.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1/2/3** | **Comments** |
| LGE | Alt C. see comments | We don’t think that explicit mechanism for phase-tracking purpose is necessary, because the same mechanism can be realized by proper SL PRS resource configuration as explained in Alt B. In this sense, we think Alt B is the explanation of Alt C, and they should be combined. |
| Ericsson | C | We think we can resolve it using repetition across slot, similar to DL PRS. |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below.  **[Low] FL2 Proposal 2.3.4-5**   * *Repetition of the RE-offset of the first SL-PRS symbol in the last SL-PRS symbol to further facilitate phase-tracking/Doppler estimation (to be down-selected from amongst the following):*   + *Alt A: is explicitly supported for all (M, N) SL PRS patterns*   + *Alt B: may be realized based on proper SL PRS resource configuration (e.g., with proper choice of M>N) and/or may be realized using repetitions of SL PRS resources (if supported)*   + *Alt C: is not supported.* |
| ZTE | Alt. C | Agree with LGE and Ericsson. |
| OPPO | Alt B |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | AltA | But the discussion can wait for more progress for the SL-PRS pattern if it can alleviate others’ concern. |
| Qualcomm | Alt C or B | We agree that B explains how the repetition can be achieved. If Alt B is selection is should be updated to include the following:  Alt B: may be realized without explicit spec support based on proper SL PRS resource configuration (e.g., with proper choice of M>N) and/or may be realized using repetitions of SL PRS resources (if supported) |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below.  **[Low] FL3 Proposal 2.3.4-5**   * *Repetition of the RE-offset of the first SL-PRS symbol in the last SL-PRS symbol to further facilitate phase-tracking/Doppler estimation (to be down-selected from amongst the following):*   + *Alt A: is explicitly supported for all (M, N) SL PRS patterns*   + *Alt B: may be realized based on proper SL PRS resource configuration (e.g., with proper choice of M>N) and/or may be realized using repetitions of SL PRS resources (if supported)*   + *Alt C: is not supported.* |
| LGE | Alt C or Qualcomm’s version of Alt B | We think that Qualcomm’s version of Alt B is equivalent to Alt C. We’re ok with either one. |
| Samsung |  | Support Alt C |

* + 1. AGC and gap symbols

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* *Most companies acknowledge the need for an AGC symbol prior to a SL PRS and a gap symbol for Tx-Rx switching following a SL PRS.*
* *However, depending on details of slot configuration and multiplexing with other SL channels/signals, there may be cases when each SL PRS resource (comprising of M symbols) is not followed by a gap symbol.*
* *For the generation of AGC symbol, the following options have been proposed:*
  + *The first symbol of SL PRS is repeated to realize an AGC symbol*
    - *Majority preference*
  + *Copy of last symbol of a SL PRS resource is used to realize an AGC symbol. This is motivated by the observation that if a Rx UE is able to settle its AGC within a fraction of the AGC symbol (ideally within CP), it can be used for phase-tracking/Doppler estimation.*
    - *Supported by: LGE, MTK*
  + *Last symbol of corresponding fully-staggered pattern (in case of partially staggered SL PRS resource) is used to realize an AGC symbol. This is motivated by the observation that if a Rx UE is able to settle its AGC within a fraction of the AGC symbol (ideally within CP), it can be used for better estimation of the channel post-de-staggering.*
    - *Supported by: LGE*
  + *AGC symbol is a duplication of the expected symbol next to the final symbol of fully/partially staggered SL PRS. This can be seen as a generalization of the above option that may be applicable to both partial and full staggering.*
    - *Supported by: ZTE*

In the following, the case of dedicated resource pool is suggested for consideration first. However, it is acknowledged that there may be exceptions to the presence of AGC and gap symbols and such cases can be discussed as a next step.

The case involving shared resource pools may require further considerations on details of multiplexing with other signals/channels.

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.5-1

* *An AGC symbol preceding a SL PRS resource is not considered as part of the SL PRS resource itself.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| CATT | Support. | |
| vivo | Okay | |
| Fraunhofer | Support | |
| Xiaomi | Support |  |
| OPPO | OK | |
| Panasonic | OK | |
| LGE | Support | |
| CMCC | Support. | |
| Samsung | OK. | |
| Spreadtrum | Support | |
| Lenovo | Support | |
| ZTE | OK | |
| NEC | Support. | |
| Apple | OK | |
| SONY | OK | |
| Intel | Support | |
| Futurewei | OK | |
| Continental Automotive | Support. | |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to discuss this proposal as part of Proposal 2.3.5-2 | |
| Nokia, NSB | OK | |
| Toyota | Ok with this. | |
| Ericsson | Agree with qualcomm. | |
| CEWiT | OK | |
| Moderator | Given that we would need further discussions on Proposal 2.3.5-2 and likely have to aim for more incremental steps there, it would be good to agree to the current proposal to align the used terminology/usage especially since most companies seem fine with the proposal.  Accordingly, the original proposal is repeated below. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.5-1  * *An AGC symbol preceding a SL PRS resource is not considered as part of the SL PRS resource itself.* | |
| vivo | Support | |
| Spreadtrum | Support | |
| Xiaomi | OK | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK | |
| NEC | Support. | |
| Lenovo | Support | |
| Qualcomm | OK | |
| Toyota | Ok with this. | |
| Intel | Support | |
| Nokia, NSB | OK | |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the ***following is recommended for email endorsement***. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.5-1  * *An AGC symbol preceding a SL PRS resource is not considered as part of the SL PRS resource itself.* | |
| Toyota | Ok with this. | |
|  |  | |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.5-2

* *At least in a dedicated resource pool, a SL PRS resource is preceded by an AGC symbol at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot.*
  + *FFS: How the AGC symbol is created*
  + *FFS: Cases involving TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot*
  + *FFS: Other exceptions, if any*
* *FFS: for SL PRS resource in a shared resource pool.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Do not support.  If a SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource but is preceded by a PSCCH , and the PSCCH is preceded by an AGC symbol within the same slot, maybe the SL PRS resource is not needed to be preceded by another AGC symbol. |
| vivo | The condition is unclear for us about “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot.*” Does it mean AGC symbol is not needed when the SL PRS resource is preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot? |
| Fraunhofer | No support. Agree with CATT, the AGC for PSCCH/PSSCH can be used for SL-PRS. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We believe SL PRS resource should always be preceded by and AGC symbol, regardless of it is the first resource within a slot or not, and regardless of dedicated resource pool or shared resource pool.   * *~~At least~~ in a dedicated resource pool or shared resource pool, a SL PRS resource is preceded by an AGC symbol ~~at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource~~ within the same slot.*   + *FFS: How the AGC symbol is created*   + *FFS: Cases involving TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot*   + *FFS: Other exceptions, if any* * *~~FFS: for SL PRS resource in a shared resource pool.~~* |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Not supported.  We need clarification on FL proposal. Is FL proposal targeted for insertion of AGC symbol between PSCCH/PSSCH and SL PRS? Is this because of the different symbol power level between PSCCH/PSSCH and SL PRS? If it’s the case, we don’t support it and need further discussion on the power control of PSCCH/PSSCH in a dedicated resource pool.  In addition, as long as TDM of multiple SL PRS resources is allowed within a slot, an AGC symbol must precede each SL PRS resource in a dedicated resource pool. It means that if TDM is not allowed within a slot, AGC symbol preceding SL PRS is not necessary at all, even in the case explained in FL proposal. |
| CMCC | We would like to clarify on the main bullet, it is for a SL PRS resource(s) from a single UE, no? If so, then we are OK with the proposal. As we have agreed to support TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from multiple UEs in a slot, we prefer to explicitly clarify the two cases. |
| mtk | 1, AGC could be adjusted by PSCCH  2, if symbol number = comb size + 1, for example comb-4 with 5 symbols. Then it could be up to UE to determine whether further AGC adjustment is needed, or use it for frequency/doppler estimation |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo | Share the view that SCI relationship to AGC and SL-PRS should be clarified |
| ZTE | Suggest to delete “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot*” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Maybe better to discuss this issue together with PSCCH’s AGC symbol. |
| NEC | We also think the clarification about “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot.*” is needed. |
| Apple | OK |
| Intel | We support the proposal. When PSCCH and SL PRS are multiplexed in a TDM manner in a dedicated resource pool, AGC symbol is needed when different Tx power or different Tx PSD are applied for PSCCH and SL PRS transmission. |
| Futurewei | More discussion is necessary on the SCI’s AGC. |
| Continental Automotive | Do not support in current form. Have same comment as CATT. We believe this can be concluded only after Feature Lead Proposal 3.2.2-v0 in AI 9.5.1.3. is concluded. |
| Qualcomm | Generally ok with the proposal’s intention. However, we prefer to move “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not preceded by another SL PRS resource within the same slot”* into an FFS. Many details are still needed for this exception, e.g. the preceding SL-PRS transmission has to contain a transmission from the same UE. |
| InterDigital | We do not support this proposal. We have a similar question as vivo. We think SL-PRS resource should always be preceded by an AGC symbol. So we can have AGC SL-PRS-resource AGC SL-PRS-resource, for the example of two TDM SL-PRS resources in a given slot.  We suggest updating the proposal as in the following:  "In a dedicated resource pool, a SL PRS resource is preceded by an AGC symbol” |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | OK, but does preceeded means in the previous symbol? what about the PSCCH location? |
| Moderator | An updated proposal is to be provided for the next round. |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.3.5-3

* *At least in a dedicated resource pool, a SL PRS resource is followed by a gap symbol at least when the SL PRS resource is not followed by another SL PRS resource within the same slot.*
  + *FFS: Cases involving TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot*
  + *FFS: Other exceptions, if any*
* *FFS: for SL PRS resource in a shared resource pool.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Do not support.  If a SL PRS resource is not followed by another SL PRS resource but is followed by a PSFCH(maybe will be introduced due to IUC for SL-PRS) , and the PSFCH is followed by an gap symbol within the same slot, maybe the SL PRS resource is not needed to be followed by another gap symbol. |
| vivo | Same view as proposal 2.3.5-2 |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Not supported.  Similar to FL1 Proposal 2.3.5-2, further clarification is needed on the proposal. It seems the case is opposite. That is, a gap symbol is needed at least when another SL PRS follows one SL PRS (i.e. in TDM-ed transmission).  Again, as long as TDM of multiple SL PRS resources is allowed within a slot, a gap symbol must follow each SL PRS resource in a dedicated resource pool. |
| CMCC | Similar views as Proposal 2.3.5-2. |
| Samsung | OK |
| ZTE | Suggest to delete “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not followed by another SL PRS resource within the same slot*” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It depends on whether a UE needs to switch between Tx and Rx within a slot. We can discuss it when other proposals are stable. |
| Apple | OK. |
| SONY | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | As LGE and other companies noticed further clarification necessary. |
| Continental Automotive | Do not support in the current form. Similar comment as CATT. We believe this can be concluded only after Feature Lead Proposal 3.2.2-v0 in AI 9.5.1.3. is concluded. |
| Qualcomm | Generally ok with the proposal. However, we prefer to move “*at least when the SL PRS resource is not followed by another SL PRS resource within the same slot”* into an FFS per the discussion in Proposal 2.3.5.-2 |
| InterDigital | We have a similar view as LG and CATT. We would like to get clarification on scenarios when a gap symbol is placed after SL-PRS. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK in general. We think the FFS are important. In some cases when SL PRS resources are TDM-ed in a slot it will be useful to have a gap symbol (e.g., for RTT) but in other cases it will be wasted overhead so we can consider dynamic gap symbols which can be indicated by the transmitted UE (e.g., via SCI). |
| Ericsson | Maybe better to say “may be followed”, or “is followed by a gap when…” and list the cases where a gap is expected (e.g. Tx to Rx or Rx to Tx switching in the slot, reception of PRS from another UE, etc.). It should be possible to not have a gap if not needed. |
| Moderator | An updated proposal is to be provided for the next round. |

* 1. Multiplexing of different SL PRS resources

**Background:**

The following was agreed during RAN1 #112 meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot is supported at least for dedicated resource pools.   + FFS: Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pools. * For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs, support at least the case wherein a single (M,N) value is possible .   + FFS: Whether to support comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values. * FFS: additional restrictions (if any) due to e.g. the impact of synchronization and IBE interference between UEs   **Agreement**  TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot is supported at least for dedicated resource pools.   * FFS: TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pools. * FFS: Details, including resource granularity and relationship to SCI/PSCCH associated with the SL PRS resources, additional AGC symbols. * FFS: restrictions for the configuration of TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot, if any * FFS: which resource allocation schemes are applicable * FFS: whether or not this is a separate UE capability |

Some key aspects to aim for progress during RAN1 #112bis-e meeting include:

* Support of comb-based multiplexing of different SL PRS resources in a shared resource pool
* Support of TDM-based multiplexing of different SL PRS resources within a slot in a shared resource pool
* Support of TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a dedicated/shared resource pool
* Support of comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values
* Support of FDM-based multiplexing of different SL PRS resources in a dedicated or shared resource pool
* For TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot in a dedicated resource pool, details, including resource granularity and relationship to SCI/PSCCH associated with the SL PRS resources, additional AGC symbols

Inputs from submitted contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Nokia [4] | *Proposal 4: To enable backward compatibility in terms of slot design for a shared resource pool, SL PRS can be transmitted via one or more of the following:*   * *In PSSCH, e.g., if accompanying positioning meta-data will be sent in the same slot* * *In PSFCH symbol, using remaining resources from legacy SL transmissions, depending on the size of SL PRS* * *In a new “mini-slot” occupying the last symbols of a legacy slot, which contains dedicated symbol(s) for SL PRS, accompanied with AGC and guard symbols.*   *Proposal 9: Support code-domain multiplexing of SL PRS transmissions.* |
| Continental Automotive [7] | *Observation 1: With comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS, UEs in the same RP may transmit SL PRSs using the same comb size and RE-offset values, leading to potential interference in SL PRS transmissions and performance degradation. This necessitates some form of coordination between UEs on selection of these parameters.* |
| vivo [8] | * *Not support comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pools.* * *Not support TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pool.* |
| OPPO [9] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131693945 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693945)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693949 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693949)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693950 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693950)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693951 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693951) |
| Toyota [10] | *Observation 1: Comb-based multiplexing of SL-PRS from different UEs create a near-far problem due to IBE interference among UEs transmitting SL-PRS in the same slot.*  *Observation 2: Comb-based multiplexing of SL-PRS from different UEs in SPS or periodic scheduling create persistent IBE interference issues.*  *Observation 3: Although the comb size 1 mitigates the IBE issue as there is only one UE involved, it reduces the number of multiplexed UEs.*  *Proposal 1: RAN1 to design the comb-based SL-PRS multiplexing solution so that it mitigates the associated short-term IBE interference within the slot.*  *Proposal 2: RAN1 to design the comb-based SL-PRS multiplexing solution for periodic/semi-persistent SL-PRS transmissions so that it mitigates the associated persistent IBE interference in multiple consecutive SL PRS transmissions.*  *Proposal 3: To mitigate the short-term and persistent IBE interference issues, the Tx UE applies a frequency RE separation for the SL-PRS resource sets. This frequency RE separation can be provided by (pre-)configuration.*  *Proposal 4: To mitigate the persistent IBE interference issue, the Tx UE changes SL-PRS resource set every SL-PRS transmission in SPS or periodic scheduling, where a frequency RE separation is applied to SL-PRS resource sets. Collision of SL-PRS resource sets among different Tx UEs can be avoided based on resource reservation and resource (re-)selection with the granularity of the SL-PRS resource set and slot.* |
| Spreadtrum [11] | *Proposal 5: TDM-based multiplexing and Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pools cannot be supported.*  *Proposal 6: Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values can be considered.* |
| CATT, GOHIGH [12] | *Proposal 3: Comb-based multiplexing of SL-PRS from different UEs in a slot is not supported for shared resource pools.*  *Proposal 4: For comb-based multiplexing of SL-PRS from different UEs in a slot, support using multiple (M,N) values for dedicated resource pools.*  *Proposal 18: To reduce resource fragmentation, TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot should have the same bandwidth and frequency resource location.* |
| Intel [13] | *Proposal 5*   * *For shared resource pool* * *Comb and TDM based multiplexing of SL PRS transmission from different UEs in a slot are not supported.*   *Proposal 6*   * *For dedicated resource pool* * *FDM based multiplexing of SL PRS transmission from different UEs in a slot is not supported.* * *In case of comb-based multiplexing, only a single (M, N) pair is supported.* * *In case of TDM based multiplexing, more than one (M, N) pair can be supported.* |
| SONY [14] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131689093 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131689093) |
| Panasonic [15] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131521785 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131521785) |
| LGE [16] | *Proposal 15: The candidate positions of SL PRS resource in a slot are determined based on the number of symbols of SL PRS resource.*  *Proposal 16: The start positions of SL PRS resources that are TDMed within a slot are aligned between UEs.* |
| Xiaomi [17] | *Proposal 5: The comb size, starting symbol(s) in a slot and number of symbols for a SL PRS transmission is (pre)configured in a SL PRS dedicated resource pool.*  *- The number of starting symbol(s) is (pre)configured in a SL PRS dedicated resource pool.* |
| China Telecom [18] | *Proposal 4: For shared resource pool, TDM multiplexing in slots where PSSCH exist is not supported.*  *Proposal 5: At least scheme 1 (Network-centric operation SL-PRS resource allocation) can be supported for TDMed SL PRS allocation of different UEs for dedicated resource pools.* |
| Samsung [20] | *Proposal 8: For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs,*   * *Supported only in dedicated resource pool.* * *Only single (M,N) value is supported .* |
| CMCC [21] | *Observation 5: For TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs within a slot, introducing AGC symbols at the beginning of each SL PRS resource to solve the reception power variation on different symbols and corresponding UE capability to perform sub-slot level AGC has been supported in NR sidelink.*  *Observation 6: For TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs within a slot, the solution to locate PSCCH and its associated SL PRS resource from a UE together within a slot to solve the reception power variation on different symbols and corresponding UE capability to perform sub-slot level PSCCH blind detection has not been supported in NR sidelink.*  *Proposal 13: For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot, only support a single (M,N) value.*  *Proposal 14: For the TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs within a slot, the following two alternatives should be considered to solve the potential reception power variation on different symbols:*   * *Alt. 1: The PSCCH of associated SL PRS resources from different UEs are located at the first 2 or 3 symbols within the SL PRS slot. For each SL PRS resource, the 1st symbol is used as the AGC symbol which is the duplication of the 2nd symbol.* * *Alt. 2: The PSCCH of its own associated SL PRS resource are located together within the SL PRS slot.*    + - *FFS details on PSCCH power control to maintain same Tx power of symbols carrying PSCCH and that carrying its associated SL PRS resource.*     - *UE capability of sub-slot level PSCCH blind detection should be further enhanced.*   *Proposal 15: Considering TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs for resource allocation Scheme 1 as 1st priority and for resource allocation Scheme 2 as 2nd priority.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 9: Restrict comb-based UE multiplexing to only the dedicated SL-PRS resource pool.*  *Proposal 10: Support different (multiple) SL-PRS comb (M, N) pairs for comb-based UE multiplexing in a slot together with any associated restrictions, e.g., avoid overlapping SL-PRS REs, where applicable.* |
| ZTE [23] | *Proposal 6: Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot for shared resource pools is not supported.*  *Proposal 7: For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot, with regards to the (M, N) value:*   * *Support using the same M value and flexibly configured N values.*   *Proposal 8: For TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot,*   * *Only supported in dedicated resource pool, not supported in shared resource from resource utilization perspective* * *Additional AGC symbol is needed preceding each SL PRS resource* |
| Fraunhofer [25] | *Proposal 2: Support multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs over the same OFDM symbols in a slot with a cyclic shift configuration for the SL-PRS.* |
| Apple [27] | *Proposal 9: For SL-PRS multiplexing,*   * *For shared resource pools, TDM and comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot should not be supported due to the need for addressing separate multiple UE pairs.* * *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values can be supported if there are no synchronization and IBE interference issues.* |
| Ericsson [28] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131753075 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753075)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753076 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753076)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753077 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753077)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753078 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753078)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753087 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753087)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753088 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753088)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753089 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753089)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753090 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753090) |
| Qualcomm [29] | *Proposal 3: In a shared resource pool, different UEs are not allowed to multiplex SL-PRS on different comb offsets in the same OFDM symbol.*  *Proposal 4: In a shared resource pool, TDM-based multiplexing of SL-PRS in a slot is not supported.* |
| NEC [30] | *Proposal 3: TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot should be supported for shared resource pool.*  *Proposal 4: Whether one or multiple SL PRS and associated SCI in a slot can be transmitted without SL data in shared resource pool should be studied.* |
| MTK [32] | *Proposal 2-4: It could be feasible within a slot under TDM based multiplexing that, a single (M,N) value is used for a set of symbols, and another (M,N) value could be used for another set of symbols. The two sets of symbols don't overlap with each other*  *Proposal 2-5: It is also feasible within a slot that a single (M,N) value applies*  *Proposal 2-6: For SL-PRS transmission within the shared resource pool, both the comb based and TDM based multiplexing are not supported* |

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

**On multiplexing of different SL PRS resources**

* *Support of comb-based multiplexing of different SL PRS resources in a shared resource pool*
  + *Yes: Ericsson* ***(1)***
  + *No: vivo, OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, Samsung, ZTE, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK* ***(10)***
* *Support of TDM-based multiplexing of different SL PRS resources within a slot in a shared resource pool*
  + *Yes:*
  + *No: vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, China Telecom, ZTE, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, CATT* ***(9)***
* *Support of TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a dedicated/shared resource pool is proposed by one company (LGE).*
* *Support of comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values within a slot in a dedicated resource pool (note: for shared resource pool, it can be discussed if comb-based multiplexing in shared resource pool is agreed)*
  + *Yes: CATT, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, ZTE, Intel, MTK*
    - *Only for same M and different N values: ZTE*
    - *Only when the different (M, N) pairs are TDM-ed within a slot: Intel, MTK*
  + *No: Samsung, CMCC*
* *One company (SONY) proposes separate UE capability for FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs within a slot while another (Intel) proposes to preclude FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs.*
* *In addition, code-domain multiplexing is proposed by two companies (Nokia, Fraunhofer).*
* *For TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot in a dedicated resource pool, details, including resource granularity and relationship to SCI/PSCCH associated with the SL PRS resources, additional AGC symbols*
  + *Resource granularity:* 
    - *For efficient multiplexing of multiple SL PRS from different UEs within a slot without complicating issues with AGC, two companies (Intel, LGE) proposed that, for TDM-based multiplexing within a slot, the granularity of time domain resource allocation for SL PRS is based on SL PRS resource, which is equivalent to the candidate positions of SL PRS resource in a slot are determined based on the number of symbols of SL PRS resource.*
    - *Two companies (LGE, Xiaomi) proposed that starting symbols for SL PRS resources that may be TDM-ed within a slot are aligned across UEs/at the resource pool-level to better align AGC and gap symbols.*
  + *Additional AGC symbols:*
    - *Some companies have shared their views on AGC symbols for TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot, some of which are included in Section 2.3.5. It may be better to take up on this once progress is made on AGC and gap symbols for single SL PRS resource case (in Section 2.3.5).*
  + *Relationship to SCI/PSCCH associated with SL PRS resources*
    - *Some companies have shared their views on potential restrictions and multiplexing options for PSCCH associated with SL PRS that are multiplexed via TDM within a slot in a dedicated resource pool. It may be more efficient to discuss these during latter half of this meeting, with likely some progress in AI 9.5.1.3 on multiplexing of PSCCH and SL PRS in the meantime.*

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.4-1

* *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.*
* *For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, at least the case wherein a single (M, N) value is configured in a resource pool is supported.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support the first bullet.  For the second bullet, it seems that the majority support the comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot **using multiple (M,N) values** within a slot in a dedicated resource pool, so we prefer the following revision for the second bullet:   * *For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, ~~at least the case wherein~~ multiple~~a single~~ (M, N) values are~~is~~ configured in a resource pool is supported.* |
| vivo | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Okay with the second bullet.  In slot configurations like mini-slot are allowable Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | support |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Support the 1st bullet because comb-based multiplexing will degrades SCI decoding performance due to the overlap of all the PSCCHs in a shared resource pool.  Support the 2nd bullet, but allowing only a single (M,N) configuration in a resource pool is too restrictive from SL positioning service perspective. We need to relax the (M,N) condition with some constraint. We propose to add FFS on this issue. [High] FL1 Proposal 2.4-1  * *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.* * *For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, at least the case wherein a single (M, N) value is configured in a resource pool is supported.*    + *FFS whether/how to allow multiple (M,N) values* |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo | Ok with proposal |
| ZTE | Generally support.  Support the first bullet.  For the second bullet, we think comb size N can be flexibly configured. For example, SL PRS resource with comb size 2 and SL PRS resource with comb size 4 can be multiplexed for one symbol PRS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the second bullet, some clarifications questions are given below:   * Q1: Does this mean the only one pair of (M, N) is configured in a resource pool? * Q2: Does this mean: if sub-slot is supported, then all slots in the resource pool can only be used for sub-slot? |
| NEC | Support. |
| Apple | OK |
| Intel | We support the proposal. For comb based multiplexing, we think only single (M, N) should be sufficient. Multiple (M, N) values can be considered for TDM’ed based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs. |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Continental Automotive | We have similar comments as CATT. |
| Qualcomm | We support the first bullet. The second bullet is missing the additional condition that a single bandwidth for SL-PRS is used. |
| InterDigital | We support the second bullet. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | OK with the second bullet. It is not clear to us why multiplexing cannot be done in the shared pool, at least when there is no PSSCH received together with PRS. |
| Moderator | Based on the received feedback, the suggested version from LGE could be considered. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.4-1  * *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.* * *For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, at least the case wherein a single (M, N) value is configured in a resource pool is supported.*    + *FFS whether/how to allow multiple (M,N) values.* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| ZTE | We support to allow multiple (M,N) values, otherwise it may result in only one (M,N) configuration in a resource pool. It is too restrictive. |
| Samsung | We think that the second bullet is not necessary (already captured in the last agreement) |
| CMCC | OK. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Multiplexing SL-PRS in shared pool is worth being considered since we should note that dedicated pool may be just optional. UE may be configured shared pool but without dedicated pool, so increasing multiplexing capacity is useful. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator | Samsung’s observation seems accurate. We can skip the second bullet.  The proposal is updated accordingly. [High] FL3 Proposal 2.4-1  * *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.* * *~~For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, at least the case wherein a single (M, N) value is configured in a resource pool is supported.~~*    + *~~FFS whether/how to allow multiple (M,N) values.~~* |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| OPPO | OK |
| Futurewei | Ok |
| ZTE | ok |
| LGE | Support |
| Ericsson | Considering the need for SCI2 in the shared pool, we agree with the proposal, but it only needs to be a conclusion. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | Support |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 2.4-2

* *TDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Xiaomi | support |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Panasonic | OK |
| LGE | Support FL proposal because TDM-based multiplexing will degrades SCI decoding performance due to the overlap of all the PSCCHs in a shared resource pool. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Samsung | * OK, with a small change: *TDM-based multiplexing in a slot of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.* |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Apple | OK |
| Intel | Agree |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Continental Automotive | Fine. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Moderator | This seems acceptable to all.  The wording is adjusted as per suggestion from Samsung. [High] FL2 Proposal 2.4-2  * *TDM-based multiplexing in a slot of SL PRS from different UEs is NOT supported for a shared resource pool~~s~~.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [Medium] FL1 Question 2.4-3

* *TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a dedicated/shared resource pool is:*
  + *Alt A: Supported*
  + *Alt B: Not supported*

*Please share your views with justification.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt A/B** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt A |  |
| vivo | Alt B | The benefit of TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE is unclear for us |
| Panasonic | Alt A |  |
| LGE | Alt A | Support.  If there are multiple TDM durations for SL PRS transmission within a slot, it should be possible to allow a UE as well as other UEs to occupy the multiple TDM slots based on network scheduling in scheme 1 or UE sensing in scheme 2.  This enables a shorter period of SL PRS repetition, and also enables a shorter latency for SL positioning. For example, a UE can complete SL PRS transmission and reception within a slot if the number of SL PRS symbols is relatively small. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt A |  |
| Lenovo | Alt A |  |
| ZTE | Alt A | The use case mentioned by LGE is solid in our understanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt B | In our view, only a single SL-PRS resource can be indicated/reserved in a slot in Rel-18, given that we do not have SL-AoD positioning methods or have FR2 optimization. |
| NEC | Alt A |  |
| Apple | Alt A |  |
| Futurewei | Alt A |  |
| Qualcomm | Alt B | Alt A could require significant specification changes and increase in implementation complexity, depending on the TDM slot structure. |
| InterDigital | Alt A for a dedicated resource pool | For a single UE, we support TDMed SL-PRS resources within a slot for a dedicated resource pool. However, for a shared resource pool, the design of PSCCH to realize TDMed SL-PRS resources is not clear from the perspective of a single UE. Therefore, we suggest to study whether TDMing of SL-PRS resources for a single UE in a shared resource pool is feasible |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt A |  |
| Ericsson | Alt A | Ok with alt A. Technical merit is unclear though. Is the purpose forward compatibility? |
| OPPO | Alt B | Shared similar views from companies above, the benefit of TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE is unclear, it does not deserve the specification impacts introduced. |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your views if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Question 2.4-3  * *TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a dedicated/shared resource pool is:*   + *Alt A: Supported*   + *Alt B: Not supported* |
| Xiaomi | Alt B |  |
| Sharp | Alt A |  |
| Moderator |  | The proposal is updated considering feedback received so far. Note that TDM-ed SL PRS from different UEs is already agreed for dedicated resource pools. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 2.4-3  * *TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a dedicated~~/shared~~ resource pool is supported.*   + *FFS: TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot from a single UE in a shared resource pool* |
| InterDigital | Alt A for a dedicated resource pool | We support the latest FL proposal.  For a single UE, we support TDMed SL-PRS resources within a slot for a dedicated resource pool. For a shared resource pool, the design of PSCCH to realize TDMed SL-PRS resources is not clear from the perspective of a single UE. Therefore, we support to study whether TDMing of SL-PRS resources for a single UE in a shared resource pool is feasible.  Thus, we support Alt A for dedicated RP and suggest investigating the feasibility for shared pool separately. |
| CATT |  | Support. |
| OPPO |  | We do not support the proposal, we have not seen the benefit of it, but it may complicate the resource selection procedure significantly. |
| ZTE |  | From our side, it is feasible to support one UE reserving multiple TDMed SL-PRS resources but it may not be the main use case. This proposal may be de-prioritized. |
| LGE |  | Support |
| Samsung |  | We share the view with OPPO. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | OK |
| Intel |  | It is not clear the benefit of supporting TDM’ed SL PRS resource in a slot from a single UE perspective. |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.4-4

* *On comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values within a slot in a dedicated resource pool, down-select between:*
  + *Alt A1: Supported without any restrictions*
  + *Alt A2: Supported for same M values and different N values. For different M values, only when the different (M, N) pairs are multiplexed via TDM within a slot.* 
    - *FFS: Potential restrictions on possible N values for a given M.*
  + *Alt B: Not supported*

*Please share your views with justification.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt A/B** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt A2 |  |
| vivo | Alt B | Based on the following figure, we can find the RE will be collided in symbol 2 and symbol 3. In this case, if different UE uses different comb size, the resource will have collided, and the multiplexing will be impacted. |
| Sharp | Alt B | We think the configuration of SL-PRS resources would be highly complicated if multiple (M, N) values are supported within a slot. Multiple (M, N) values can be supported by configuring multiple TDM’ed resource pools. |
| LGE | See comments | We think that comb-based multiplexing of different (M,N) values can be supported with some constraint. Therefore we don’t support Alt 1 and Alt 3.  Regarding Alt 2, it is too restrictive to allow only the same M values. Multiplexing of SL PRS having different M values can be supported if there is no significant performance degradation in both AGC and SL PRS detection in the receiver side.  To avoid AGC issue above, the start symbols of multiple SL PRSs should be aligned in time domain. To manage the interference level, the portion of the RE overlap between SL PRS resources with different (M,N) should be lower than a threshold.  With the observation above, we propose to add Alt A3.   * + *Alt A3: Supported if the start timings of SL PRSs with different (M,N) are aligned, and the portion of RE overlap between SL PRSs is below a threshold.* |
| CMCC | Alt. B | If multiple (M,N) values are allowed, it may increase the resource selection complexity and reduce the resource utilization efficiency, while no significant advantages can be observed. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt B |  |
| ZTE | Alt.A2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt A2 with comments. | We think for different M values is ok, at least for the case when the total number of OFDM symbols for the TDMed SL-PRS cannot be divided by the TDMed SL-PRS resources. For example, 9 symbols with 2 TDM groups.  For different N values, the benefits are not clear. And this can also make the scheme 2 RA more complex. |
|  |  |  |
| Apple | Alt B |  |
| Futurewei | Alt A2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Alt B |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt A2 |  |
| Ericsson | Alt A2 |  |
| OPPO | Alt B |  |
| Moderator |  | Please continue providing your views if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.4-4  * *On comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values within a slot in a dedicated resource pool, down-select between:*   + *Alt A1: Supported without any restrictions*   + *Alt A2: Supported for same M values and different N values. For different M values, only when the different (M, N) pairs are multiplexed via TDM within a slot.*      - *FFS: Potential restrictions on possible N values for a given M.*   + *Alt B: Not supported* |
| Xiaomi | Alt B | The resource selection mechanism would be rather complicated otherwise. |
| Moderator |  | It is noted that so far about half the number of respondents prefer not to support multiple (M,N) values while the other half proposes to support with some variations on the details. Accordingly, we may not be able to down-select right now and instead see if all options under Alt A category are considered. Accordingly, the proposal is updated with inclusion of Alt A3 from LGE. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 2.4-4  * *On comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot using multiple (M,N) values within a slot in a dedicated resource pool (to be down-selected from):*   + *Alt A1: Supported without any restrictions.*   + *Alt A2: Supported for same M values and different N values. For different M values, only when the different (M, N) pairs are multiplexed via TDM within a slot.*      - *FFS: Potential restrictions on possible N values for a given M.*   + *Alt A3: Supported if the start timings of SL PRSs with different (M,N) are aligned, and the portion of RE overlap between SL PRSs is below a threshold.*   + *Alt B: Not supported.* |
| CATT | Alt A2 | Support to consider all the Alts at this stage and try to down select at next meeting. |
| vivo |  | We suggest discussing the *comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs* without TDD cases*.* So, if no TDD in a slot, or for a minimum timing unit, whether companies still consider multiple (M,N)? |
| OPPO | Alt B |  |
| ZTE2 |  | We doubt the necessity of this proposal  The key issue is if we can support multiple (M,N) configurations in a resource pool. As for how to multiplex different UEs, it is up to implementation, e.g. gNB scheduling, or sensing results |
| LGE |  | We’re fine with FL proposal for further downselection. |
| Samsung | Alt B |  |
| Qualcomm | Alt B | There have not been evaluations or analysis showing that multiplexing with different N,M works. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt A2 |  |
| Intel | Alt. B | We are fine with the proposal and down-selecting in the next meeting. |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.4-5

* *FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for dedicated/shared resource pools.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Do not support.  If the two SL PRS resources occupy different sub-channels in the same resource pool, it is possible to FDMed multiplexing them and they are indicated with different SCIs, for both the dedicated RP and shared RP. |
| vivo | At least, for a shared resource pool, FDM can be supported as legacy UE to select different frequency resources and indicated in SCI.  For dedicated resource pool, it may depend on the discussion of Proposal 2.3.2-1 |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Do not support. We share similar views as CATT |
| LGE | Support |
| CMCC | For shared RP, I think FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs are naturally supported.  For dedicated RP, on the other hand, it is related to whether the BW of the SL PRS in the dedicated RP can be smaller than that of the RP. Our view is that for dedicated RP, NOT support FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a slot. |
| ZTE | Wait for the progress of Proposal 2.3.2-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For shared resource pool, the PRS is in the slot, subchannel-level FDM can be done together with the PSSCH transmission or PSCCH scheduling.  For dedicated resource pool, OK |
| NEC | As legacy SL, FDMed SL PRS can be supported at least in shared resource pool, while for dedicated resource pool, it’s up to the outcome of Proposal 2.3.2-1. |
| Apple |  |
| Futurewei | We have similar comments with CATT, and Panasonic. We could come back to it later. |
| Qualcomm | It would be difficult to prevent FDMing in the shared resource pool since that is regular SL operation and the UE transmitting SL-PRS would need to content for resources with UEs sending data and thus efficiently use any available resources.  In the dedicated resource pool, the conclusion is related on allowed SL-PRS BW: if only full-BW SL-PRS transmissions are allowed, then there is no FDMing. |
| InterDigital | We suggest to treat separately the case for shared and dedicated resource pools. For the shared resource pools, we could consider at least an implicit support of FDM if more than one UEs transmit PRS within their scheduled resource. |
| Nokia, NSB | Not ok. For dedicated resource pool, if bandwidth of SL PRS can be less than the bandwidth of resource pool, FDM-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources improves resource utilization. For shared resource pool, FDM of different UEs is quite natural. |
| Ericsson | Do not support. From the UE perspective, it is already supported in SL. |
| OPPO | Ok for dedicated resource pool, but it is too restrictive for shared resource pool. |
| Moderator | To be revisited after decision on SL PRS bandwidth. An updated proposal will be provided accordingly. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 2.4-6

* *For TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot in a dedicated resource pool,* 
  + *the granularity of time domain resource allocation for SL PRS is based on the number of symbols of SL PRS resource, and*
  + *starting symbols for SL PRS resources that may be TDM-ed within a slot are aligned across UEs at the resource pool-level*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | support |
| Sharp | We think this is more related to 9.5.1.3 and prefer to discuss this issue under that agenda item. |
| LGE | Support |
| CMCC | OK. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar as above, we suggest to discuss this issue together with the PSCCH symbol location. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the second bullet.  The first bullet needs additional details on resources to use for PSCCH for example. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | OK. We understand the second bullet. But the first bullet is unclear. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Moderator | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.4-6  * *For TDM-ed SL PRS resources within a slot in a dedicated resource pool,*    + *the granularity of time domain resource allocation for SL PRS is based on the number of symbols of SL PRS resource, and*   + *starting symbols for SL PRS resources that may be TDM-ed within a slot are aligned across UEs at the resource pool-level* |
| CATT | The first bullet is related to time-domain resource allocation granularity for SL PRS in dedicated RP, which is also discussed in AI 9.5.1.3 (section 3.2.7). We prefer to discuss this issue only in one AI. The related proposal in AI 9.5.1.3 is pasted as follows,  [MEDIUM] Feature Lead Proposal 3.2.7-v1  For a a dedicated resource pool,   * with regards to the SL-PRS time-domain resource allocation within the resource pool support a (downselection needed): * ~~Alt. 1: slot-based allocation~~ * Alt. 2: sub-slot-based allocation   + Note: This may include the cae of sub-slot equals a slot. * Alt. 3: SL-PRS-resource-based allocation * Alt. 4: time-domain resource allocation granularity can be (pre-)configured between Alt. 2 and Alt. 3 |
| ZTE | Prefer to wait for the progress in 9.5.1.3 (reosurce allocation granularity, mapping between PSCCH and SL-PRS). |
| Moderator | Let us hold off this proposal considering the ongoing discussion in 9.5.1.3. |
|  |  |

1. Transmit power control for SL PRS

**Background:** The following decisions were made during the SI phase.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Study power control mechanisms for SL-PRS transmission, including whether it is necessary.  **Agreement**  With regards to the power control for SL-PRS at least Open Loop PC should be introduced. |

Subsequently, as quoted in the Introduction section, it was agreed to specify procedures for transmit power control for SL PRS transmissions at least based on open loop power control (OLPC).

During RAN1 #112 meeting, the following was agreed.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  The OLPC framework defined for PSSCH/PSCCH is considered as a starting point for OLPC for SL PRS. |

Some key aspects to aim for progress during RAN1 #112bis-e meeting include:

* Consideration of DL and/or SL pathloss for SL PRS TPC determination
* Pathloss reference for SL pathloss determination
* Relationship between TPC for SL PRS and PSSCH in shared resource pool
* Relationship between TPC for SL PRS and PSCCH in dedicated resource pool
* Reporting of L3 filtered RSRP for SL OLPC.

Inputs from submitted contributions to RAN1 #112bis-e.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Nokia [4] | Error: Reference source not found  Error: Reference source not found  Error: Reference source not found  Error: Reference source not found |
| Futurewei [5] | *Proposal 10: Support the received power measurements SL-PRS RSRP for the estimation of the UE-to-UE pathloss.* |
| HW-HiSi [6] | *Proposal 11: Support to use SL-PRS as the pathloss reference signal for the power control mechanism based on SL for both dedicated resource pool and shared resource pool of Option 2 (SL-PRS without SL-SCH).*  *Proposal 12: For the power control of PSCCH and SL-PRS, two power control mechanisms can be considered:*   * *independent power control for PSCCH and SL-PRS with one AGC symbol ahead of PSCCH and one AGC symbol ahead of SL-PRS from the same transmitting UE,*   + *Consulting RAN4 on the impact of AGC performances for PSCCH and for SL-PRS.* * *keeping the same transmission power for the PSCCH symbol and for the SL-PRS symbol to avoid the potential transient period.* |
| vivo [8] | * *The minimum of SL pathloss and the DL pathloss should be applied in the power control of the SL-PRS.* * *The power of PSCCH should be equal to the power of the SL PRS when PSCCH and SL PRS are TDMed in a slot.* |
| OPPO [9] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131693956 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693956)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131693957 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131693957) |
| CATT, GOHIGH [12] | *Proposal 24: For SL-PRS open-loop power control in Rel-18:*   * *Both DL pathloss and SL pathloss should be considered as the compensated pathloss for the SL-PRS open-loop power control.*   *Proposal 25: A UE determines a power for a SL-PRS transmission on a resource pool in symbols where a corresponding PSCCH is not transmitted in PSCCH-SL-PRS transmission occasion on active SL BWP of carrier as:*  *[dBm]*  *where*  *- is defined in [TS 38.101-1];*  *- is determined based on measured CBR of SL-PRS, the details are FFS;*  *- if a new higher layer parameter dl-P0-SL-PRS -PSCCH is provided*  *- [dBm],*  *where, and are the parameters of SL-PRS fractional power control according to DL pathloss , is a number of resource blocks for PSCCH-SL-PRS transmission occasion and is a SCS configuration, the details are FFS;*  *- else*  *- [dBm]*  *- if a new higher layer parameter sl-P0-SL-PRS-PSCCH is provided and if a SCI format scheduling the SL-PRS transmission includes a cast type indicator field indicating unicast*  *- [dBm]*  *where, and are the parameters of SL-PRS fractional power control according to SL pathloss , is a number of resource blocks for PSCCH-SL-PRS transmission occasion and is a SCS configuration, the details are FFS;*  *- else*  *- [dBm]*  *Proposal 26: A UE determines a power for a PSCCH associated with the SL PRS transmission on a resource pool in PSCCH-PSSCH transmission occasion as*  *[dBm]*  *where*  *- is described in section 5.1.*  *- is a number of resource blocks for the PSCCH transmission associated with SL-PRS transmission in PSCCH-SL-PRS transmission occasion .*  *- is a number of resource blocks for PSCCH-SL-PRS transmission occasion i.* |
| Intel [13] | *Proposal 8*   * *For SL PRS transmissions in a dedicated resource pool, transmit power control mechanism follows the same open loop power control mechanism as defined for PSSCH.* * *For SL pathloss, higher layer filtered RSRP can be obtained based on SL PRS or PSCCH DMRS.*   *Proposal 9*   * *For SL PRS transmissions in a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is determined based on that for PSSCH.* |
| LGE [16] | *Proposal 17: The following OLPC options for SL PRS transmission can be considered.*   * *OLPC based on DL pathloss* * *OLPC based on SL pathloss* * *OLPC based on both DL and SL pathloss*   *Proposal 18: SL PRS RSRP can be used for SL pathloss estimation.*  *Proposal 19: Both PSCCH and PSSCH DMRS RSRP can be used for SL pathloss estimation.*  *Proposal 20: Further study is needed for SL PRS power control when multiple SL PRS resources are transmitted simultaneously.*  *Proposal 21: Further study is needed whether EPRE or the total symbol power is same between PSCCH/PSSCH and SL PRS, if they are transmitted in a same slot.*  *Proposal 22: SL PRS power control for coexistence with SL communication in a shared resource pool needs to be investigated.* |
| Xiaomi [17] | *Proposal 7: For SL PRS transmission in a dedicated resource pool, both DL based and SL based open loop power control for SL PRS transmission are supported*  *- For SL based open loop power control, only unicast of SL PRS is supported*  *Proposal 8: the RSRP report used in SL based open loop power control is measurement obtained from SL PRS reception.*  *Proposal 9: For SL transmission in a shared resource pool, the transmission power of SL PRS follows the transmission power of the PSSCH to keep constant TX power in all the OFDM symbols.* |
| Samsung [20] | *Proposal 10: With regards to SL PRS power control, we propose the following characteristics:*   * *SL PRS and other SL channels/signals is not FDMed with each other.* * *Within a slot, a symbols have the same power, including symbols that carry SL PRS* * *Only OLPC is supported.* * *Both DL pathloss and SL pathloss are applied.* * *is based on PSSCH and/or SL PRS depending on whether SL PRS is multiplexed with PSSCH or not.* |
| CMCC [21] | *Proposal 16: Both DL pathloss-based and SL pathloss-based OLPC should be supported for SL-PRS.*  *Proposal 17: The transmit power of the PSCCH is determined based on its associated SL PRS. FFS details.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 13: Support SL PRS open loop power control mechanisms based on SL and DL pathloss references and SL PRS or other RS RSRP reporting.*  *Proposal 14: Support power control parameter(s) sharing, e.g., SL RS/PRS transmit among UEs performing SL positioning.* |
| ZTE [23] | *Proposal 9: For SL PRS power control, a UE determines the SL PRS transmission power in SL PRS transmission occasion as:*  *[dBm]*  *Proposal 10: For a dedicated resource pool or a shared resource pool*   * *Dedicated resource pool: SL PRS is used as pathloss reference for OLPC.* * *Shared resource pool: SL PRS transmit power is the same as that for PSSCH if those two are transmitted in the same slot*   + *PSSCH DMRS is used as pathloss reference if PSSCH and SL PRS are transmitted in the same slot*   + *SL PRS can be used as pathloss reference only if PSSCH and SL PRS are not transmitted in the same slot*   *Proposal 11: Transmission power control for PSCCH which associated with SL PRS in dedicated resource pool is associated with SL PRS, support one of the following options:*   * *Option 1: PSCCH which associated with SL PRS applies the same Tx PSD as SL PRS* * *Option 2: Tx PSD of PSCCH which associated with SL PRS is equal to the sum of Tx PSD of SL PRS and an offset for more robust PSCCH transmission, i.e.* |
| Fraunhofer [25] | *Observation 3: For positioning application “many-to-many” scenarios requires a different power control strategy compared with one-to-many or many-to-one scenarios.*  *Proposal 5: Support enabling multiple SL reference signals from multiple UEs, to be used for determining the minimum transmit power for the SL-PRS transmissions to the multiple UEs and the maximum transmit power avoiding overload of nearby UEs.* |
| IDCC [26] | *Proposal 20: For OLPC, support Downlink pathloss for all cast types of SL-PRS.*  *Proposal 21: For OLPC, study whether sidelink pathloss is used for groupcast SL-PRS.*  *Proposal 22: For OLPC, support sidelink pathloss for unicast SL-PRS.*  *Proposal 23: For OLPC, study how to derive sidelink pathloss for unicast.*  *Proposal 24: Study power control of SL-PRS based on the feedback from the receiver UE.*  *Proposal 25: Study benefits of independent power control between PSCCH and PRS.* |
| Apple [27] | *Observation 1: SL PRS power control is necessary especially in in-coverage scenarios to prevent unnecessary co-channel interference in the network.*  *Proposal 10: OLPC for SL-PRS transmission can be designed based on the similar principles with the following options:*   * *Option 1: If the SL-PRS is transmitted in the same slot as the SL communication signals (shared resource pool), the OLPC parameters will depend ultimately on the shared resource pool design*   + *Option (1-a): If SL-PRS is time multiplexed with PSSCH/PSCCH in the PSSCH/PSCCH region of the slot, the OLPC parameters are the same in the symbols used for PSCCH/PSSCH transmissions in a slot*   + *Option (1-b): If SL-PRS is multiplexed with PSFCH (in the PSFCH region of the slot), the OLPC parameters are the same in the symbols used for PSFCH transmissions in a slot.* * *Option 2: If SL-PRS is in its own dedicated slot (or TDMed with other signals with its own independent AGC, similar to the PSFCH), the OLPC parameters are SL-PRS specific.* |
| Ericsson [28] | [PAGEREF \_Toc131753091 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753091)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753092 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753092)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753093 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753093)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753094 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753094)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753095 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753095)  [PAGEREF \_Toc131753096 \hError: Reference source not found](#_Toc131753096) |
| Qualcomm [29] | *Proposal 14: In the shared resource pool, the existing OLPC procedure is used for SL-PRS power control.*  *Proposal 15: DL pathloss-based OLPC from sidelink communications can be used for DL pathloss-based OLPC in the SL-PRS dedicated resource pool.*  *Proposal 16: L3-filtered RSRP measurement on PSCCH DMRS is used for SL pathloss-based OLPC for unicast SL-PRS transmissions in the dedicated resource pool. FFS additional changes to procedure.* |
| MTK [32] | *Proposal 3-1: Consider to support both DL path loss and SL path loss for SL-PRS power control*  *Proposal 3-2: Consider to support the report of the filtered RSRP to the UE from a UE receiving SL-PRS*  *Proposal 3-3: Consider to support providing the transmission power from the UE to a UE receiving SL-PRS, at least it is feasible for groupcast type* |

Based on the discussions in submitted contributions, the issues quoted above are classified in the following two sub-sections.

* 1. Open loop PC (OLPC) for SL PRS transmissions

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* *Majority of companies consider both DL and SL pathloss for defining OLPC for SL PRS transmissions (when in network coverage)*
* *Some companies point out that consideration of SL pathloss may be limited to unicast cases and in this regard, consider at least DL pathloss based OLPC when in network coverage for dedicated SL PRS resource pools.*
  + *Supported by: OPPO, Qualcomm*
* *At least for a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, and at least when PSSCH (including PSSCH DMRS) are not present, three options are considered by companies for SL pathloss reference:*
  + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference for OLPC*
    - *Supported by: Nokia, Futurewei, HW-HiSi, Intel, LGE, Xiaomi, Lenovo, ZTE, IDCC, Ericsson, MTK*
  + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference for OLPC*
    - *Supported by: Intel, Qualcomm*
  + *Option 3: S-SSB as pathloss reference*
    - *Supported by: Nokia*
  + *Note: The above solutions may apply also for the case of shared resource pools if SL PRS is transmitted without PSSCH. For the case when PSSCH and SL PRS are transmitted in the same slot in a shared resource pool, most companies assume use of PSSCH DMRS as the SL pathloss reference as for the case of PSSCH TPC to realize same Tx power as that for PSSCH.*
* *For a shared resource pool, many companies propose that SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH (if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot).*
  + *Supported by: Intel, Xiaomi, Samsung (Within a slot, a symbols have the same power, including symbols that carry SL PRS), ZTE, Apple (same OLPC parameters as that of PSSCH/PSCCH or same OLPC parameters as that of PSFCH depending on multiplexing of SL PRS with PSSCH/PSCCH region vs. PSFCH region of a slot), Ericsson, Qualcomm*
* *Companies expressed their views on TPC for PSCCH associated with SL PRS if/when PSCCH is present in dedicated resource pools. In general, three options can be identified:*
  + *Option A: Same Tx power between PSCCH and SL PRS (no need for AGC but transient gap may still be needed due to PSD change if BW of PSCCH and SL PRS are different).*
  + *Option B: Same Tx PSD between PSCCH and SL PRS (AGC symbol may be needed between PSCCH and SL PRS if BW are different)*
  + *Option C: Independent power control between PSCCH and SL PRS (AGC symbol or AGC symbol and transient gap may be needed between PSCCH and SL PRS)*
* *For OLPC for SL PRS, while it can be considered that filtered RSRP is reported by Rx UE (as for SL communications), one company (MTK) proposes to additionally consider reporting of Tx power from Tx to Rx UEs for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.*

Based on the above, the following proposals are made.

### [High] FL1 Proposal 3.1-1

* *For in-coverage Tx UE and for unicast SL PRS, both DL and SL pathloss are considered as pathloss reference for defining OLPC for SL PRS.*
* *For in-coverage Tx UE and for groupcast/broadcast SL PRS, at least DL pathloss is considered as pathloss reference for defining OLPC for SL PRS.*
* *For out-of-coverage Tx UE and for unicast SL PRS, at least SL pathloss is considered as pathloss reference for defining OLPC for SL PRS.*
* *FFS: Use of SL pathloss as pathloss reference for groupcast/broadcast SL PRS.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | support |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | Support FL proposal except FFS.  We have agreement that the OLPC framework defined for PSSCH/PSCCH is considered as a starting point for OLPC for SL PRS. With the agreement above, we don’t think that SL pathloss can be used for OLPC of GC/BC SL PRS, similar to SL communication. We suggest to delete FFS point.   * *~~FFS: Use of SL pathloss as pathloss reference for groupcast/broadcast SL PRS.~~* |
| CMCC | Support. We share similar views as LGE on the FFS bullet. |
| Samsung | For the condition for applying pathloss, we can simply reuse the principle of PSSCH power control rather than categorizing as above (even though it is similar as PSSCH power control). So, we suggest to modify the proposal as:   * For the SL PRS open-loop power control, a UE can be configured to use DL pathloss (between TX UE and gNB) only, SL pathloss (between TX UE and RX UE) only, or both DL pathloss and SL pathloss.   + The same principle as PSSCH power control is applied for deciding pathloss. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Qualcomm | Generally ok with the intention, though we prefer to remove the coverage wording since it was not used for sidelink communication as noted by Samsung. We’d also like to remove the FFS for the same reasons mentioned by LGE |
| InterDigital | We support this proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Moderator | Most companies seem fine with the proposal. There is also suggestion to just reuse the approach from SL communication for groupcast/broadcast of SL PRS.  There is also a suggestion to describe the behavior similar to that used for SL communications without mentioning coverage conditions.  Accordingly, the proposal is updated below, with an explicit FFS to refer to the discussion in FL Proposal 3.1-2 on determination of SL pathloss in view of the first sub-bullet. [High] FL2 Proposal 3.1-1  * *For the SL PRS open-loop power control, a UE can be configured to use DL pathloss (between TX UE and gNB) only, SL pathloss (between TX UE and RX UE) only, or both DL pathloss and SL pathloss.*   + *The same principle as for PSSCH power control is applied for deciding which (i.e., SL, DL, or SL and DL) pathloss to use.*   + *FFS: SL pathloss reference for open-loop power control for SL PRS.* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| LGE | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| ZTE | OK |
| Samsung | Support |
| OPPO | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the ***following is recommended for email endorsement*.** [High] FL3 Proposal 3.1-1  * *For the SL PRS open-loop power control, a UE can be configured to use DL pathloss (between TX UE and gNB) only, SL pathloss (between TX UE and RX UE) only, or both DL pathloss and SL pathloss.*   + *The same principle as for PSSCH power control is applied for deciding which (i.e., SL, DL, or SL and DL) pathloss to use.*   + *FFS: SL pathloss reference for open-loop power control for SL PRS.* |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
|  |  |

### [High] FL1 Proposal 3.1-2

* *For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, and at least when PSSCH (including PSSCH DMRS) are not mapped in a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, options for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS are:* 
  + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference*
  + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference*
  + *Option 3: S-SSB as pathloss reference*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support the Option 1 and Option 2.  For S-SSB, since the SL PRS and S-SSB may come from different UEs, the S-SSB is not suitable for the pathloss reference. |
| vivo | We prefer option 1 and option 2. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer option 1 and option 2. |
| OPPO | Option 3 should be removed, S-SSB resource is SL BWP specific rather than resource pool specific, and S-SSB resource is shared by multiple UEs rather than dedicated to an individual UE. |
| LGE | Regardless of PSSCH transmission in a dedicated resource pool, we think that SL PRS should be allowed to be used for SL pathloss reference. This is because the pathloss estimation may be inaccurate if only PSCCH DMRS is used due to the limited number of resources for RSRP measurement. We don’t think that it is necessary to use S-SSB as SL pathloss reference for SL PRS, which was not the case in PSSCH OLPC. [High] FL1 Proposal 3.1-2  * *For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, ~~and at least when PSSCH (including PSSCH DMRS) are not mapped in a dedicated SL PRS resource pool,~~ options for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS are:*    + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference*   + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference*   + *~~Option 3: S-SSB as pathloss reference~~* |
| CMCC | We prefer Option 1 and 2. |
| Samsung | It is not clear why the condition is necessary. We think this condition is for Option 2 and 3. We prefer Option 1 and we suggest to modify the proposal as   * *~~For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, and at least when PSSCH (including PSSCH DMRS) are not mapped in a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, options~~ DL PRS is used for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS ~~are:~~* |
| Lenovo | Support for at least Option 1 |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 1 and Option 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support S-SSB. SL-PRS or PSCCH DMRS can be used.  The reason is: In NR sidelink, the S-SSB transmission is decoupled with the PSSCH transmission. |
| Apple | Remove Option 3 |
| Intel | We are fine with the update from LGE. S-SSB should not be included in the list as mentioned by other companies. |
| Futurewei | OK. Prefer Opt 1 and Opt 2 |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option 2.  We agree that S-SSB is not suitable since the receiver UE would not know who the S-SSB transmitter is. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1 and Option 2. We also suggest to further study when Option 1 or Option 2 can be applicable. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | Agree with other that opt. 3 can be removed. Are we aiming at downselection or supporting both option 1 / 2? |
| Moderator | Based on the received feedback, the proposal is updated as below. [High] FL2 Proposal 3.1-2  * *For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, options for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS are:*    + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference*   + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference*   + *FFS: Applicability conditions for either option, if any.* |
| CATT | Support |
| LGE | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| ZTE | Generally OK, with this proposal, Is it still possible to support both Option 1 and Option 2? |
| OPPO | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ok |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Qualcomm | We have a similar question to ZTE, is the intention is that both are supported and will discuss applicability conditions? Or is the intention to downselect? |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator | We may not be able to down-select to one of Options 1 or 2 right now. There seems to be interest to support both as well. In light of this the FFS bullet on applicability could be absorbed as relevant to a 3rd option that supports both Options 1 and 2. Proponents of (new) Option 3 can provide details on applicability. [High] FL3 Proposal 3.1-2  * *For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, options for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS are (to be down-selected from):*    + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference*   + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference*   + *Option 3: Both Options 1 and 2*   + *~~FFS: Applicability conditions for either option, if any.~~* |
| CATT | We support to keep Option 1 and Option 2 for further study and down selection.  And we prefer Option 1 for dedicated RP. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | We’re fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcom | We are generally ok with the proposal. Could you add an FFS under Option 3 “FFS how to select between Option 1 and Option 3, including (pre-)configuration”? |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 3.1-3

* *For a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission.*
  + *FFS: SL PRS transmit power if and when SL PRS is transmitted with a time gap with respect to PSSCH, e.g., in the PSFCH region.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LGE | From OLPC perspective, SL PRS needs to be treated similar to PSSCH in a shared resource pool. PSFCH is different from SL PRS in this regard. We think that SL PRS transmit power should be same as PSSCH transmit power, regardless of a time gap between them. [Medium] FL1 Proposal 3.1-3  * *For a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot ~~at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission~~.*   + *~~FFS: SL PRS transmit power if and when SL PRS is transmitted with a time gap with respect to PSSCH, e.g., in the PSFCH region.~~* |
| ZTE | Support LGE’s modification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Apple | Support. Based on this agreement, can we say definitely that in the shared resource, the SL-PRS is not multiplexed with the PSFCH ? |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Qualcomm | We agree that transmission power needs to be the same but disagree about making exceptions such as the one in the proposal. The transmitted power needs to be the same across OFDM symbols to ensure proper AGC operation of other UEs. LGE’s proposal addresses this issue and we are ok with it. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Ericsson | OK. Regarding the FFS, we agree with LGE’s view and propose instead to add the case where PRS is transmitted without PSCCH as FFS. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Moderator | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 3.1-3  * *For a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission.*   + *FFS: SL PRS transmit power if and when SL PRS is transmitted with a time gap with respect to PSSCH, e.g., in the PSFCH region.* |
| CATT | Support the proposal in principle.  We prefer to remove the FFS and keep the same power for PSSCH and SL-PRS. |
| Xiaomi | We refer to LG version. |
| Moderator | The proposal is now updated with removal of the FFS bullet. For the case of SL PRS w/o PSCCH in a shared resource pool, it may be better to wait until such an option stabilizes further in AI 9.5.1.3. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 3.1-3  * *For a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission.*   + *~~FFS: SL PRS transmit power if and when SL PRS is transmitted with a time gap with respect to PSSCH, e.g., in the PSFCH region.~~* |
| CATT | Support to remove the bullet of FFS.  And we prefer to further remove the words of “*at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission*” in the proposal, since the same power for PSSCH and SL-PRS should always be kept. |
| OPPO | If FDM between SL PRS and PSSCH was supported at the end, this proposal seems not applicable. How about the following:   * *For a shared resource pool, ~~SL PRS~~ transmit power of a UE across all contiguous OFDM symbols ~~are is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted~~ in the same slot* a*re same ~~at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission~~.* |
| ZTE | Same understanding with FL, we may wait for the progress in AI 9.5.1.3. |
| LGE | We prefer to remove ‘at least’ condition based on the comments in the previous round. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 3.1-3  * *For a shared resource pool, SL PRS transmit power is same as that for PSSCH when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot ~~at least when SL PRS is transmitted without a time gap from PSSCH transmission~~.*   + *~~FFS: SL PRS transmit power if and when SL PRS is transmitted with a time gap with respect to PSSCH, e.g., in the PSFCH region.~~* |
| Qualcomm | We prefer CATT’s and LGE’s version |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 3.1-4

* *For TPC for PSCCH associated with SL PRS in dedicated resource pools the following options are considered further:*
  + *Option A: Same Tx power between PSCCH and SL PRS (no need for AGC but transient gap may still be needed due to PSD change if BW of PSCCH and SL PRS are different). RAN1 to consider sending an LS to RAN4 for confirmation.*
  + *Option B: Same Tx PSD between PSCCH and SL PRS (AGC symbol may be needed between PSCCH and SL PRS if BW are different)*
  + *Option C: Independent power control between PSCCH and SL PRS (AGC symbol or AGC symbol and transient gap may be needed between PSCCH and SL PRS)*
  + *Other options are not precluded.*

*Please provide justifications for your preference.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support.  We prefer Option B. |
| vivo | We prefer to consult RAN4 about whether the AGC or GP is needed for Option A, B and C. And then downselect the issue. |
| LGE | First of all, PSCCH power should be same as SL PRS power if a single UE transmit them in a same slot. Second, even in this case, if TDM of multiple SL PRSs within a slot is allowed in a resource pool, there should be Tx/Rx gap symbol and AGC symbol after PSCCH and before SL PRS. This is because, the very first TDM duration after PSCCH can be used by other UE’s SL PRS transmission. We suggest to add option D as follows.   * + *Option D: Same Tx power for both PSCCH and SL PRS. If TDM of multiple SL PRS resources within a slot is allowed/configured, Gap symbol and AGC symbol are inserted between PSCCH and SL PRS resource.* |
| ZTE | We prefer Option B.  PSCCH which associated with SL PRS applies the same Tx PSD (power spectral density) as SL PRS and there needs an extra AGC symbol between PSCCH and SL PRS since normally their bandwidth are different. |
| Apple | Option B |
| Qualcomm | Option A or Option B. Our preference, however, is to further discuss the slot structure, then revisit this issue. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Ericsson | Prefer option B, but agree with QC that slot structure should be discussed first. |
| OPPO | Agree with QC to discuss first the slot structure. |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, it seems companies prefer to wait on this for further progress on multiplexing between SL PRS and other SL channels/signals in AI 9.5.1.3. An updated proposal will be made in time. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [Medium] FL1 Proposal 3.1-5

* *For OLPC for SL PRS, filtered RSRP is reported by a receiving UE* 
  + *FFS: If, in addition or as alternative, Tx power may be reported from transmitting UE to receiving UE(s) for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LGE | We prefer to reuse PSSCH OLPC mechanism. For clarification on the main bullet, add the operation is for unicast. We suggest to delete FFS point because there is no such operation in PSSCH OLPC. [Medium] FL1 Proposal 3.1-5  * *For OLPC for SL PRS in unicast, filtered RSRP is reported by a receiving UE*    + *~~FFS: If, in addition or as alternative, Tx power may be reported from transmitting UE to receiving UE(s) for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.~~* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Qualcomm | We agree with LGE’s comments. One more change is needed to capture that the RSRP is for SL pathloss measurements, not DL.   * *For SL pathloss-based OLPC for SL PRS in unicast, filtered RSRP is reported by a receiving UE*    + *~~FFS: If, in addition or as alternative, Tx power may be reported from transmitting UE to receiving UE(s) for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.~~* |
| Ericsson | OK with keeping the agreement about unicast. |
| OPPO | Support the version proposed by LG |
| Moderator | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Medium] FL2 Proposal 3.1-5  * *For OLPC for SL PRS, filtered RSRP is reported by a receiving UE*    + *FFS: If, in addition or as alternative, Tx power may be reported from transmitting UE to receiving UE(s) for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.* |
| CATT | Support.  Filtered RSRP had been used in the legacy PSSCH OLPC scheme. SL-PRS OLPC should use the similar mechanism. In addition, how to filter the RSRP should be FFS. |
|  |  |
| ZTE | Ok with the original proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK but more prefer LG version. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator | The proposal is updated considering suggestions from LGE and QC. [Medium] FL3 Proposal 3.1-5  * *For SL pathloss-based OLPC for SL PRS in unicast, filtered RSRP is reported by a receiving UE.*    + *~~FFS: If, in addition or as alternative, Tx power may be reported from transmitting UE to receiving UE(s) for groupcast(/broadcast) cases.~~* |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| LGE | Support. We agree with adding “SL pathloss-based” suggested by Qualcomm. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

* 1. SL PRS Power Control - Others

***Summary of observations based on submitted contributions:***

* *RAN1 to discuss whether power control for the purpose of congestion control should be applied to SL-PRS?* 
  + *Proposed by: Nokia*
* *Whether to support CL PC for SL PRS transmissions?* 
  + *Yes: Nokia, IDCC (PC of SL PRS based on feedback from Rx UE)*

As can be seen from the above, further inputs and discussions would be necessary to progress on these.

1. Other issues

**Background:** In addition to the aspects discussed above, in contributions, some further considerations have been raised.

Inputs from submitted contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Fraunhofer [25] | *Observation 1: Using the existing release of TS38.101-1 the maximum allowed bandwidth for SL is restricted to 40MHz.*  *Proposal 1: Inform in an LS RAN4 that Rel-18 support 100MHz in FR1 is restricted by RAN4 specification. Current restrictions means that RAN1 specification may not be implemented in Rel-18.* |
| Spreadtrum [11] | *Proposal 12: Considering energy efficient of SL-PRS transmission, feedback mechanisms should be considered.* |
| Continental Automotive [7] | *Observation 2: When a UE that wishes to transmit an SL PRS cannot find a suitable comb size and RE offset value to avoid overlap with other existing SL PRS transmissions, a procedure for requesting muting of SL PRS transmissions is desired.*  *Proposal 2.1: A UE intending to transmit SL PRS may send a request for existing SL PRS transmissions to be muted at indicated occasions.*  *Proposal 2.2: Upon receiving such a request, a UE already transmitting SL PRS may mute its own SL PRS transmissions based on the priority indicated by the requesting UE and several other considerations detailed in Section 2.2. of this contribution.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 15: RAN1 to support muting of SL-PRS transmissions. FFS further details such as the type of muting configurations, etc.* |
| Sharp [34] | *Proposal 1: Muting is supported for SL-PRS.*  *• The muting functionality as specified for DL-PRS can be considered as a starting point.* |
| CMCC [35] | *Proposal 8: SL-PRS muting mechanism can be introduced to further alleviate the congestion condition.*   * *The corresponding enhancements on resource selection procedure for Scheme 2 may be required.* |
| IDCC [36] | *Proposal 22: Study SL muting indication and signalling.* |

On the proposal to send an LS to RAN4 on potential practical support of 100 MHz SL BW in Rel-18, it may not be necessary as this should be known to RAN4 already.

### [Low] FL1 Question 4.1

* *Companies are encouraged to provide further feedback on the LS to RAN4, support of lower-layer feedback in response to SL PRS reception, or any other issues not listed above below.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |

In addition, several companies proposed to consider SL PRS muting in this agenda as well as in AI 9.5.1.3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Views** |
| Continental Automotive [7] | *Observation 2: When a UE that wishes to transmit an SL PRS cannot find a suitable comb size and RE offset value to avoid overlap with other existing SL PRS transmissions, a procedure for requesting muting of SL PRS transmissions is desired.*  *Proposal 2.1: A UE intending to transmit SL PRS may send a request for existing SL PRS transmissions to be muted at indicated occasions.*  *Proposal 2.2: Upon receiving such a request, a UE already transmitting SL PRS may mute its own SL PRS transmissions based on the priority indicated by the requesting UE and several other considerations detailed in Section 2.2. of this contribution.* |
| Lenovo [22] | *Proposal 15: RAN1 to support muting of SL-PRS transmissions. FFS further details such as the type of muting configurations, etc.* |
| Sharp [34] | *Proposal 1: Muting is supported for SL-PRS.*  *• The muting functionality as specified for DL-PRS can be considered as a starting point.* |
| CMCC [35] | *Proposal 8: SL-PRS muting mechanism can be introduced to further alleviate the congestion condition.*   * *The corresponding enhancements on resource selection procedure for Scheme 2 may be required.* |
| IDCC [36] | *Proposal 22: Study SL muting indication and signalling.* |

### [Low] FL1 Proposal 4.2

* *RAN1 to further study support of muting of SL PRS resources.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | OK to study muting of SL PRS resources since it may be useful in the case where an anchor UE needs to select a SL PRS configuration (e.g., comb offset or sequence) which is not preferred by another UE. |
| Moderator | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Low] FL2 Proposal 4.2  * *RAN1 to further study support of muting of SL PRS resources.* |
| Moderator | Please continue providing your inputs if you have not done so. Original proposal repeated below. [Low] FL3 Proposal 4.2  * *RAN1 to further study support of muting of SL PRS resources.* |
| LGE | Fine with further study. |

1. Proposals for Wednesday GTW

***SL PRS sequence***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.2-1**

* *For SL PRS sequence generation, one of the following options is down-selected to define the parameter :*
  + *Option 1: is a higher layer configured parameter that is provided to a transmitting UE by a location server.*
  + *Option 2: is based on 12 bits CRC of PSCCH.*
  + *Option 3: based on a combination of higher layer configured parameter from a configured ID list and 12 bits of CRC of PSCCH.*

***SL PRS comb sizes***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.1-1**

* *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in dedicated resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 2, 4, 6, the following values are also supported:*
  + *N = 1, 8, 12*
  + *FFS: for one or both of N = 8, 12, whether they are limited to partially staggered patterns only.*

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.1-2**

* *[Working assumption] For SL PRS in shared resource pools, in addition to the already-agreed comb sizes (N) of 1, 2, 4, the following are supported: N = 6, N = 8.*

***SL PRS bandwidth***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-1**

* *[Working assumption] For dedicated resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be same as or smaller than resource pool bandwidth.*

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-2**

* *For shared resource pools, SL PRS bandwidth can be smaller than resource pool bandwidth and is same as the bandwidth indicated for PSSCH if/when PSSCH is transmitted in the same slot with SL PRS from the same transmitter UE.*

***AGC symbol***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.5-1**

* *An AGC symbol preceding a SL PRS resource is not considered as part of the SL PRS resource itself.*

***SL PRS multiplexing***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.4-1**

* *Comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS resources from different UEs in a slot is NOT supported for shared resource pools.*
* *For comb-based multiplexing of SL PRS from different UEs in a dedicated resource pool, at least the case wherein a single (M, N) value is configured in a resource pool is supported.* 
  + *FFS whether/how to allow multiple (M,N) values.*

***SL PRS Power Control***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 3.1-1**

* *For the SL PRS open-loop power control, a UE can be configured to use DL pathloss (between TX UE and gNB) only, SL pathloss (between TX UE and RX UE) only, or both DL pathloss and SL pathloss.*
  + *The same principle as for PSSCH power control is applied for deciding which (i.e., SL, DL, or SL and DL) pathloss to use.*
  + *FFS: SL pathloss reference for open-loop power control for SL PRS.*

**[High] FL1 Proposal 3.1-2**

* *For a dedicated SL PRS resource pool, options for SL pathloss reference for OLPC for SL PRS are:* 
  + *Option 1: SL PRS as pathloss reference*
  + *Option 2: PSCCH DMRS as pathloss reference*
  + *FFS: Applicability conditions for either option, if any.*

***SL PRS resource/resource sets***

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.1-1**

* *SL PRS resource sets are not defined in Rel-18.*

**[High] FL2 Proposal 2.1-2**

* *Parameters associated with a SL PRS resource include:* 
  + *SL PRS resource ID,*
  + *SL PRS comb offset and associated SL PRS comb size (N),*
  + *SL PRS starting symbol and number of SL PRS symbols (M),*
  + *SL PRS frequency domain allocation,*
  + *SL PRS with/without periodic reservation, periodicity values if with periodic reservations, and number of SL PRS occasions, otherwise. FFS: details.*
  + *SL PRS sequence ID.*
  + *Note: Additional parameters can be included as/when identified.*
* *A SL PRS resource is identified by a SL PRS resource ID*
  + *FFS: details.*

*NOTE 1: The above does not imply need for signalling/(pre-)configuration of these parameters.*

**Proposals for email approval:**

|  |
| --- |
| **[Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.2-2**  *For SL PRS sequence generation, no additional parameters other than the following input parameters are used: slot number, symbol number, and the parameter .*  *Note to Mr. Chairman: All companies support or can accept it.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **[High] FL2 Proposal 2.3.3-1**   * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS may not be mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS transmitted by the same UE.*   + *FFS: SL PRS may be mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*   *Note to Mr. Chairman: Based on received feedback, the updated proposal should be acceptable to all.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **[Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.3.4-3**   * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*   *Note to Mr. Chairman: Based on received feedback, the updated proposal should be acceptable to all.* |

|  |
| --- |
| **[High] FL2 Proposal 2.4-2**   * *TDM-based multiplexing in a slot of SL PRS from different UEs is NOT supported for a shared resource pool~~s~~.*   *Note to Mr. Chairman: All companies support or can accept it.* |

1. Proposals for email endorsement (Friday)

**FL2 Proposals for email endorsement since Wednesday (04/19) end:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | There appears to no concern for this proposal. Thus, the original version is repeated and is recommended for email approval.  [Medium] FL2 Proposal 2.2-2   * *For SL PRS sequence generation, no additional parameters other than the following input parameters are used: slot number, symbol number, and the parameter .*   *This is recommended for email endorsement.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | This seems acceptable to all.  The wording is adjusted as per suggestion from Samsung.  **[High] FL2 Proposal 2.4-2**   * *TDM-based multiplexing in a slot of SL PRS from different UEs is NOT supported for a shared resource pool~~s~~.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |

**FL3 Proposals for email endorsement since Friday (04/21):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the *following is recommended for email endorsement*.  [High] FL3 Proposal 2.1-1   * *SL PRS resource sets are not defined in Rel-18.* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Moderator |  | The wording is updated based on feedback above.  **[High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.3-1**   * *For shared resource pools, SL PRS ~~may not be~~ is not mapped to symbols with PSSCH DMRS if transmitted by the same UE.*   + *FFS: SL PRS ~~may be~~ is mapped to contiguous-in-time symbols only.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Typo corrected below. Should be stable now.  **[Medium] FL3 Proposal 2.3.4-3**   * *(M, N) patterns with M > N with full staggering are supported.*    + *In the last (M-N) symbols, the SL PRS symbols are repeated with same order of comb offsets as in the first ~~M~~ N symbols.*   ***This is recommended for email endorsement.*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the ***following is recommended for email endorsement***.  **[High] FL3 Proposal 2.3.5-1**   * *An AGC symbol preceding a SL PRS resource is not considered as part of the SL PRS resource itself.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Based on received feedback, the ***following is recommended for email endorsement*.**  **[High] FL3 Proposal 3.1-1**   * *For the SL PRS open-loop power control, a UE can be configured to use DL pathloss (between TX UE and gNB) only, SL pathloss (between TX UE and RX UE) only, or both DL pathloss and SL pathloss.*   + *The same principle as for PSSCH power control is applied for deciding which (i.e., SL, DL, or SL and DL) pathloss to use.*   + *FFS: SL pathloss reference for open-loop power control for SL PRS.* |

1. Outcome from RAN1 #112bis-e

Agreed over email:

FL2 Proposal 2.2-2

* *For SL PRS sequence generation, no additional parameters other than the following input parameters are used: slot number, symbol number, and the parameter .*

FL2 Proposal 2.4-2

* *TDM-based multiplexing in a slot of SL PRS from different UEs is NOT supported for a shared resource pool~~s~~.*

…
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