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# Introduction

 This document summarizes the contribution submitted to A.I 9.5.5, positioning for RedCap UEs. the proposals are prioritized with [LOW][MEDIUM][HIGH] tags, with the intention that [HIGH] proposals are intended for online discussion during this meeting, and [MEDIUM] proposals could be discussed if time allows. [LOW] proposals are listed to collect views from companies and are typically consisting of proposals based on few contributions.

# General issues

## Reporting of measurements per hops [Closed]

### Background

 The issue of whether to report measurement per hop has been discussed for both UL bandwidth hopping [6,10,13,14,21] and downlink BW hopping[6,13, 14].

In [6, 10, 13,14], it is proposed to consider the case where only part of the transmitted hops (either UL or DL) are successfully received and therefore it is not possible to coherently combine all hops to form a wideband measurement. In this case, a “fallback measure” would be to revert to report measurements on a per-hop basis[14]. [6,21] also propose to indicate in the measurement report whether the reported measurement is made on a given hop, or using all hops. [10,13] mention the use of a “part index” or a “hop indicator” to be attached to the measurement to link a particular hop to the measurement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [14] | Proposal 4: Study measurement procedure for SRS hopping or Rx hopping for timing and power measurements (e.g., RSTD, UE/gNB Rx-Tx time difference, RSRP), i.e., whether to make measurements on received RS based on coherently combined hops or per hop-basis |
| [6] | Proposal 5: For RedCap UEs positioning with UL frequency hopping, support a gNB to report the measurement to the LMF with single combined reporting and multiple per hop reportings.* FFS: indicator for combined reporting/per hop reporting, with a value of 1 corresponding to combined reporting, with a value of 0 corresponding to per hop reporting.
* FFS: whether and how the gNB/TRP reports the number of hops to the LMF.
* FFS: the hop index for per hop reporting method.

Proposal 9: For RedCap UEs positioning with DL frequency hopping, support a UE to report the measurement to the LMF by use of combined reporting and per hop reporting method. |
| [10] | Proposal 3: support FH based reporting and associated FH part index within one complete PRS. |
| [13] | Proposal 4: For measurement report considering DL frequency hopping, UE should report the corresponding hop indication for each measurement result, where the hop indication includes the frequency range.Proposal 10: Support that TRPs can report the corresponding hop indication for each measurement result. |
| [21] | Proposal 8: In frequency hopping for RedCap uplink positioning, the measurements are reported per hop, or a single measurement is reported after combining all the hops. |

### Round 1

We start discussing whether to support per-hop reporting. Regarding the FFS points mentioned by [6], from the FL perspective it would be more suitable to leave these the RAN2 and RAN3.

 **Proposal 1.1-1: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping , support the UE or gNB to report the following:**

* **A measurement based on combining all hops**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.1-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support. We think both the single combined reporting and multiple per hop reporting should be supported. |
| vivo | Generally OK. For the 2nd sub-bullet, it can be changed as FFS after the application scenarios is clear. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal in principle. Regarding the bullets, is it expected that both options (measurement for combined hops, measurement per hop) are reported simultaneously? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| NEC | Support in general.For the second sub-bullet, we think measurement based on several consecutive hops but not all the hops should also be included. |
| ZTE | Support in general.We would like to additional support UE or gNB to report a measurement based on some of the hops. For example, hop 4 and hop 5 may have collision with other UL/DL transmission/reception, a UE or gNB may still report a measurement based on combing hop {1,2,3}. Therefore, we recommend the following: **Proposal 1.1-revised: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping of RedCap UE , support the UE or gNB to report the following:*** **A measurement based on combining all hops**
* **A measurement based on combining some of the hops**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop.**
 |
| SONY | Okay |
| mtk | For the measurement on each hop, UE may perform IFFT with same size on each hop. The number of IFFT operations increase but we don't see what is the benefit of doing so. We prefer to put SSF for 2nd sub-bullet  |
| Nokia/NSB | Do we mean this applies to all types of measurements? We are not sure what the benefit of RSRP per hop is. If the UE can measure all/multiple hops then what is the benefit of reporting timing measurements on a single hop? We agree with the comments above that a measurement based on combining some hops is worth considering.  |
| Futurewei1 | Propose FFS for the second sub-bullet. |
| Qualcomm | A UE can always be possible to report a measurement based on a single hop (this is legacy behavior, and cannot be excluded). We agree with ZTE’s view that, in addiiton to the „all hops“ and „single hop“, it shoudl be allowed to report a measurement based on a subset of hops.  |
| CMCC | Support. |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle.  |
| Ericsson | Support in principle, and ok with the update from ZTE.  |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We Support the proposal |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

Two companies (vivo, Mediatek) proposed to put FFS on using per-hop measurements. additionally, 1 company (ZTE) proposes to also consider the measurements combining some of the hops. 1 company wants to discuss which of the measurements should be considered for per-hop reporting.

Regarding adding “of RedCap UEs”, from the FL perspective, any UE could report support for Rx hopping, even if the feature is clearly targeting redcap UEs, therefore we could keep the wording generic.

Based on the received comments, the proposal brought to GTW is revised as follow:

**Proposal 1.1-2: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:**

* **A measurement based on combining all hops**
* **FFS: A measurement based on combining some of the hops**
* **FFS: One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop.**

### Round 2

Let’s continue the discussion based on the latest updated proposal from the online session:

**Proposal 1.1-3**

For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:

* A measurement based on coherently combining all measured hops
* One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.4-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | We think the word of “coherently” is not clear. And we prefer to use the following wording for the first sub-bullet:* A measurement based on ~~coherently~~ combining some of or all measured hops
 |
| vivo | Firstly, for the sub-bullet, if only hop 3 4 can be measured, whether the additional indication is needed for this case, and we are not sure whether the requirement can be satisfied if only part of hoping is measured.Secondly, we are not against the second sub-bullet but would like to double-check the majority view that the second bullet means the UE can report 4 hop measurements separately for DL Rx hopping |
| LGE | We prefer to remove the second bullet.If our understading is correct, in online session QC proposed that single hop reporting of FH should be not precluded becuase the multiple measruement reporting is supported in Rel-17. We are ok with the intention for non-FH cases, and beleive that the legacy beahviour will be supported regardless of this proposal. However, this proposal is for FH, and reporting multiple measurments for multiple hops with different frequency location was not the UE behaviour that shall be supported. Our evaluation results shows that per hop reporting cause significant positioning performance degradation. And we don’t think that the word “coherently“ is needed to be included, because combining methods is up to the receiver implementation.So we propose following: **Proposal 1.1-3: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping , support the UE or gNB to report the following:****- A measurement based on ~~non-coherently or coherently~~ combining all measured hops****- ~~One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements.~~** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think that coherent is important, and non-coherent combining from multiple hops can be somehow achived by reporting multiple measurement each for a hop.We think that the intention should be a measurement is reported based on coherently combining multiple hops (not supported prior to Rel-18), or multiple measurements are reported each based on a single hop (not supported prior to Rel-18).Then the wording can beFor DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A single measurement based on coherently combining all measured hops
* Multiple measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements.
 |
| NEC | We prefer to limit the hops for measurement determination is contiguous in the first bullet.A measurement based on coherently combining some of or all measured hops contiguous in time domain. |
| Samsung | 1. Suggest to remove „coherently“, for reporting purpose, we should not constraint the method to get the measurement ;
2. Keep one or multiple in second bulldet.

For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on ~~coherently~~ combining all ~~measured~~ hops
* One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements.
 |
| Nokia/NSB | We think it is important to enable the UE to indicate that some measurements may have been made only with a sub-set (down to 1) of hop(s). We feel this needs to somehow be captured in the current proposal.  |
| Futurewei | Based on our understanding, “coherently” should be kept in the first bullet. If it were removed, then there is no significant difference with the non-frequency hopping (legacy) case. The individual single hop measurements reported can always be combined.We suggest the following wording in the 2nd bullet:For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on coherently combining all measured hops
* One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements, or a single measurement based on combining each received (measured) hop.
 |
|  |  |
| Intel | Support removal of „coherently“ and „measured“, and we suggest a formulation similar to what was suggested by Nokia during Monday GTW.We suggest the following modification:For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on ~~coherently~~ combining all ~~measured~~ hops
* Indication if not all hops are combined to derive the measurement
	+ FFS: If number of hops that are combined in this case.
 |
| Qualcomm | Seems there are several differnet views. From our side and trying to do somewhat in the middle of what is being proposed above:* Whether it is coherently or noncohernetly may not be needed, but it is expected that RAN4 will define new requirements; if a UE/gNB can meet those requirements with noncoherent measurement that would be fine. Simialry, if a UE can meet requiremetns of a 100 MHz measurement BW by measuring a single hop of 20 Mhz, so be it; its a good UE.
* On the „measured/received“, we still dont see the need of adding it.
* All aspects about „indication“ from the UE/gNB could be FFS.

For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on combining one or more of the hops
	+ FFS: Whether this applies to only timing measurements or timing & RSRP/RSRPP measurements.
* Up to RAN4 to discuss any related accuracy requirements

FFS: details on indication(s), e.g., number of hops combined, which hops are combined if any,  |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We are fine with the proposal. And we think ‘coherently‘ should be there in the first bullet. |
| ZTE | Firstly, we prefer to delete “coherently” in the first bullet. RAN1’s spec can not capture a wording like this and it may cause confusion because how to make sure coherently combining may be up to implementation. If our understanding is correct, use adjacent/contiguous hops may address companies’ concern.Secondly, for the last bullet, our intention is if UE can not coherently combine multiple hops due to collision or other causes, it is possible for a UE to report measurement based on a single hop. We prefer the wording provided by Huawei.For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on combining multiple adjacent hops
* Multiple measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop

  |
| mtk | For the revised proposal**Proposal 1.1-3**For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on coherently combining all measured hops
* One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop, at least for timing measurements.

1, it seems that, if “hop“ here is treated as being pre-defined, then it is better to use “measured hop“. The combination is actually up to implementation. If a UE can’t perform coherent combining so that the performance suffers then UE will get the penalty. Since it is implementation issue, we are okay to remove “coherently“ from the sentence2, We hesitate to understand the need to report several measurements, each with a hop. To report a measurement based on a hop makes more sense. Also, the need to report **a** measurement based on the combined hops and **another** measurement based on a single hop is not clear. It is okay to optionally report the measurement based on a single hop.We suggest the following wording:For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A measurement based on combining all measured hops, and optionally report a measurement based on a single hop
 |
| OPPO | Fine with the rewording.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with ZTE’s version. |
| Ericsson | Regarding the first bullet, perhaps the word coherent can be dropped. As mentioned by Qualcomm, the measurement will have an associated requirement, and as long at it is met, the network does not really care how it is met, including how many hops were used. Hence the first bullet is basically the legacy measurement with a potentially relaxed RAN4 requirement. For the second bullet, we see single-hop reporting as a fallback mechanism when the UE cannot deliver the required accuracy because it could not process the whole wideband PRS and combine all the hops. Thus in that case there should be some indication that the network should expect a lower quality. Signaling the hop index for the measurement could fulfil this objective.Finally, even if the measurement is meeting the requirement, it would be good information for the LMF to know whether the UE or gNB used only some of the hops when reporting the measurement. Therefore we support at least studying further indicating which hops or how many hops where used in the report for the single measurement.Thus we propose the following:Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth
	+ Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.
	+ Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.
* Multiple measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop
* FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.
 |
| SONY | We prefer the updated proposal made by Ericsson. However, we suggest to update the first bullet point:* A single measurement based on ~~receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth~~ combining all or a subset of contiguous hops.

It is unclear on the definition of PRS’s full bandwidth. |
| Apple | Fine with the updated wording |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | With regards to Ericsson’s proposal, we have the same feeling as SONY to remove PRS full bandwidth. Since it can be up to UE/TRP implementation, whether contiguous hops is used or not does not really matter, and meeting the performance requirement is sufficient.So the suggestion from our side isUpdated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A single measurement based on combining all or a subset of hops
	+ Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.
	+ Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.
* Multiple measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop
* FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.
 |
| InterDigital | Thank you very much for the discussion. I think the first bullet from Ericsson’s latest proposal addresses our concern made during the online. Our point is that we should support a case when the UE receives all hops the UE was supposed to receive (i.e., PRS’s full bandwidth). Regarding the second bullet, does it have to be multiple? From our perspective, even when the UE receives only one hop (out of let’s say 4 hops the UE is supposed to receive), the UE should report the measurement for the received hop. Therefore, we propose the following modification. Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth
	+ Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.
	+ Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.
* One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop
* FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.
 |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the latest update from IDC.  |

### Status before GTW (Friday, week1)

There is convergence in the comments that for the “main measurement” it is up to the UE/TRP’s implementation to deliver the required accuracy in the measurement using one hop, multiple hops or all hops available for a given PRS. Based on the different proposed rewording, it seems that we should capture the following changes:

* The first bullet: include the possibility to measure on one or multiple (including all) hops, remove the need for coherent combining..
* The second bullet: there were proposal to change “one or more” to “multiple, but this does not seem critical
* Adding FFS for attaching an indication for which of the hop(s) where used in producing the “main measurement”

**Proposal 1.1-4:**

**Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:**

* **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth**
	+ **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
	+ **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
	+ **FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop**

**Proposal 1.4-4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | Firstly, only DL PRS is related in the sub-bullet. Whether the UL Tx hopping can be removed in the main bullet.In addition, we have some concerns about the two sub-bulletFor the first bullet, we have some concerns about the description of “ receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth“ since the PRS’s full bandwidth is unclear, so can we modify it as follows* **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS of the UE over the PRS configured for the measurement ~~the PRS’s full bandwidth~~**

In addition, the second sub-bullet may mean each measurement is based on a single hop, and the association hop for different measurements can be different. If right, we prefer to add a note * **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop,**
	+ Note: the association hop for different measurements can be different
 |
| LGE | Since frequency hopping is upto UE implemeation for DL PRS Rx hopping, reporting definition regarding to FH configuration (e.g. number of hop, hop index, etc.) cannot be in spec. So we propose to separate this proposal into two proposals regarding to DL Rx hopping and UL Tx hopping, respectively, as following: **Proposal 1.1-4.a:****Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping, support the UE to report the following:*** **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth**
	+ **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
	+ **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
* **~~One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop~~ Legacy measurment reporting mechanism is supported.**

**Proposal 1.1-4.b:****Updated proposal: For UL Tx hopping, support the gNB to report the following:*** **A single measurement based on all measured hops**
	+ **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
	+ **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
	+ **FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop**

We are okay with changing „all measured hops“ to „all or subset of hops“. We don’t think this issue is critical. |
| Nokia/NSB | While we support the intention of the proposal we are not sure that over the PRS full bandwidth is the best way to capture this proposal. In our understand what is meant is that the UE takes one measurement based on all received/configured hops. What is important is that a UE may only use some of the hops (either as it knows it can meet the RAN4 requirements or that one of the hops has a conflict/interference). In this case would this fall under the first sub-bullet?  |
| Futurewei | Proposal 1.1-4 seems to mix UL SRS and DL PRS. To make the proposal clearer and unambiguous, suggest the following wording:**Updated proposal:** * **For DL Rx hopping, support the UE to report the following:**
	+ **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS over the PRS’s full bandwidth**
		- **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
		- **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
		- **FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.**
	+ **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop**
* **For UL Tx hopping, support gNB to report combining one or more UL SRS, where each SRS is associated with a single received hop**
 |
| FL | Thanks for all the received feedback!To LG: my understanding from the discussion is that for the measurement per hop, there will be a need for some additional information regarding the hop the measurement is based on. I am not sure this correspond to the legacy measurement report. To Nokia: as you say, the first sub-bullet correspond to the measurement made by the UE to meet the RAN4 requirements. I agree it should be possible to use some of the hops for this measurement, it is up to the UE. To LGE: thanks for the proposal. In the sub-bullet regarding SRS, you mention multiple SRSs. Since we have not decided the hopping procedure for SRS (but it looks likely to be within a resource), I would prefer having a wording similar to the one for DL. Regarding the mix of UL and DL, I have noticed now that UL is missing from the sub-bullets. A revised proposal is given below:**Proposal 1.1-5:****Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:*** **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS or UL SRS for positioning**
	+ **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
	+ **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
	+ **FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop**
 |

### Conclusion for RAN1#112b-e

The following was agreed during the GTW:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:* A single measurement based on receiving multiple hops of the DL PRS or UL SRS for positioning
* One [or more] measurements where each measurement is associated with one received hop
* FFS: indication of how many received hops / which received hops where used in the measurement report.
* Note: no new measurement definition is introduced in RAN1
* FFS: conditions when the above measurements are reported, and whether the above measurements can be reported together
 |

## Capabilities for Overlap between hops and number of hops [closed]

### Background

Signaling of a UE capability regarding the maximum number of hops for DL PRS Rx hopping is mentioned in [5, 12, 6, 8,13, 19,21]. [13] propose values between 2-5 hops. A similar capability for UL SRS hopping is discussed in [21, 20, 17 ]

In [5, 6,13,17, 19, 20, 21], the amount of overlap (or the support of overlap, for [20]) is also part of the capability. [21] proposes to report overlap between 1,2,4 or8 PRBs. [19] proposes to consider multiple of 4 PRBs for the overlap granularity, while [17] proposes to consider a minimum of 1 PRB. For the maximum value, [3] propose that the overlap size should be smaller than 8 PRBs. In[18], it is propose to make the overlap size a function of the channel quality.

In [21], the maximum bandwidth per hop is also part of the capability.

A few contributions mentioned the phase offset compensation. In [10,18], it is proposed to discuss further the phase compensation, while in [12], it is proposed to leave it to UE implementation. From the FL perspective, it seems suitable to leave the compensation technique to implementation. RAN4 will work on the requirements for the measurement reported with Rx hopping, and this will depend on the total bandwidth (and thus the total number of hops) as well as the amount of overlap between hops. How the UE uses the overlap to compensate the phase offset can be left to implementation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [12] | Proposal 5: Specify the capability on the amount of Rx hops to combine, storing the number of time domain DL-PRS samples across different hops for coherent Rx combining to achieve wideband DL-PRS measurement for RedCap devices. Proposal 2: Phase offset compensation should be left to UE implementation. |
| [6] | Proposal 6: For RedCap UE positioning with DL Rx frequency hopping, support the following UE capability: the number of overlapping frequency resources in adjacent hops and the number of hops (Alt 1). |
| [8] | Proposal 5: Support the UE capability parameter to reflect the supported frequency hopping operation for NR RedCap UE. (i.e, by considering the RedCap UE constraints / limitations). |
| [10] | Proposal 5: FFS how to compensate the impacts on phase offset and/or amplitude change, from the time varying channel property. |
| [13] | Proposal 1: With regards to frequency hopping for positioning for RedCap UE, the number of hops should be configured by the network:* UE reports a capability on the maximum number of supporting frequency hops to network, the candidates are {2, 3, 4, 5}
* UE reports a capability on the overlapping PRB(s) between adjacent hops or a capability on the maximum equivalent bandwidth after combing all hops
 |
| [21] | Proposal 3: For RedCap positioning, the number of hops, measurement bandwidth per hop, and overlapping bandwidth are UE’s capabilities to be reported to LMF. Proposal 4: For RedCap positioning, the overlap of bandwidth between the adjacent hops is X PRB. The possible values of X are 1,2,4,8 PRB. |
| [11] | Proposal 5: To support RS frequency hopping, the partial overlapping in the frequency domain should be considered to mitigate the phase discontinuity between different hops. |
| [19] | Proposal 3: * RAN1 should first agree to support the overlap between hops, and then discuss a UE capability related to overlap.

Proposal 4: * If the number of overlapping frequency resources in adjacent hops is a UE capability, 4 PRBs overlap may be a reasonable starting point from the specification impact perspective.
	+ If the overlap size needs to be larger than 4 PRBs, it should be multiple of 4 PRBs.
 |
| [22] | **Proposal 3-1**: For the configuration for SRS transmission frequency hopping, UE may report the RF retuning capability, since the duration in terms of symbol number between the end of a hop and the start of next hop is related to the UE RF retuning capability |
| [20] | ***Proposal 6: For SRS for positioning frequency hopping configuration mechanism, following should be specified:**** ***Switching mechanism for SRS-pos frequency hopping configuration***
* ***Configuration of overlap size***
 |
| [17] | **Proposal 2: Support a UE to report a capability for the amount of overlap required for DL PRS and SRS for Positioning.****Proposal 3: Support in the specification multiple overlap options between 2 frequency-adjacent hops with a minimum value of 1 PRB.**  |
| [3] | ***Proposal 2:**** ***For the sizes of overlapping bandwidth for different hops, the balance between phase error compensation performance and bandwidth span of frequency hopping should be considered.***
* ***A size smaller than 8 PRBs can be considered***
 |
| [5] | ***Proposal 7: The number of overlapping frequency resources in adjacent hops required for the UE to perform phase offset compensation the overlap between hop for DL PRS Rx frequency hopping is a UE capability.******Proposal 8: For positioning for RedCap UEs, the number of hops for DL PRS Rx frequency hopping is a UE capability.*** |
| [18] | ***Proposal 4: To refine the overlapped bandwidth configuration among kinds of RedCap UEs, support RedCap UE reports the related parameters as a capability, such as level of phase offset between hops.*** ***Proposal 5: For frequency hopping of PRS, support size of overlapped bandwidth between two adjacent hops is decided by channel quality.*** |

### Round 1

 There seem to be consensus from the proposals that there should be a capability for the number of hops, as well as overlap between hops, for both reception of the DL PRS with Rx hopping and transmission of the UL SRS with Tx hopping. The granularity for these capability could be discussed later during UE features. For the UL SRS, the proposals only included the overlap between hops and the bandwidth for each hop.

**Proposal 1.2a-1: For the reception of DL PRS with Rx hopping, the following are separate UE capabilities:**

**the overlap between hop for DL PRS frequency hopping**

* **FFS: granularity of the capability**

**the number of hops for DL PRS frequency hopping**

* **FFS: granularity of the capability**

**The maximum bandwidth in a hop**

* **FFS: granularity of the capability**

**Proposal 1.2b-1: For the transmission of UL SRS with Tx hopping, the following are separate UE capabilities:**

**the overlap between hop for UL SRS frequency hopping**

* **FFS: granularity of the capability**

**The maximum bandwidth in a hop**

* **FFS: granularity of the capability**

Comments can be entered in the tables below:

**Proposal 1.2a-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support. |
| vivo | The details of PRS Rx hopping is up to RAN4, it is still not clear the impact of UE reporting these capabilities. In our view, the UE capability of Rx hopping can also be determined by RAN4 together with other Rx hopping details. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is too early to discuss UE capabilities. What is the spec for those capabilities? |
| NEC | We agree with the maximum overlapped bandwidth as a kind of capability. For the actual overlapped bandwidth, associates with channel quality, positioning requirement is more reasonable, of which, base station may have a more accurate understanding. In addition, by comparing with leaving the overlapped bandwidth to be an implementation of RedCap UE, configured overlapped bandwidth reduces the complexity of measurement determination by using a definite configuration, rather than trying multiple possible sets of overlapped bandwidth to find the one with best performance. So, we think configurable overlapped bandwidth is beneficial. |
| ZTE | OK to postpone the discussion.Generally we support that both the overlap between hops and number of hops should be UE capabilities. However, for the maximum bandwidth of a hop, no separate UE capability is needed. It can simply refers to the the existing UE capability. |
| SONY | Support |
| mtk | RX hopping is RAN4’s work |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Huawei. This should be low priority and discussed in future meetings. We should first agree that at least overlapping hops will be supported.  |
| Futurewei1 | For DL PRS frequency hopping, the maximum bandwidth capability may not be needed if the number of hops is capability. It is too early to discuss overlapping capability without knowing if overlapping is supported or not for DL PRS frequency hopping. |
| Qualcomm | There needs to be an agreeemnt on supporting „overlapping hops“, and it is related to how much will be the total BW that is being mesaured. If a UE needs significant overlap, then tthe total BW will be smaller. This will result to different expected behavior and performance. At a minimum having a „principle agreement“ on a UE reporting related capability is needed.  |
| CMCC | Postpone the discussion to future meetings. |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | Although we understand the intention of the proposal, it seems to us it is a bit too early to discuss UE capability and that there are aspects here that need further progress in RAN4. We also share similar view as other companies that maximum bandwidth in a hop would not be a part of UE capability.  |
| Ericsson | Similar view as many above, we can delay this discussion.  |
| Apple | We think that the overlap between hops for both DL and UL should be discussed in some additional detail.  |

**Proposal 1.3b-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Why do we need the maximum bandwidth per hop as the capability? |
| NEC | Same comment as Proposal 1.2a-1. |
| ZTE | Similar as our comment for Proposal 1.2a-1, we are ok to introduce a separate UE capability for the overlap between hops and delete “**~~The maximum bandwidth in a hop~~**”. |
| SONY | Support |
| mtk | 1, not clear why overlapping between hops is UE capability. If the UE could switch RF, the next center frequency point could be anywhere2, not clear why max BW per hop is also UE capability |
| Nokia/NSB | This should be low priority and discussed in future meetings. We should first agree that at least overlapping hops will be supported. |
| Futurewei1 | It is too early to discuss overlapping capability without knowing if overlapping is supported or not for UL SRS frequency hopping. Suggest to discuss SRS configuration first, namely overlapping, bandwidth per hop and the number of OFDM symbols per hop (i.e., dwell time per hop). |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | Same comments as above.  |
| Ericsson | Same comments as for 1.3a-1.  |
| Apple | Same as above |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

Based on the received comments, we should park this discussion until further progress has been made and capabilities can be better discussed. Let’s close the discussion for this meeting and reconsider it at a later stage.

## Switching time between hops (paused)

### Background

[14,12,8,10,22] have additional proposals with respect to the time gap between hops for either the SRS or the PRS. Since RAN1 has not yet received a response regarding the retuning time, it is proposed to pause the discussion until next meeting, when we will hopefully have a better view on what time gap between hop is suitable for both DL PRS Rx hopping and SRS Tx hopping.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [14] | **Proposal 1: Study dependency between the amount of overlapped bandwidth and gap between two consecutive frequency hops** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 6: Specify the timing offset resulting from the reception of different positioning hops.*** |
| [8] | Proposal 2: Introduce two parameters, Tgap (the time gap between two adjacent hops) and F\_ovl (the overlap resources in frequency domain), to facilitate bandwidth stitching in the frequency hopping operation.Proposal 3: These parameters (T\_gap and F\_ovl) can be configured for each measurement occasion or semi-consistent for multiple occasions. |
| [10] | Proposal 4: a time gap configuration should be considered between hops, FFS the candidate value and applicable condition. |
| [22] | **Proposal 2-3**: The suitable UE capability for reception frequency hopping could consider RF retuning time, not the total measurable BW, since it could depend on the DL-PRS structure |

### Round 1

From the FL perspective, we should delay discussions related to the time gap between hops until RAN4 has responded to the RAN1 LS on switching time.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Hopping pattern [MEDIUM]

### Background

Multiple companies have discussed the hopping patterns for Rx and Tx hopping[8,13,21,3,17]. In [8], it is propose to make the hopping pattern reconfigurable. In [13] it is proposed to ensure that the overlap between hops is such that the same Res are available from the two overlapping hops. [3] and [17 discuss a diagonal hopping pattern (where two consecutive hops always have an overlap), and [17] propose to also study hopping where overlap may not always be between consecutive hops.

 In [7], it is propose to let the gNB chose between a Redcap-UE only pattern and a pattern suitable to both redcap and non-redcap UEs. however, this seem to contradict the following conclusion from the last meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**For positioning enhancements for RedCap UEs, only Rx frequency hopping of the DL PRS is supported. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [8] | Proposal 4: Further study whether the frequency hopping pattern is fixed or reconfigurable. |
| [13] | Proposal 9: In the overlapping PRB(s), support SRS transmission with comb size 1 for effective estimation of phase rotation. |
| [21] | Proposal 2: For UE-assisted Redcap positioning, bandwidth overlap between the adjacent frequency hops should be supported. |
| [3] | Proposal 1:* Regarding frequency hopping pattern for RedCap positioning, the diagonal hopping pattern is supported.

Proposal 3: • For channel stitching of the symbols from different hops, the same comb size and RE offset should be supported |
| [17] | Proposal 7: Study further at least the following two options for the SRS frequency hopping pattern:* Option 1: Use the current hopping formula of SRS as a starting point and update it such that there can be frequency domain overlap over 2 hops that are adjacent in frequency.
	+ Example of the update in the frequency-domain starting position $k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}$ :

$$k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}=\overbar{k}\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}+\sum\_{b=0}^{B\_{SRS}}(K\_{TC}M\_{sc,b}^{SRS}n\_{b} -M\_{overlap}⋅n\_{b}⋅\prod\_{b^{'}=b+1}^{B\_{SRS}}N\_{b^{'}})$$* Option 2: Use a staircase-like hopping formula with a parameter that controls the amount of overlap of frequency domain adjacent hops.
 |
| [7] | Proposal 1* For DL PRS for RedCap UEs, detailed frequency hopping pattern for the reception of DL PRS across different subbands is defined.
* gNB may choose between the option of transmitting a single common DL PRS that may be received by RedCap and non-RedCap UEs and the option of transmitting DL PRS for RedCap UEs separate from that for non-RedCap UEs.
 |

### Round 1

It seems that at least the principle of overlap between consecutive hops is agreeable, with further discussion on how exactly to configure the hopping pattern for the SRS to be decided later.

**Proposal 1.4-1**

**For DL PRS rx hopping and UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two consecutive hops.**

 **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.4-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | The details of PRS Rx hopping are up to RAN4 and whether the overlap in frequency for DL PRS Rx hopping has RAN1 spec impact is not clear now. Therefore, in this stage, we propose to only support SRS hopping related overlapping. So, the proposal can be modified as**Proposal 1.4-1****For ~~DL PRS rx hopping and~~ UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two consecutive hops.**  **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**  |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | What is the spec impact for this proposal? |
| NEC | Support in general. And to include the special case of overlapped bandwidth being zero, we suggest adding a note for this proposal.Note: It doesn’t mean the overlapped bandwidth being zero is precluded. |
| mtk | 1, For DL PRS RX hopping, it is up to implementation2, For UL SRS TX hopping, we are okay |
| Qualcomm | Does the „Two consecutive hops“ mean, „2 time-domain consecutive hops“ or frequency-domain hops? Some clarification is needed  |
| CMCC | Support for SRS part, fine with vivo’s revision. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | For DL PRS, we don’t really see a need to specify the way hopping is done, since it’s up the UE to carry out the hopping in a way that can deliver the required accuracy of measurement. We are ok with vivo’s rewording.  |
| Apple | Support this proposal. |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

From the received comments, the SRS configuration seems more important than for the PRS. To answer the question from QC, the intention was to describe two consecutive hops in the time domain. This is clarified in the revised proposal.

**Proposal 1.4-2**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two time domain consecutive hops.**

 **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**

### Round 2

Since the updated proposal was not treated during the online, let’s continue the discussion.

**Proposal 1.4-2**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two time-domain consecutive hops.**

 **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.4-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| vivo | We would like to confirm whether the proposal is suitable for the case of ‘Hop first, then repeat’?For example, as the following table, Hop 4 and Hop 5 are **time-domain consecutive hops**, but they don’t have overlapping bandwidth.Regarding ‘two continuous hops’, a more accurate description may be ‘two **frequency-domain continuous hops**’. |
| LGE | Support to remove the „DL PRS Rx hopping“And we would like to clarify if configuring the overlap is optional or not. Similar with NEC’s view, it can imply the non-overlapping to configure overlap size as zero. Based on our simulation results, performance of UL SRS Tx hopping without overlapping could be comparable with one of SRS hopping with perfect phase compensation depending on the receiver implementation. We support both overlapped and non-overlapped frequency hopping. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| NEC | Support it in general. In addition, by considering the phase error introduced by RF retuning is a property of RedCap UE, the overlap bandwidth would be unnecessary for the RedCap UE with phase error charateristic lower than a threshold. So we think the size of overlap bandwidth being zero should not be precluded. |
| Samsung  | Generally fine, but considering time gap might be there for different hops, the word „**two time-domain consecutive hops.** “ **two time-domain consecutive hops.** “ should change to „“ **two time-domain adjecent hops.** “**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two time-domain ~~consecutive~~ adjecent hops.**  **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  |
| Futurewei | Support the wording proposed by Samsung with a minor editorial modification, which is“adjacent” -> adjacent |
| Intel | We are fine with the update from Samsung. |
| Qualcomm | Such an approach only allows for a single pattern if I am not wrong; the staircase pattern (in the figure below the UE with ID 1). Any other Ues will have frequency overlapped hops that are not consecutive. In that case, we have multiplexing limitations. If the hops are close-by, we dont see the need to restrict the frequency-domain overlap to only consecutive hops. Similarly, i dont see the need to excluding the case of following the legacy hopping pattern with just a small shift in frequency of the frequency-adjacent patterns (as the example below):Chart  Description automatically generated |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| ZTE | Agree with Samsung’s modification. |
| mtk | 1, This issue may move to section 4 since it is only related to SRS FH2, no strong view for using “adjacent“ or “consecutive“. Both are fine  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the updated proposal by Samsung. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with Samsung’s modification |
| Ericsson | Ok with samsung’s update.  |
| SONY  | We actually have similar view as Qualcomm. Do we really want to limit / restrict the multiplexing option(s)? |
| Apple | Similar view with Qualcomm |
| InterDigital | Ok with Samsung‘ version but we don’t see a big difference between the FL’s version and Samsung’s version. |
| Ericsson | To Qualcomm: for frequency overlapped hops that are not consecutive, we wonder how the UE will compensate the phase rotations occuring between hops. In our understanding these are random, not slowly changing over time.  |
| Qualcomm | To Ericsson: Yes the rotations are random. So, if they are random, why do the hops need to be close by in time?Lets look at the photo below: hop1 (the blue) overlaps with hop4 (the purple) in 1 PRB (the PRB with ID 47). Assuming 2 symbols of retuning time, the difference in time between the 1st and the 4th hop is 8 symbols; the underlying channel would not change significantly in between these hops. Chart  Description automatically generatedThe phase will have „rotated randomly“ once when the UE moves from the blue to the orange, then again from orange to yelow, and then again from yellow to purpose. Overall, it is just a random rotation still. The receiver will just take any 2 frequency domain overlapped hops and try to estimate the phase jump with the underlying assumption that the channel hasnt changed much.  |

### Round 3

A majority of companies think that a so-called “staircase pattern” of overlapping hops is required for the SRS with FH. Some companies suggest to include the case of zero overlap. At least 3 companies want to keep the hopping pattern flexible to allow multiplexing.

From the FL perspective, it seems that as long as the channel is coherent over the whole transmission, phase correction between overlapping hops can happen even if the hops are not adjacent, as explained in Qualcomm’s last comment. Let’s see if the explanation is satisfactory and we can relax the pattern to be more flexible:

**Proposal 1.4-3**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops which may or may not be adjacent.**

* **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported**

**Proposal 1.4-4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | OK |
| LGE | For 2nd bullet, based on our evaluation results, it is clear that performance FH with non-coherent combining without overlapping could meet target requirement. Also, since whether coherently or non-coherently combine the hops is upto receiver’s implementation, we should not constraint to exact combining method. So we propose modification as follow:**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops which may or may not be adjacent, including the case of zero overlap.*** **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **~~FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported~~**
 |
| Apple | Ok with proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Generally okay but one question for clarification, is it right that the intention of this proposal is to support both staircase and non-staircase patterns?  |
| Futurewei | What does „not adjacent mean in Proposal 1.4-3? For clarity, sugges the following wording:**Proposal 1.4-3****For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops.** * **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported**
* **FFS: whether the overlapping hops may not be adjacent in the time domain**
 |
| Samsung  | Question to QC, for the suggested non-staircase pattern, it seems the such pattern can be stair-case, if we do following:So we are curious, what is the extra benefit to do your suggested pattern instead of the staircase pattern? Thx in advance. |
| Ericsson | Based on QC’s comment, we are ok with the proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general, we would be OK with the update.However we would like to point out that what Qualcomm referred was a MIMO-SRS frequency hopping pattern, and in this case, we prefer to also include the usage of MIMO-SRS with frequency hopping. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| NEC | We prefer the suggestion of LGE. And we can accept the proposal to make a progress. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Intel | We have similar question for clarification: does that mean both staircase and non-staircase patterns are supported, based on the configuration of detailed frequency hopping pattern?  |
| ZTE | Firstly, we believe the core idea of this proposal is to agree on introducing overlap between hops. We do not think what LGE suggests is reasonable. According to our agreements made in SI phase, the following was captured in TS 38.859, where multiple companies’ evaluation shows that partial overlap can compensate the phase offset between hops and thus meet accuracy requirement.

|  |
| --- |
| Regarding the performance for positioning of Redcap UEs using frequency hopping in IIoT scenarios, considering phase offset between hops: - In FR1, based on the results provided by the following sources: - If the phase offset between hops in frequency hopping is compensated, for InF-SH, the positioning requirement for IIOT use cases can be achieved using frequency hopping with partial overlap for the purpose of phase offset compensation, - Results in [111] show that UL TDOA can meet the requirements.- Results in [111], [62], and [113] show that DL TDOA can meet the requirements.- Results in [55], show that the requirement cannot be met, even if the phase is compensated. - If the phase offset between hops in Frequency hopping is not compensated,- Results in [62] and [119] show that DL TDOA can meet the requirements if the random phase offset is set to be equal or smaller than 0.4π.- Results in [121] show that DL TDOA cannot meet the requirement with the random phase offset distributed from [-π, π]. |

Secondly, regarding “may or may not be adjacent”, we think it is up to future discussion on whether we support staircase or non-staircase hopping. Therefore, we support Futurewei’s update and put “may or may not be adjacent” in FFS.  |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| LGE | To ZTE: The above captured in TR 38.859 only showed the performance gain using overlap, but it does not recommend or force partial overlap. Also, WID does not say that overlap must be supported.The evaluation results of our tdoc show the advantages and disadvantages of overlap and non-overlap methods depending on the receiving algorithm. Our suggestion is not to support only non-overlap, but to consider non-overlap as well. |
|  |  |

### Status before GTW (Wednesday, week2)

Based on the received feedback, the proposal seems mostly acceptable, with a small rewording. Regarding the use of no overlap, considering the discussion with ZTE and LGE, it is better to keep it as FFS.

**Proposal 1.4-4**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops.**

* **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported**
* **FFS: whether the overlapping hops may not be adjacent in the time domain**

If you have any strong concern, please enter your comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.4-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Bandwidth limitation [Closed]

### Background

3 companies had proposals regarding the bandwidth to consider for positioning of RedCap UEs. the previous meeting captured the following conclusion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**The scope for RedCap positioning includes FR1 and FR2. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 3: Support Redcap PRS processing capability with reduced bandwidths e.g., 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz for FR2 including a reduced Rx antenna/RF chain of a single antenna.***  |
| [1] | **Proposal 4: For improving the positioning accuracy of RedCap UEs, support transmit/receive frequency hopping for SRS and PRS with partial overlapping frequency resources for both FR1 and FR2.**  |
| [4] | **Proposal 1: For RedCap UE positioning, the maximum DL/UL frequency hopping bandwidth should be limited to 100MHz at FR1.****Proposal 2: On frequency hopping for RedCap UE positioning, reuse the existing bandwidth part restriction for each hop, i.e. up to 20MHz at FR1 and 100MHz at FR2 per DL/UL BWP.** |

### Round 1

We can try to further detail the conclusion from the previous meeting by detailing the maximum supported hop bandwidth for each frequency range. Note that there is also a discussion for signalling a UE capability regarding the hop bandwidth in section 2.2.

**Proposal 1.5-1: for the positioning of redcap UEs, for the DL PRS reception and UL SRS transmission, the maximum hopping bandwidth for a single hop is 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz with FR2.**

Comments can be entered in the tables below:

**Proposal 1.5-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support it as the conclusion. |
| NEC | Support. |
| ZTE | Agree with Huawei’s comment. The maximum hopping bandwidth for a single hop should refer to the maximum bandwidth supported for legacy RedCap UE. A simple conclusion is necessary. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Intel | Fine with a conclusion.  |
| Ericsson | Ok with a conclusion |
| Apple | Fine as conclusion. |
| Spreadtrum | Support it as the conclusion. |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

Seems everyone is ok with capturing a conclusion, let’s try to capture it online if there is time:

**Proposal 1.5-1: (for conclusion) For the positioning of redcap UEs, for the DL PRS reception and UL SRS transmission, the maximum hopping bandwidth for a single hop is 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz with FR2.**

### Conclusion for RAN1#112b-e

The proposal was agreed as follow:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**For the positioning of redcap UEs, for the DL PRS reception and UL SRS transmission, the maximum hopping bandwidth for a single hop is 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz with FR2. |

## Supported methods [LOW]

### Background

 Three companies mentioned the methods to be supported by redcap positioning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 1: Prioritize timing-based positioning technique such as TDoA, RTT for*** ***Redcap positioning.***  |
| [14] | **Proposal 3: Support both DL/UL timing and angle based positioning methods for hopping based positioning methods** |
| [9] | **Proposal 1**: RAN1 should discuss how to perform phase alignment between frequency chunks in PRS frequency hopping/stitching including the impacts of a poor channel on the overlapping RB/REs.**Proposal 2**: RAN1 should support phase alignment for Multi-RTT and determine if phase alignment is needed for both UL at the gNB and DL at the UE. |

### Round 1

 From the FL perspective, the WID does not specify a particular method to be supported. The topic was discussed during RAN1#112 but did not progress to an agreement due to differing views on including carrier phase positioning in the included methods. Since the issue is not critical to the progress of the other issues, it is propose to treat the proposal with low priority.

**Proposal 1.6-1:**

**Rel-18 positioning enhancements for RedCap UEs includes all RAT-dependent positioning methods supported in Rel-17.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 1.6-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support but we feel this is somehow obvious.  |

## Requirements [LOW]

### Background

One company proposed to send an LS to RAN4 regarding the definition of RRM requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [11] | Proposal 2: It is up to RAN4 to define RRM requirements for UE performing DL PRS Rx frequency hopping.• A LS to RAN4 can be sent. |

### Round 1

 From the FL perspective, the definition of RRM requirements by RAN4 once a feature is specified is business as usual for the RAN4 WG. An LS is not required to trigger this, thus we propose to not take further action on the issue.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with FL view.  |

# DL-PRS Frequency Hopping

##  Further configuration of Rx hopping for DL PRS [paused]

### Background

 Several companies presented further proposals regarding the configuration of DL PRS RX hopping [2,5,8,15,16,18].

In [8] it is proposed to support hopping to be configurable across multiple PRS resources or resource sets, and thus reconsider the previous agreement to hop within a resource. The raised issue is the number of retuning/switches considering beam sweeping.

[5,15,16,18] propose to implement the Rx hopping using the DL PRS repetition scheme. [5] also mentions that hopping across resources could be considered, which would revert the previous agreement to focus on hopping within a DL PRS resource. [15] also points that the resource periodicity may need to have additional values, in order to support both beam sweeping and hopping. [16] proposes to consider sub-slot repetitions to lower the Rx hopping overall latency when possible.

[18] proposes to configure the overlap to use by the UE when performing Rx hopping.

[18] propose to consider configuring lower SCSs in order to improve performance for low speed UEs.

[2] proposes to pause the discussion until a response from RAN4 on the retuning time has been received.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [8] | Proposal 9: Support frequency hopping is configurable across multiple DL PRS resources or resource-sets. |
| [5] | Proposal 1: UE perform frequency hopping reception between different PRS transmission repetitions within one period of one PRS resource can be considered.Proposal 2: UE performs frequency hopping reception of PRS between PRS resources can be considered. |
| [18] | Proposal 1: Repetition scheme for PRS can be considered to realize DL PRS frequency hopping in Rx.Proposal 2: For frequency hopping of PRS, support configurable overlapped bandwidth between two adjacent hops to address the influence caused by phase offset between hops.Proposal 3: For frequency hopping of PRS, support presence of overlapped bandwidth between two adjacent hops associates with the level of phase offset between hops.Proposal 9: Consider using small SCS to increase the positioning performance for RedCap UEs with low speed at least. |
| [15] | Proposal 1: For DL PRS Rx Hopping, the UE hops within a DL PRS resource. The specification impact includes the following:* Frequency domain: no change
* Time domain: increase number of repetitions to enable mapping over BW. This may need an update to parameters like the L-PRS-ResourceRepetitionFactor, DL-PRS-ResourceTimeGap and the DL-PRS-Periodicity.
 |
| [2] | Proposal 2: RAN1 should wait the reply LS from RAN4 for further discussion on PRS Rx hopping reception. |
| [16] | Proposal 1 Inter-slot PRS frequency hopping can be implemented without RAN1 specification impact.Proposal 2 Send an LS to RAN4 requesting to consider measurements based on intra-slot hopping for RedCap UEs.Proposal 4 Support sub-slot (symbol) level repetitions, with resource time gap using symbol resolution. |

### Round 1

From the FL perspective, it is preferable to avoid reopening closed issues from the previous meeting, and therefore hopping across resources as proposed in [5,8] is not considered at this stage, unless a serious issue is identified.

Regarding the configuration of the overlap proposed in [18], the motivation is unclear. The UE should be able to use any overlap in Rx hopping, provided it can deliver the measurement quality set by the RAN4 requirements. RAN2/RAN4 could discuss the need for assistance data for the requirement. Similarly, the configuration of different SCSs as proposed in [18] seem an implementation issue.

Thus, the following proposal focuses on configuration of the repetition framework to support Rx hopping. The FFSs list the potential inpact on repetition factor and periodicity configuration.

**Proposal 2.1-1: Rx hopping of the DL PRS is supported using DL PRS repetitions of a DL PRS resource**

* **FFS: additional values to the repetition factor configured in D*L-PRS-ResourceRepetitionFactor* and periodicity in *DL-PRS-Periodicity***
* **FFS: additional values to the resource time gap configured in *DL-PRS-ResourceTimeGap*, including support for sub-slot repetitions.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 2.1-1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | We are generally OK for the main bullet. But we have some concern on the last FFS, considering the UE may measure the PRS resource from multiple TRP for each hop, the benefit and performance of intra- slot repetition is unclear. |
| InterDigital | Is this discussion related to the definition of “DL PRS Rx hopping sequence” in 3.3?FL: thanks for your comment. The hopping sequence in 3.3 is the sequence of hops where each hop would be one repetition instance of the DL PRS.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Up to RAN4. |
| NEC | Support. |
| ZTE | We believe this proposal is highly related to the conclusion of RAN4, if eventually the switching gap is less than 1 ms, then both inter-slot Rx hopping of DL PRS and intra-slot Rx hopping of DL PRS can be supported, where:* Inter-slot Rx hopping of the DL PRS is supported using DL PRS repetitions of a DL PRS resource
* Intra-slot Rx hopping of the DL PRS is supported by implementation (e.g. DL PRS can be configured with comb size 2 and symbol number 12 in a slot. Then symbols {3,4} are a repetition of symbols {1,2} and naturally intra-slot hopping can be supported).
 |
| SONY | Support |
| mtk | 1, we would consider it is up to RAN4. Because if a UE has short RF switch time, the UE could also hop within a resource with large symbol number, for example when comb-4 with 12 symbols being configured. UE could measure in the first 4 symbols, hop in second 4 symbols and further measure in last 4 symbols. |
| Nokia/NSB | Hard to agree on the main bullet prior to RAN4 decision. Might be better to directly discuss what enhancements are really needed (i.e., details of the FFS points).  |
| Futurewei1 | It is too early to discuss the details of DL PRS repetition without knowing configuration parameters such as the switching time from one hop to another.  |
| Qualcomm | We think that the hopping could happen within a single repetition also (e.g. 12-symbol PRS pattern with comb-4, there are 3 fully-staggered patterns. A UE could measure the first and the last with a retune in between. It may be related to the RAN4’s agreement on the retuning time. Overall, we agree with ZTE’s proposal.  |
| CMCC | We think that it should be up to RAN4, at least we should wait for the LS reply from RAN4. |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | We understand the intention, but it would be good to wait for the progress in RAN4 before we can make a decision on this.  |
| Ericsson | We agree with QC and ZTE that hopping could happen within a single repetition with 12 symbol PRS. However, this would limit the deployment of PRS to comb 2 or comb 4. since 1-symbol PRS are being introduced, we think we could leverage on this to also support it for larger comb sizes.  |
| Apple | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

It seems many company tend to agree with the proposal but also prefer to wait for confirmation of the retuning time from RAN4 to address the proposal. Thus we suggest to pause the proposal for now and wait for a reply LS from RAN4.

## Partial staggering / number of symbols restrictions [LOW]

### Background

[16] propose to consider partially staggered PRS patterns, and [12] to introduce restriction on the number of PRS symbol length.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [12] | ***Proposal 4: Support only longer PRS symbol lengths for RedCap devices {6,12} and FFS support PRS symbol lengths of {2, 4}.*** |
| [16] | Proposal 3 Support partially staggered PRS patterns. |

### Round 1

Regarding support of partial staggering, TEI18 introduces the support of 1-symbol PRS. From the FL perspective, there does not seem to be any restriction to the 1-symbol PRS to non-redcap UEs. therefore, if the feature is signalled as supported by a redcap UE, it could potentially be used.

Regarding restriction on the symbol length, it may not be required to be specified, as it could symbol stem from the constraints on retuning time.

It is therefore proposed to not further discuss these issues. Please leave a comment in the table below if needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Use of one or more MGs for reception of DL PRS with rx hopping, processing capability [closed]

### Background

During RAN1#112, we discussed the use of measurement gaps (MGs) for DL PRS Rx hopping. Use of a single or several gaps in the Rx hopping procedure was left FFS:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**For RedCap UEs, support at least measurements on DL PRS with Rx frequency hopping using a measurement gap* FFS: details on RedCap UE processing capabilities for DL PRS with Rx frequency hopping and MG
* FFS: the use of a single or multiple instances of a MGs
* FFS: the use of PPW
 |

Single-MG solutions are supported by [5,6,8,13,17,19]

Multiple-MG is mentioned to be at least considered in [17][15][18]

In [3], it is propose to request feedback from RAN4 on the issue of using one or multiple MGs during FH.

Defining a new UE DL PRS Rx processing capability is discussed in [8,15,18] .

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [6] | Proposal 7: For RedCap UE positioning with Rx frequency hopping, support a single instance of a MG. |
| [8] | Proposal 8: For RedCap UE positioning, only support the use of a single instance of MG for DL PRS with Rx frequency hopping.Proposal 6: Support the RedCap UE’s processing time for Rx frequency hopping as part of the UE capability. |
| [13] | Proposal 2: To ensure positioning performance, a single MG instance is used for PRS measurement of all hops. |
| [19] | Proposal 1: * RAN1 should support a single instance of a MG for DL PRS FH.
 |
| [22] | Proposal 2-1: The reception frequency hopping across gap instances for the combination to acquire a larger measurement BW is not considered. If it is supported, there should be a signaling to indicate to NWProposal 2-2: Support the reception frequency hopping in each gap instance for the combination to acquire a larger measurement BW |
| [17] | Proposal 4: Support a MG-based DL-PRS frequency hopping approach in which the UE is expected to perform up to N Rx Retunings during a single MG instance in order to measure multiple frequency parts of a single PRS resource, with N = [4]. * FFS: the case of hopping across multiple instances of a MG
 |
| [1] | Proposal 1: For RedCap UE with DL PRS Rx hopping, RAN1 to discuss measurement gap length. |
| [3] | Proposal 4: • For MG-based Rx frequency hopping, send an LS to RAN4 to determine one of the following methods and study detailed MG design- One MG instance for multiple hops- One MG instance for one hopProposal 5: • For MG-based PRS Rx frequency hopping, detailed Rx hopping behavior within MG depends on RRM requirement, which is up to RAN4. |
| [5] | Proposal 4: UE can only apply a single instance of a measurement gap to complete one PRS frequency hopping reception. |
| [18] | Proposal 6: Whether all the frequency hops are included in a single measurement gap or multiple measurement gaps, is determined by the measurement gap configuration and the PRS processing capability of RedCap UE. |
| [15] | Proposal 2: Additional design details DL PRS Rx Hopping are as follows:* Time domain repetition may have to account for the hops across the bandwidth as a single repetition is over multiple hops.
* The muting pattern may either mute a single hop or may mute a hop set.
* The measurement gap may have to accommodate the duration of the hop set. This may be accommodated by a single large MG or multiple instances of a MG.
* Gapless measurements based on the PRS Processing Window (PPW) should be lower priority.

Proposal 4: A reply from the RAN4 LS is needed to update the existing sets of values for the UE DL PRS processing capability.  |

### Round 1

There is a majority support for the support of a single gap covering the whole DL PRS Rx FH reception. However, it seems appropriate to request further feedback from RAN4 on the feasibility of a single gap before committing to a single gap to be used, since measurement gaps are within RAN4 specifications.

Therefore, we propose to start the discussion with the proposal to request RAN4 to consider single or multiple measurement gaps.

Regarding the processing capability for gap-based measurements, we will probably discuss extensively the issue during the UE feature discussion. A proposal to declare a separate feature for PRS processing with Rx FH is given below.

**Proposal 2.3a-1: For DL PRS Rx hopping using measurement gap(s), send an LS to RAN4 requesting the following**

* **For a given DL PRS with hopping, whether a single measurement gap or multiple measurement gaps may be configured configured to overlap with at least 1 DL PRS hopping sequence**

**Proposal 2.3b-1: For DL PRS Rx hopping using measurement gap(s), DL PRS processing for Rx frequency hopping is a UE capability**

* **FFS: details of the capability.**

Comments can be entered in the tables below:

**Proposal 2.3a-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Since the majority supports a single gap covering the whole DL PRS Rx FH reception, we prefer to try a single gap for the consensus. And we can inform the conclusion to RAN4 for confirmation.Therefore, we prefer the following updated proposal:**Updated Proposal 2.3a-1: For DL PRS Rx hopping using measurement gap(s), ~~send an LS to RAN4 requesting the following~~*** **For a given DL PRS with hopping, ~~whether~~ a single measurement gap ~~or multiple measurement gaps may~~ should be configured ~~configured~~ to overlap with at least 1 DL PRS hopping sequence**
* **Send an LS to RAN4 to check if there is any issue to support the above enhancement.**
 |
| vivo | Okay with FL proposal, but remove ”configured to overlap ” after may be configured in the sub-bullet |
| InterDigital | We suggest to change “DL PRS with hopping” => “DL PRS Rx hopping“. If the intention of “DL PRS hopping sequence” is “DL PRS RX hopping sequence”, there is a need to define what an Rx hopping sequence is. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No need for the LS. This is exactly RAN4 RRM scope. |
| NEC | We think RAN4 may cannot determine it directly, because it should consider the switching gap length, number of hops, measurement gap length, PRS processing capability simultaneously.  |
| ZTE | In our understanding, as long as the length of a MG instance is long enough, a single MG instance can cover all the DL PRS hops.  |
| mtk | We also don't consider to send LS |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Huawei. We can also wait for RAN4 to determine switching times prior to decided if single MG can be supported.  |
| Futurewei1 | This depends on the dwell time of “1 DL PRS hopping sequence”, the number of hops, and switching time from one hop to another.  |
| Qualcomm | We support CATT’s update.  |
| CMCC | It should be up to RAN4. |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | The need to send LS to RAN4 is not clear. Share similar view as HW.  |
| Ericsson | We think this should be driven by RAN4.  |

 **Proposal 2.3b-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support |
|  Huawei, HiSilicon | No need to discuss it in RAN1. Any capability pertaining to DL PRS processing should be decided by RAN4 RRM. |
| NEC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| SONY | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Huawei.  |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We Support the proposal  |
| Intel | Share similar view as HW |
| Apple | support |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

Views on Proposal 2.3a-1 are mostly for leaving the issue to RAN4. For Proposal 2.3b-1, similarly half of the comments show we can probably also wait on RAN4. The discussion is thus closed for this meeting.

## Gap-less measurements / PPW for DL PRS with frequency hopping [HIGH]

### Background

Support of PPW with PRS Rx hopping was discussed during the previous meeting, and further input are given in the contributions.

In [6,9, 10,14,17], it is proposed to support PPW to received the PRS with Rx hopping.

In [2,3,5,7, 8,11,13,15,16,19,20,22], PPW is not supported.

In[3], it is proposed to consider the PPW when frequency hopping is not used.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [14] | Proposal 2: Support PRS processing window to receive PRS via Rx hopping |
| [6] | Proposal 8: For RedCap UE positioning with DL Rx frequency hopping, support the use of PPW, e.g., one/multiple PPW based BWP frequency retuning method. |
| [8] | Proposal 7: Down-prioritize the frequency hopping operation within a PRS Processing Window (PPW) for RedCap UE. |
| [10] | Proposal 1: PPW only with PRS as higher priority could to be used for PRS Rx FH. |
| [13] | Proposal 3: De-prioritize PPW for RedCap UE with PRS frequency hopping measurement. |
| [11] | Proposal 1: For RedCap UEs, the PPW-based DL PRS measurement with Rx frequency hopping should be treated as low priority. |
| [19] | Proposal 2: * RAN1 may not need to support PPW with FH.
 |
| [22] | Proposal 2-4: The use of PPW for positioning measurements for RedCap UEs is not considered |
| [20] | Proposal 1: Deprioritize DL-PRS frequency hopping outside MG. |
| [17] | Proposal 5: Support Rx frequency hopping for MG-less PRS processing using the following principle as a starting point: * A UE may perform Rx frequency hopping within a PPW instance under the condition that the required retune time before and after each hop is taken into account in the specified PRS prioritization/collision rules.
	+ E.g. If the retune time before or after a low-priority PRS hop collides with a high-priority channel, then the UE does not perform the Rx frequency hopping.
* FFS: Details including relation to the Rx frequency hopping with the PPW types
 |
| [3] | Proposal 6: • For PRS Rx frequency hopping, PPW-based method is not supported.Proposal 9• For RedCap positioning without frequency hopping, the following aspects related to PPW should be further considered.- The type of PPW can be limited to Type 1A and Type 2.- The collision rules between PPW and UL transmission for a half-duplex UE (HD-UE) in FDD. |
| [5] | Proposal 3: Only measurement gap based measurement for DL PRS frequency hopping should be considered. |
| [9] | Proposal 3: Unless a critical issue is identified, RAN1 should support DL PRS frequency hopping outside MG for RedCap UE.Proposal 4: RAN1 should specify solutions to effectively support DL PRS frequency hopping within PPW configurations. |
| [7] | Proposal 2* For DL PRS with Rx frequency hopping for RedCap UEs, only MG based measurement is supported.
 |
| [15] | Proposal 2: Additional design details DL PRS Rx Hopping are as follows:* Time domain repetition may have to account for the hops across the bandwidth as a single repetition is over multiple hops.
* The muting pattern may either mute a single hop or may mute a hop set.
* The measurement gap may have to accommodate the duration of the hop set. This may be accommodated by a single large MG or multiple instances of a MG.
* Gapless measurements based on the PRS Processing Window (PPW) should be lower priority.
 |
| [2] | Proposal 1: Do not further consider MG-less/PPW-based scheme for PRS Rx frequency hopping for the target UE. |
| [16] | Proposal 5 PPW is not supported with DL PRS Rx hopping. |

### Round 1

Based on the majority, we propose to downprioritize the support of PPW. Regarding the support of PPW for PRS without Rx hopping as proposed in [3], from the FL perspective, this should be possible already if a redcap UE reports the rel17 feature.

**Proposal 2.4-1: (for conclusion) for RedCap UEs, measurements on DL PRS with frequency hopping using PPW (gapless measurements) are not supported.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 2.4-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Do not support.We prefer to further discuss DL PRS with frequency hopping using PPW, in order to increase the complexity of configuration of DL PRS with frequency hopping. In PPW, the priority of different signals can be defined and configured, which is a significant advantage of PPW compared with MG. |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Our preference is to support the PPW. Since a priority level can be associated with PRS, a PPW for Rx hopping is beneficial so the UE can prioritize between making measurements of PRS and processing of other DL channels. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| NEC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| SONY | Support |
| mtk | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support. For the companies that do not want to support DL FH with the PPW can they explain the technical concern? It is really weird for us to say that a Rel-17 feature can’t be implemented with RedCap devices which want to support high accuracy positioning at this stage already.  |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Intel | Support |
| Ericsson | Support. In our understanding, only one of the hop of the DL PRS will correspond to the active BWP. That means that the UE would need to receive data together with DL PRS and in the next slot or so, switch outside the active BWP. If multiple PRSs are received, this mean the UE is maintaining the active BWP for one hop for each PRS. Thus we would configure the PPW for only 1 slot in every hop, and expect the scheduler to work around the hopping sequence to schedule data and receive harq feedback. This sounds overcomplicated for the potential benefits.  |
| Apple | Okay |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

A majority of the comments support the proposal, however some companies still see some merits to support PPW with frequency hopping.

From the FL perspective, more discussion seems needed, and perhaps online time will benefit the discussion.

### Round 2

Let’s re-open the comments for the proposal, to see if a compromise can be reached. One possibility was brought up by Qualcomm, to support part of the PPW features, e.g. one of the supported types.

**Question 2.4-1: which part of the PPW framework (i.e. which capability type and which prioritization option) should be supported for positioning of redcap UEs?**

**Proposal 2.4-1/ question 2.4-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | Do not support. For PRS Rx frequency hopping, it is sufficient to only apply MG-based method, no need to extend to PPW-based method. PPW was introduced for low-latency purpose. If the DL PRS is inside the active DL BWP and has the same numerology as the active DL BWP, PPW can be applied without additional procedures of MG request and configuration, so that physical layer latency is reduced. But when Rx frequency hopping is needed, the DL PRS is always outside the active BWP, compared with MG-based method, we don’t find enough benefit for PPW-based method.In addition, support of PPW assumes the UE can process data and PRS in the window, but when Rx frequency hopping is needed, the DL PRS is always outside the active BWP, and the DL and UL signal can not be processed in the case. |
| LGE | Support the proposal 2.4-1 in round 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can be flexible with PPW-based if the follow-up understanding is confirmed from proponents (basically it should be a feature combination without enhancement)* No additional change or restriction on the use of PPW beyond modification of the condition with respect to the active BWP is introduced.
* The current PPW length is used without considering enhancement due to RF retuning time.
* The current (N,T)/(N2,T2) candidate values are used without introducing new values or new methods of calculating the PRS duration.
* Whether to define RAN4 requirement is up to RAN4.
 |
| Samsung | As we suggested in tdoc, at least the PPW with PRS as high priority should be considered which has similar effect as MG. For PPW with PRS as not high prioirty, it may not have much use since the PRS (hops) could easily dropped to make the measurement less useful. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the bullets from Huawei. We feel that minimal changes would be needed to ensure that PPW can work. We support at least Type 1A and Type 2.  |
| Intel | Given that UE needs to perform RF returning for Rx frequency hopping, the benefit of considering PPW for PRS measurement is not clear. The key objective for RedCap positioning is to enable higher accuracy and not optimzie for positioing latancy. Thus, consideration of PPW with FH-based operation is not necessary for RedCap UEs. Note that RedCap UE can operate using PPW when not using FH based on Rel-17 specs. Moerever, during the last meeting, we agreed to decouple the BWP switching for DL PRS Rx frequency hopping and sent LS to RAN4. However, if we reuse the current mechanism for PPW, BWP switching is clearly involved, which seems contradiactory to the previous aggreement.  |
| Qualcomm | We generally agree with Huawei’s understanding. We just noticed that:* Especially for Type 1A, and given the available legnths of PPW windows, when a PRS is higehr priority than other channels, the UE already drops all the other channels in both NR and LTE. So, what does it preclude the UE in the current spec, to retune and get measurements on other hops?
* a rel-17 redcap UE supporting type 1A PPW could already do it (just that, for the PPW-based processing, the requirements will be based on 20 MHz since RAN4 would not add new requirements for PPW-based processing, likely only for MG-based processing).

Having said the above, if indeed we are still strong minority, we are OK to not spend more time on it and just proceed with MG-based processing.  |
| ZTE | Generally, our first preference is to support only MG-based hopping. What we are really opposed to is using BWP switching to realize PPW-based hopping because PPW is configured within active BWP. However, as clarified by Qualcomm, we can also be flexible at least for PPW Type 1A. Type 1A refers to the determination of prioritization between DL PRS and other DL signals/channels in all OFDM symbols within the PRS processing window. The DL signals.channels from all DL CCs (per UE) are affected across LTE and NR.Technically we are fine to further discuss this feature if the understanding raised by Huawei can be confirmed.  |
| mtk | Don't support PPW based. If PRS has higher priority, MG based is good enough |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer the proposal 2.4-1 in round 1. In order to support PPW-based positioning with frequency hopping, BWP swiching is required, which prevents low latency positioning. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 2.4-1 in Round 1.  |
| SONY | We dont support. We did not evaluate this aspect during the study item phase.It would be better to focus on MG-based.  |
| Apple | We prefer to support MG-based only. |
| Ericsson | We do not support and prefer to stick to MG based. Even with type 1A, how do the processing capability translate to the PRS with Rx hopping. Our understanding is that processing N/N2 PRS according to (N,T) or (N2,T2) is not the same as processing N/N2 PRSs with hopping and phase compensation.  |
| Nokia/NSB | It is interesting from our side that many companies that are opposed to PPW are okay with studying UL dropping in a window dedicated for SRS. How are these two things fundamentally different? To be clear we support having an UL time window where UE should just transmit SRS FH. We just feel that DL should be handled similarly. As pointed out by QC and Huawei we are fine to add some restrictions (e.g., which PPW type).  |

### Round 3

There is still a majority of companies that do not want to support the PPW framework with frequency hopping. However, 3 companies have voiced that they are willing to at least investigate whether PPW could be supported “as is”. If the framework (or at least some of it) can be supported without further spec impact, we should obviously not forbid UEs to signal they support an existing rel17 feature. As a way forward, I would like to ask if a compromise could be reached before the end of the meeting and what part of PPW could be agreed, or if we need to push the issue back to the next meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  vivo | Even for Type 1-A PPW, the half-duplex issue still be further considered for Redcap UE. That means we need to further consider the collision with UL and retuning time for half-duplex Redcap UE. It is different from Rel-17 that UE can be flexibly transmitted UL in PPW. So we still prefer to drop the discussion of FH within PPW. |
| LGE | Same with vivo’s view. |
| mtk | Yes, same view as vivo. Also, PPW in Rel-17 has been confined within active BWP as compromise |
| CATT | We can live with Type 1A PPW as the way forward. |
| InterDigital | We are also ok to limit the scope to Type 1A PPW. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are also okay to limit the scope to Type 1A.  |
| Intel | We share similar view as Vivo.  |

### Status before GTW (Wednesday, week2)

The last GTW is a come-back session and we cannot expect to have a lot of online time to resolve the issue. Clearly, the support of PPW is still controversial, and not stable enough for the GTW come-back session. Therefore, we suggest to close the issue for this meeting.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## PRS reception for HD-FDD (paused)

### Background

 In [6,3,7], the issue of collision with HD FDD are discussed for both the DL PRS and UL SRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [6] | Proposal 3: For RedCap UEs positioning in HD-FDD, collision handling rules for UL SRS-Pos transmission and DL reception should be defined.Proposal 10: For RedCap UEs positioning in HD-FDD, collision handling rules for DL PRS and other UL signals/channels within PPW should be defined, e.g., by the following two methods.* Method 1: Reuse collision handling rule for DL PRS and other DL signals/channels in PPW in Rel-17, with new definition of PPW types (Type 3/4).
* Method 2: Reuse the collision handling rule for other DL signals/channels and UL signals/channels for RedCap UE in HD-FDD.
 |
| [3] | Proposal 9* For RedCap positioning without frequency hopping, the following aspects related to PPW should be further considered.
* The type of PPW can be limited to Type 1A and Type 2.
* The collision rules between PPW and UL transmission for a half-duplex UE (HD-UE) in FDD.
 |
| [7] | Proposal 6• For HD-FDD RedCap UE, collision handling between DL PRS and UL channels/signals within a configured positioning processing window outside the measurement gap needs to be addressed. |

### Round 1

Regarding the collision of DL PRS with UL signals in HD-FDD redcap UEs, we propose to wait on the decision to support the PPW before introducing further proposals on collision rules. For the UL SRS, the discussion is grouped with the other collision rules discussion in section 4.3.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Assistance data for PRS with Rx hopping [LOW]

### Background

 In [13], it is proposed to consider sending the number of hops, overlap and total bandwidth between hops to the UE as assistance data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [13] | Proposal 5: For PRS reception with hopping, one or more of the following parameters in assistance data should also be introduced to facilitate UE’s PRS measurement.* + - * Number of hops
			* Number of overlapped RB between hops
			* Total bandwidth of all hops
 |

### Round 1

Since only 1 company has raised each of the issues above, let’s first collect some comments on the proposals to see the level of support.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| InterDigital | Does this discussion relate to the definition of an Rx hopping sequence (AI 3.3)? |

## On demand DL PRS with hopping [LOW]

### Background

 In [6,13], the support of on-demand PRS is proposed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [6] | Proposal 11: Support a RedCap UE to use an on-demand method to provide the recommended PPW-related configuration information to the network (serving gNB/LMF). |
| [13] | Proposal 6: For on-demand PRS, a RedCap UE can request a larger bandwidth that the UE supports, which implies PRS frequency hopping measurement is requested. |

### Round 1

Since only 2 companies has raised each of the issues above, let’s first collect some comments on the proposals to see the level of support.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | Support a RedCap UE to use an on-demand method to provide the recommended PPW-related configuration information to the network (serving gNB/LMF). |

## Muting patterns for DL PRS with FH [LOW]

### Background

In [18, 15] it is proposed to study further enhancements for the muting framework to support DL PRS with FH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [18] | Proposal 7: For NR RedCap UEs, study the muting mechanism for frequency hopping sub-bands.Proposal 8: For NR RedCap UEs, separate muting options configured for each hop is slightly preferred due to the flexibility on resource allocation. |
| [15] | Proposal 2: Additional design details DL PRS Rx Hopping are as follows:* Time domain repetition may have to account for the hops across the bandwidth as a single repetition is over multiple hops.
* The muting pattern may either mute a single hop or may mute a hop set.
* The measurement gap may have to accommodate the duration of the hop set. This may be accommodated by a single large MG or multiple instances of a MG.
* Gapless measurements based on the PRS Processing Window (PPW) should be lower priority.
 |

### Round 1

Muting was not discussed during the SI phase, and no recommendation to extend the muting framework was captured. Therefore, we propose to start the discussion with checking the support for the proposals above.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| NEC | Muting pattern by considering hop configuration is beneficial for spectral efficiency. |

##  Impact of DL PRS with FH on RACH [LOW]

### Background

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [10] | Proposal 2: RAN1 to study the impact of RACH related signal to the PRS Rx reception FH. |

### Round 1

Since only 1 company has raised each of the issues above, let’s first collect some comments on the proposals to see the level of support.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

# UL-SRS Frequency Hopping

## SRS Hopping configuration [Closed]

### Background

 During RAN1#112, we agreed to support SRS Tx hopping, with details to be worked out on how to configure it:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**For RedCap UEs, support SRS for positioning frequency hopping by * Using a configuration separate from the existing BWP configuration
	+ FFS: hopping is configured within a SRS resource or across SRS resources
 |

In[1,2,6,7,9,15,16,17,19], it is propose to implement SRS Tx hopping within a UL SRS resource

In[3,4,5,13,15], companies instead propose to use hopping across resources

* [4] also mentions hopping across BWPs.

In [22], hopping is across SRS resource sets, and each resource correspond to a different beam.

In [20], a separate configuration from the hannels SRS-pos configuration is proposed. [2] also proposes to consider the MIMO SRS.

Regarding the use of BWPs to configure hopping, [11] proposes to consider either a single BWP broader than the active BWP maximum size for redcap UE, or a set of BWPs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [6] | **Proposal 1: For positioning for RedCap UEs with UL SRS-Pos Tx Hopping, the UE hops within a UL SRS-Pos resource.** |
| [13] | Proposal 7: For RedCap UE, support frequency hopping across SRS resources. |
| [11] | Proposal 3: For RedCap UEs, consider the following enhancement on BWP configuration to support SRS for positioning frequency hopping:• Alt. 1: Define a virtual UL BWP which is outside of RedCap UE active BWP limitation;• Alt. 2: Define a BWP set consisting of multiple BWPs. The total number of BWP and BWP set for a UE is up to 4.Proposal 4: For RedCap UEs, consider the following enhancements on SRS for positioning configuration to support frequency hopping:• Alt. 1: Frequency hopping is configured for a given SRS for positioning resource.• Alt. 2: Frequency hopping is configured for a given SRS for positioning resource set.• Alt. 3: Frequency hopping is configured across multiple SRS for positioning resource sets. |
| [19] | Proposal 5: • LS reply from RAN4 regarding the switching time values should be taken into account, and considering that RAN1 agreed DL PRS Rx hopping within a DL PRS resource at the last meeting, RAN1 should discuss further to support UL SRS hopping within a SRS resource depending on the switching time values. |
| [22] | **Proposal 3-7**: It is feasible to have a particular SRS resource set for hopping purpose in which each resource has the associated beam direction, and each resource could be associated with several different starting RB locations in different time instances. The resource transmitting in different starting RB locations has the same transmission power and the same transmission direction |
| [20] | Proposal 4: As parameter configuration method for determining the frequency hop of the SRS for positioning, the following alternatives can be considered.* Alt. 1) Separately configured with SRS-Pos configuration.
* Alt. 2) Jointly configured with SRS-Pos configuration.

Proposal 5: The intra-slot + inter-slot SRS-pos Tx hopping mechanism should be considered. |
| [17] | **Proposal 6: For SRS for Positioning frequency hopping:*** **Define SRS for positioning associated with a CC (and not an active BWP) with each own numerology and bandwidth (e.g. similar to the SRS for Positioning of Rel-17 RRC inactive feature).**
* **Introduce a transmission/switching/retune gap before and after a transmission of such an SRS resource.**
 |
| [1] | **Proposal 2: For RedCap UE Tx frequency hopping is configured within one SRS resource, RAN1 should clarify which one or both of the following possible alternatives:****Alt 1: One SRS resource spanning the instantaneous bandwidth****Alt 2: One SRS resource spanning the total frequency hopping bandwidth** |
| [3] | **Proposal 7:** **• SRS for positioning frequency hopping configured across SRS resources is supported, including the following.****- Hopping is configured across multiple SRS resource set/resource lists****- Each SRS resource set/resource list is associated with a hop, and each hop includes a SRS resource set/resource list.****- Each SRS resource set/resource list is configured with a ‘virtual BWP’, similar to the ‘BWP configuration’ of SRS outside initial BWP in RRC\_INACTIVE** |
| [4] | **Proposal 3: For RedCap UEs positioning, support the SRS frequency hopping across multiple BWPs with multiple SRS resources.**  |
| [5] | ***Proposal 5: SRS hopping between SRS resources should be supported.*** |
| [9] | **Proposal 5:** RAN1 should support SRS for positioning frequency hopping within an SRS resource, where the SRS resource configuration is separate from the existing UL BWP configuration. **Proposal 6**: When UE is FH within an SRS resource it should transmit part of the SRS resource/sequence (i.e., 1 SRS frequency hop) during one hop.  |
| [7] | **Proposal 3*** For SRS for positioning with frequency hopping for RedCap UEs,
* Frequency hopping is configured within an SRS resource.
* SRS resource set is configured within a carrier.
 |
| [15] | ***Proposal 3: To support SRS for positioning frequency hopping, the hopping configuration need to identify the number of hops, the bandwidth of each hop, and the amount of overlap between hops. The hopping can be configured within an SRS resource or across resources. Both cases require an update to the existing configuration***. |
| [2] | ***Proposal 3: Following Rel-17 Option 2 of SRS for positioning transmission in RRC\_INACTIVE, SRS transmission in a frequency hopping way outside the initial UL BWP is supported for RedCap UEs.******Proposal 4: Support SRS transmission outside the active UL BWP to support SRS Tx hopping based positioning of RedCap UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state.******Proposal 6: Study the enhancement of pos-SRS configuration to achieve SRS Tx frequency hopping within an SRS resource, e.g., introducing the frequency/time domain offset between adjacent hops, the number of hops*** ***for a single transmission occasion.******Proposal 7: Subject to UE capability, within a larger BWP with bandwidth beyond maximum RedCap UE bandwidth to achieve SRS Tx frequency hopping, MIMO SRS can also be configured.*** |
| [17] | Proposal 7: Study further at least the following two options for the SRS frequency hopping pattern:* Option 1: Use the current hopping formula of SRS as a starting point and update it such that there can be frequency domain overlap over 2 hops that are adjacent in frequency.
	+ Example of the update in the frequency-domain starting position $k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}$ :

$$k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}=\overbar{k}\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}+\sum\_{b=0}^{B\_{SRS}}(K\_{TC}M\_{sc,b}^{SRS}n\_{b} -M\_{overlap}⋅n\_{b}⋅\prod\_{b^{'}=b+1}^{B\_{SRS}}N\_{b^{'}})$$* Option 2: Use a staircase-like hopping formula with a parameter that controls the amount of overlap of frequency domain adjacent hops.
 |

###  Round 1

We can start the discussion using the majority support option, which is to configure the SRS Tx hopping within a resource, and in a separate configuration from the active BWP, similar to the SRS config in RRC inactive. For the details on how to configure the hopping pattern, see section 4.2 discussion:

**Proposal 3.1-1: for RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured separately from the SRS configuration in the active BWP, similarly to the SRS configuration for RRC\_INACTIVE**

* **SRS Tx hopping is configured within the SRS resource.**
* **FFS: details on how to configure the hopping pattern, e.g. modify the equation for legacy FH or define a new hopping formula**
* **FFS: support of inter or intra slot FH**
* **FFS: support of the MIMO SRS with SRS Tx frequency hopping for redcap UEs.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.1-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | We support the SRS Tx hopping is configured within the SRS resource. And how to configure the SRS Tx hopping had better to listed as FFS. Therefore, we prefer the following revision:**Updated Proposal 3.1-1: for RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured within the SRS resource. ~~separately from the SRS configuration in the active BWP, similarly to the SRS configuration for RRC\_INACTIVE~~*** **FFS :SRS Tx hopping is configured separately from the SRS configuration in the active BWP, similarly to the SRS configuration for RRC\_INACTIVE ~~within the SRS resource~~.**
* **FFS: details on how to configure the hopping pattern, e.g. modify the equation for legacy FH or define a new hopping formula**
* **FFS: support of inter or intra slot FH**
* **FFS: support of the MIMO SRS with SRS Tx frequency hopping for redcap UEs.**
 |
| vivo | OK with the main-bullet of FL proposal. However, we have concerns about the first sub-bullet for hopping configured within an SRS resource. Firstly, the concept of SRS Tx hopping is configured within the SRS resource is unclear. For example, different hops are different symbols of SRS resource, or different hop are different repetitions of SRS resources. Secondly, different from DL PRS, there is no repetition configuration in SRS resource configuration. So, if different hops are different symbols of SRS resource, SRS Tx hopping is configured within the SRS resource may require UE complete the hopping within a slot. And it may introduce the huge impaction for specification. But before the receiving the response of LS from RAN4, it is difficult to confirm the UE can complete the hopping within a resource in a slot. In addition, for SRS frequency hopping, either SRS hopping within an SRS resources or SRS hopping within SRS resource sets can work. So, for the issue, we prefer to list all the option and decide it based on RAN4 response in the next meeting |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal in principle. We don’t see a need to include “similarly to the SRS configuration for RRC\_INACTIVE” since we are not sure if there will be commonalities between SRS design for RRC\_INACTIVE and Tx frequency hopping. If the intention is to emphasize that a separate SRS config from the config in active BWP, “for RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured separately from the SRS configuration in the active BWP” is sufficient. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK in general. |
| ZTE | We agree with vivo’s understanding and we still prefer SRS Tx hopping configured across SRS resources.SRS hopping within one resource may have less flexibility since the current SRS configuration for each resource is only limited to one slot, and then the SRS hopping is limited to intra-slot hopping case only. |
| Mtk | It seems that both hopping within a resource, or hooping within a resource set work. To hop within a resource may limit the hopping within a slot.It seems to be more okay to hop within a resource set and it can be across consecutive slots |
| Nokia/NSB | What does the main bullet actually give us over the prior agreement? We already agreed to have a configuration separate from BWP configuration. So we don’t see the need to discuss that part at all here. The key is hopping in a resource or across resources. From our side we support hopping within a resource. |
| Futurewei1 | RAN1 should clarify the concept of SRS Tx hopping is configured within the SRS resource. Based on our understanding, there are multiple interpretations as follows:Alt 1: One SRS resource spanning the instantaneous bandwidthAlt 2: One SRS resource spanning the total frequency hopping bandwidthIt is too early to decide whether intra- or inter-slot, which depends on other configuration parameters such the number of hops, and switching time from one hop to another.  |
| CMCC | We are OK with the main bullet but think it is pre-mature to only say support of configuring SRS Tx hopping within a resource. Suggest to list all the options. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal in principle. We also prefer to configure SRS frequency hopping within an SRS resource. The update from CATT align with our view. For the last FFS: we do not think we need to discuss MIMO SRS in this AI. It is clearly out of scope. The use of MIMO SRS for the purpose of positioning has been motivated by its transparency to the UE. Introducing Tx FH for MIMO SRS for a RedCap UE would certainly violate that and thus, outside the scope of the WI. |
| Ericsson | Ok with CATT’s update. We do not think that it should be an issue to keep 1 SRS resource for positioning and hop over multiple slots.  |
| Apple | Fine with main bullet. |
| Qualcomm | * We dont agree on using „MIMO SRS“ for this purpose and it is not needed even as an FFS. It will not be transparent to the UE
* We dont see the need of „**, similarly to the SRS configuration for RRC\_INACTIVE**“

Then, generally OK.  |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with vivo. |
| OPPO | Sorry for the late input for Round 1. Actually we failed to find this high priority issue in Round 2, perhaps the discussion was by any good reason stopped. Regarding the Proposal 3.1-2 updated after the 1st GTW, we would like to be supportive. Our preference is on Alt.4, so we hope all these alternatives can be further accessed and discussed by the group.  |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

Several companies would prefer to list all the options. Many companies also support the proposal. Let’s try to progress in round 2 by listing the possible options.

**Proposal 3.1-2: for RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured:**

**Alt 1: within one SRS for positioning resource**

**Alt 2: across resources, within one SRS for positioning resource set**

**Alt 3: across resource sets, with all resources in a set corresponding to the same hop sub-bandwidth**

**Alt 4: across BWPs.**

### Round 2

The following agreement was reached during the GTW:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**For RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured (select one alternative):* Alt 1: within one SRS for positioning resource
* Alt 2: across resources, within one SRS for positioning resource set
* Alt 3: across resource sets, with all resources in a set corresponding to the same hop sub-bandwidth
 |

For the sake of progress, companies are encourage to continue the discussion in the table below regarding their preferred alternatives. If there is enough progress we could make further agreements during this meeting, otherwise, we will revisit the issue during the May meeting

Comments on preferred alternative in the agreement above can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | We prefer Alt.1. |
| vivo | We are open to further discuss 3 Alternatives. But regarding Alt 1, we need proponents to clarify the following questions.1. Considering inter-slot repetition is not supported for posSRS, so, whether to only support intra-slot hopping?
2. For intra-slot hopping (if confirmed by RAN4),
3. Based on current SRS pattern for a SRS resource, how to support FH for some full stagger pattern with large comb size, such as comb-8 with 8 symbols or 12 symbols?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| $$K\_{TC}$$ | $$k\_{offset}^{0}, …, k\_{offset}^{N\_{symb}^{SRS}-1}$$ |
| $$N\_{symb}^{SRS}=1$$ | $$N\_{symb}^{SRS}=2$$ | $$N\_{symb}^{SRS}=4$$ | $$N\_{symb}^{SRS}=8$$ | $$N\_{symb}^{SRS}=12$$ |
| 2 | 0 | 0,1 | 0,1,0,1 | - | - |
| 4 | - | 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 |
| 8 | - | - | 0, 4, 2, 6 | 0, 4, 2, 6, 1, 5, 3, 7 | 0, 4, 2, 6, 1, 5, 3, 7, 0, 4, 2, 6 |

1. How to support FH for SRS patterns without intra-slot repetition, such as patterns of (comb2, 2 symbols), (comb 4, 4 symbols)?
2. whether to support non-consecutive OFDM symbols for a SRS resource due to RF retuning time, for example, some symbols (e.g.,symbol 2, 4 , 6..) are used in RF retuning and doesn’t transmit signal when SRS is configured as (comb 8, 8 symbols) , or (comb 2, 12 symbols) pattern?
3. In our view, for SRS frequency hopping, either SRS hopping within an SRS resources or SRS hopping across SRS resource sets can work. But at least from the perspective of flexibility and spec impact, we have not found that SRS within a SRS resource has more advantage. Whether proponents of Alt 1 can further provide the advantage of Alt 1?
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer Alt.1. |
| LGE | We prefer Alt. 1Since UL SRS for MIMO frequency hopping and DL PRS frequency hopping are configured within a resource, SRS for positioning configuration within a resource seems natural as a start point in consideration of consistency with DL PRS.All 3 alternatives require new resource mapping rules. From our point of view, there is no difference in the FH structure that alternatives can express, but there can be a difference in flexibility of configuration or overhead. If different SRS resources are configured for each hop, Alt. 2 can be advantageous. However, if the resources of each hop only have a difference in time/frequency location, Alt. 1 has an advantage in reducing unnecessary overhead. Moreover, since Alt. 2 uses the SRS resource IDs, there may be restrictions on configurable SRS resources.Also regarding to vivo’s question 1, we would like to discuss supporting of inter or intra slot FH which was proposed as FFS in this proposal 3.1-1. |
| Ericsson | We prefer alt1. For the cases where the FH may exceed 1 slot (for example when coverage is an issue), we think extending FH to multi-slot could be done if measures to ensure phase continuity are taken (e.g. the UE can assume no other signals or channel will be transmitted between hops across slot).  |
| Apple | We prefer Alt 1. |
| Futurewei | It seems more than one alternative is feasible. We are open to discuss the technical merits of each alternative, in particular, configuration feasibility with respect to frequency hopping (intra- and inter-slot), etc. |
| Nokia/NSB | To FL, thank you for reopening the discussion.We prefer Alt 1. To vivo, we are not sure that larger comb size and symbol numbers is specific to Alt 1. Wouldn’t this also be true in the other alternatives? We are open to discuss any restriction. Anyways from our point of view we have already agreed to introduce a new configuration of SRS FH (hannelsg from BWP) so we have a lot of flexibility. For inter-slot and intra-slot repetition we think this can be further discussed based on RAN4 outcome on switching time. As we are anyways introducing a new configuration for SRS so we are not restricted by the current SRS repetition. From our side at least one major benefit of Alt 1 vs Alt 2/3 is that a single ZC can be configured across the hopping quite easily. This will clearly provided improved performance.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt.1.Reply to vivo, if we seek resort to inter-SRS resource frequency hopping, then I guess a lot of restrictions will anyway be applied to the multiple SRS resource configurations assuming they should be common on BW, number of symbols, comb values/offset.In addition, UE should also somehow be indicated that in order to transmit those resources, it needs to use the same Tx antenna.It becomes more complicated, if UE uses different Tx beams in FR2, meaning a subset of SRS resources are using the same Tx beams beam for the purpose of frequency hopping, while another subset of SRS resources are using another same Tx beams with frequency hopping, and the configuration itself requires a lot of discussion.Then we think the natural grouping using SRS resource for the implication of same SRS BW, same Tx antenna, the same spatial relation, should a good way of avoiding tedious discussion. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 1. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 1. For Alt. 1, it is much simpler and current framework for signalling SRS resource can be fully reused. For Alt. 3, existing configuration/triggering/activation mechanism may need to be updated.  |

### Status before second GTW (Friday, week1)

Since the vast majority of comment seem to support alt1 (hopping within a resource), it would be beneficial to capture one more agreement this meeting on the issue of SRS hopping configuration. Let’s try to bring it online:

**Proposal 3.1b-1**

**For RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured within one SRS for positioning resource**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | Thanks for the discussion of the issue, and okay to follow the majority view.  |
| LGE | Support the proposal.We also propose to further study the support of inter or intra slot FH which was proposed as FFS in this proposal. The details on how to configure the hopping pattern can be further discussed after we progress in the proposal 1.4-3. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal (Alt 1) and also Alt 2.  |
| Samsung  | ok |

### Conclusion for RAN1#112b-e

the following agreement was made regarding SRS for positioning Tx FH:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**For RedCap Ues, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured within one SRS for positioning resource. |

## Parameters to configure frequency hopping for SRS tx hopping [High]

### Background

Several contributions provided further details as to how to configure the hopping patterns for the SRS, using a combination of ovelap, time gap, number of hops or total target bandwidth. Note that there is a dependency on the high level configuration discussion in section 4.1, thus we should treat this issue once we progress in the issue in 4.1.

In [6,9], it is proposed to configure the overlap, starting PRB, time between hops and number of hops

In [7,15,13,20], the overlap is not configured and instead implied by configuration of the starting PRB and the hopping bandwidth for each hop.

 In [17], the overlap and hopping bandwidth are configured and the hopping pattern follows a FH equation.

In [6], is is also propose to configure the start and end of the FH.

In [16], it is propose to allow FH to be configured commonly to multiple resource sharing the same pattern, for the purpose of overhead reduction.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [6] | Proposal 2: UL Tx frequency hopping pattern information should include the following SRS-Pos resource configuration information:* In time domain:
	+ the start time of the frequency hopping pattern
	+ the end time of the frequency hopping pattern
	+ time gap between two consecutive hops (in unit of slot or OFDM symbol)
* In frequency domain:
	+ partial overlapping size(granularity: PRB or RE)
	+ starting PRB index per frequency hopping
	+ the number of frequency hopping N, N={1,2,…,N\_max}

FFS:N\_max |
| [13] | Proposal 8: For RedCap UE with SRS, introduce partial overlapping in frequency for adjacent hops.* The number of overlapping PRBs in adjacent hops is based on the bandwidth of each hop.
 |
| [21] | Proposal 2: For UE-assisted Redcap positioning, bandwidth overlap between the adjacent frequency hops should be supported.Proposal 4: For RedCap positioning, the overlap of bandwidth between the adjacent hops is X PRB. The possible values of X are 1,2,4,8 PRB. |
| [22] | Proposal 3-4: For the configuration for SRS transmission frequency hopping, it is up to NW to determine whether there is partial overlapping in frequency domain, or the overlapping RB number between hops |
| [20] | Proposal 2: Following parameters should be included in SRS-pos frequency hopping configuration* Number of hops, bandwidth of each hop, switching gap

Proposal 3: For configuration of frequency hopping for SRS-Pos, the followings can be considered:* Alt. 1) based on the frequency hopping principles for SRS-MIMO resource configuration
* Alt. 2) new frequency hopping configuration dedicated for the SRS-pos resource configuration

Proposal 6: For SRS for positioning frequency hopping configuration mechanism, following should be specified:* Switching mechanism for SRS-pos frequency hopping configuration
* Configuration of overlap size

Proposal 9: Support both of partially overlapped frequency hopping structure and non-overlapped one. |
| [17] | **Proposal 1: Support DL-PRS Rx frequency hopping and SRS for Positioning frequency hopping with overlapping tones.*** **A UE cannot perform coherent DL-PRS processing or coherent SRS transmissions without overlapped hopping.**

**Proposal 3: Support in the specification multiple overlap options between 2 frequency-adjacent hops with a minimum value of 1 PRB.**  Proposal 7: Study further at least the following two options for the SRS frequency hopping pattern:* Option 1: Use the current hopping formula of SRS as a starting point and update it such that there can be frequency domain overlap over 2 hops that are adjacent in frequency.
	+ Example of the update in the frequency-domain starting position $k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}$ :

$$k\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}=\overbar{k}\_{0}^{(p\_{i})}+\sum\_{b=0}^{B\_{SRS}}(K\_{TC}M\_{sc,b}^{SRS}n\_{b} -M\_{overlap}⋅n\_{b}⋅\prod\_{b^{'}=b+1}^{B\_{SRS}}N\_{b^{'}})$$Option 2: Use a staircase-like hopping formula with a parameter that controls the amount of overlap of frequency domain adjacent hops. |
| [1] | **Proposal 3: For RedCap UE Tx frequency hopping, RAN1 to discuss instantaneous SRS bandwidth configurations per hop.**  |
| [3] | * ***For the sizes of overlapping bandwidth for different hops, the balance between phase error compensation performance and bandwidth span of frequency hopping should be considered.***
* ***A size smaller than 8 PRBs can be considered***
 |
| [9] | Proposal 7: For the SRS frequency hopping, the SRS configuration independent with the existing UL BWP supports at least with the following configuration parameters * Starting RB index and the number of RBs of the SRS resource,
* Starting slot, the number of slots and/or the number of symbols
* Periodicity and offset
* SRS sequence ID
* Number of frequency hops,
* Gap time between frequency hops,
* Number of RBs overlapped between frequency hops

Proposal 9: RAN1 should discuss the detailed feature to support frequency hopping while waiting for RAN4 input. |
| [7] | **Proposal 4*** For SRS for positioning with frequency hopping for RedCap UEs,
* Starting PRB, size of subband for each hop and switching period between adjacent hops are configured within an SRS resource.
* Periodic, semi-persistent and aperiodic SRS transmission are supported.
 |
| [15] | ***Proposal 3: To support SRS for positioning frequency hopping, the hopping configuration need to identify the number of hops, the bandwidth of each hop, and the amount of overlap between hops. The hopping can be configured within an SRS resource or across resources. Both cases require an update to the existing configuration***. |
| [2] | ***Proposal 5: To achieve SRS Tx frequency hopping for RedCap UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE or RRC\_CONNECTED state, the configuration includes frequency location and bandwidth, SCS, and CP length for a larger BWP containing the frequency resources for all hops.*** ***Proposal 8: The enhancements of pos-SRS configuration should be supported to enable partial overlaps between hops for RedCap UEs.*** |
| [16] | * ***Proposal 9 SRS for positioning Tx bandwidth hopping is supported for RedCap UEs, by extending the SRS configuration with at least***
* ***i. The total BW to be covered over all hops***
* ***ii. The gap (in symbols) between two adjacent hops***
* ***iii. The overlap between two adjacent hops in frequency domain***
* ***1. FFS: whether the overlap is common for all hops or specific for each hop.***
* ***Proposal 10 A new repetition number can be introduced to indicate the number of SRS frequency hopping where each hop has one symbol in one SRS frequency hopping, or to indicate the number of symbols in one SRS hop, if partially overlapped SRS frequency hopping is configured.***
* ***Proposal 11 The frequency hopping configuration parameters can be configured both at resource set level and/or resource level. If frequency hopping is configured in both level for one or more of the FH parameters, the configured parameter(s) at the resource level overrides the resource set configuration for these parameters.***
 |

### Round 1

 Since there is a need to clarify how the hopping is configured first in section 4.1, the discussion on the issues of parameters may need to be delayed, hence it is seen as medium priority. The proposal below captures the majority view that a at least time between hops, hop bandwidth can be part of the configuration. Regarding configuring the overlap or the starting PRB for each hop, we need further discussion.

**Proposal 3.2a-1: for the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of SRS Tx positioning includes:**

* **The number of hops**
* **The hop bandwidth**
* **The time hannel hops**
* **FFS: overhead reduction for multiple SRS transmissions with the same parameters.**

**Proposal 3.2b-1 For the overlap configuration of SRS Tx hopping:**

* + **Alt1: include the starting PRB for each hop**
	+ **Alt2: include the starting PRB for the first hop and a parameter for the configured overlap**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.2a-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | This proposal depends on the discussion of Proposal 4.1.2. If hopping is configured across SRS resources, different parameters may be configured. So, we prefer to modify the main bullet as follows**Proposal 3.2a-1: for the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of SRS Tx positioning may include~~s~~ one or more parameter as following:*** **Hop ID**
* **The number of hops**
* **The hop bandwidth**
* **The time between hops**
* **FFS: overhead reduction for multiple SRS transmissions with the same parameters.**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| NEC | Support in general. We think overlap should be included as one of the parameters too. |
| ZTE | Ok in general. |
| CMCC | It should wait for the progress on Proposal 3.1-1 |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | Prefer to wait until hannelsg in 4.1 is sorted.  |
| Apple | Fine with proposal |
| Qualcomm | Not sure if „time between the hops“ will be explicitly needed as a hannelsgn. If we have that each hop is „X symbols“ of a resource, and RAN4 defines the time gap needed, then we dont see the need to have the „time between the hops“.  |
| Spreadtrum | We also think that it should wait for the progress on Proposal 3.1-1. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| LGE | We have a similar view with Qualcomm.We prefer to discuss on the time between hops as FFS regarding to cases of intra-slot or inter-slot hopping. |

 **Proposal 3.2b-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| vivo | This proposal depends on the discussion of Proposal 4.1.2. So, we prefer to more general option for SRS Tx hopping. In addition, the starting PRB may be configured for first hop by the frequency location of virtual BWP, or Nshift in SRS for MIMO**Proposal 3.2b-1 For the overlap configuration of SRS Tx hopping, it may include one or both options as following:*** + **The starting PRB for hop(s)**
		- **FFS: first hop or each hop**
	+ **The overlap bandwidth**

**Note: This doesn’t mean the new parameter will be introduced** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.2 |
| NEC | Support. And we prefer the Alt2 slightly. |
| ZTE | Alt. 1. |
| Mtk | We slightly prefer Alt.1, because it could control the hopping being ascending or descending |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Alt. 2  |
| Ericsson | Prefer to wait until hannelsg in 4.1 is sorted.  |
| Apple | Alt 2 |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2 |
| CATT | OK with the proposal.We support Alt.1. |

### Round 2

We have now agreed that SRS Tx hopping will be within an SRS for positioning resource. Regarding how to configure the frequency hopping, the comments in round 1 were generally supportive of the proposal, with questions regarding the usefulness of comfiguring the time between hops (Qualcomm, LGE) and a proposal to include a hop ID (vivo).

On the configuration of the overlap between hops, most company prefer to configure the starting PRB of the resource, and the overlap (i.e. alt2), rather than a starting PRB for each hop (alt1). However, the difference in support between the two option is not very large.

Based on the received comments, a new proposal grouping the two proposal from the first round is presented:

**Proposal 3.2-2: For the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of the SRS for positioning resource at least includes:**

* **The number of hops**
* **The hop bandwidth**
* **FFS: The time hannel hops**
* **FFS: overhead reduction for multiple SRS transmissions with the same parameters.**
* **FFS: For the overlap configuration of SRS Tx hopping:**
	+ **Alt1: include the starting PRB for each hop**
	+ **Alt2: include the starting PRB for the first hop and a parameter for the configured overlap**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.2-2:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| mtk | 1, the time between hops seems to be the sum of SRS symbol number and the time gap for RF retuning. It seems to us that the two parameters need to be configured separately, then the “time between hops” may not be needed2, when SRS symbol number is configured, and also time gap as retuning time is configured, the starting symbol for each hopped transmission could be derived3, based on the above, two parameters may be further included* The time gap (for retuning)
* The resource number
 |
| vivo | Based on SRS for MIMO, the hop number or bandwidth can be obtained by CSRS, we would like to confirm whether the proposal includes this case (ie., Indirect configuration ). If not, we prefer to modify the main-bullet as**Proposal 3.2-2: For the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of the SRS for positioning resource can indicate the following information directly or indirectly ~~at least includes~~:** |
| LGE | We are generally OK with proposal and vivo’s modified main bullet.We also support the Alt. 2 of the 5th bullet.For the 4th bullet, we don’t think that SRS-pos FH configuration method being discussioned has a a large overhead, compared to the existing SRS-MIMO FH configuration method, which is also configured within a resource. |
| InterDigital | We supppor the FL proposal. We prefer to limit the scope of the disucssion to the SRS for positioning for this proposal. |

### Status before GTW (Wednesday, week2)

Based on the received feedback, the proposal seems mostly acceptable. Regarding the comment from vivo about indicating directly or indirectly, I don’t think there is any difference, a parameter could be either configured by itself or as part of a group of parameters (as such is the case for FH in SRS mimo, as mentioned by vivo), but still, the value is configured.

Thus, the proposal is left unchanged for the GTW discussion:

**Proposal 3.2-2: For the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of the SRS for positioning resource at least includes:**

* **The number of hops**
* **The hop bandwidth**
* **FFS: The time between hops**
* **FFS: overhead reduction for multiple SRS transmissions with the same parameters.**
* **FFS: For the overlap configuration of SRS Tx hopping:**
	+ **Alt1: include the starting PRB for each hop**
	+ **Alt2: include the starting PRB for the first hop and a parameter for the configured overlap**

If you have any strong concern, please enter your comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.2-2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Collision rules [MEDIUM]

### Background

 In [6,9,20,22] Collision with other UL transmission are discussed and propose to introduce a window where UL SRS with FH is transmitted without being interruption from other UL signals, similar to DL measurement gaps. This is essentially a special case of collision rules, where the UL SRS with FH always have highest priority.

[5,7,21,22], propose to re-use or extend collision rules and priorities from the existing dropping rules.

[17,22] mentions that the collision rules should include the retuning time.

[3,16] propose to introduce additional rules for dropping of one or more hops based on the collision of the SRS with FH with other signals only in some of the hops.

[16] proposes to define collision rules when one or more hop is within the active BWP, and consider SRS to be high priority outside of the active BWP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [14] | Proposal 5: Study scenarios of collision between SRSp and UL channels and prioritization of SRSp during SRSp hopping |
| [6] | Proposal 4: It is necessary to introduce a window so that the RedCap UEs can continuously transmit SRS-Pos signals with UL frequency hopping multiple times without being interrupted by PUSCH/PUCCH. |
| [21] | Proposal 7: A mechanism should be supported to avoid the collision of a high-priority signal with the UL SRS transmission and DL PRS reception for positioning purposes in the FDD mode. |
| [22] | Proposal 3-2: For the configuration for SRS transmission frequency hopping, consider to have the transition time at the end to retune back to the original BWP Proposal 3-3: For the configuration for SRS transmission frequency hopping, consider to have the transition time at the beginning if the first transmission is not exactly within the uplink BWP Proposal 3-5: For SRS transmission frequency hopping, UE is not expected to transmit data or other reference signalsProposal 3-6: For SRS transmission frequency hopping, consider a mechanism to abort the transmission in an instance when other uplink transmission has higher priority |
| [20] | Proposal 8: Consider following for handling of collision between frequency hopping SRS transmission and other UL transmission* Opt. 1) UL time domain window where UE is expected to transmit only SRS for positioning
* Opt. 2) Priority rule between SRS for positioning and other UL transmission
 |
| [17] | **Proposal 6: For SRS for Positioning frequency hopping:*** **Define SRS for positioning associated with a CC (and not an active BWP) with each own numerology and bandwidth (e.g. similar to the SRS for Positioning of Rel-17 RRC inactive feature).**
* **Introduce a transmission/switching/retune gap before and after a transmission of such an SRS resource.**
 |
|  [3] | Proposal 8: • For SRS for positioning frequency hopping collides with other DL/UL reception/transmission, the following aspects should be considered.- The dropping rules should include at least one of the following Alt 1: UE drops all the SRS hops Alt 2: UE drops affected hops Alt 3: UE drops affected symbols- The other DL/UL reception/transmission should include other UL signals/channels, DL signals/channels in TDD, DL signals/channels for half-duplex UE (HD-UE) in FDD |
| [5] | ***Proposal 6: Define scheduling restriction rules for SRS frequency hopping transmission should be supported.*** |
| [9] | **Proposal 8:** Support an UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.  |
| [7] | **Proposal 5*** Switching period associated with reception of DL PRS and transmission of SRS for positioning with frequency hopping has same priority as the corresponding DL PRS and SRS for positioning.
 |
| [16] | **Proposal 6 When the SRS for positioning is using Tx bandwidth hopping, the active BWP bandwidth does not apply during transmission of the hops outside of the BWP.****Proposal 7 The UE is not expected to transmit other UL signals in the same slot as the one used by a SRS with Tx bandwidth hopping while the UE is hopping outside of the active BWP bandwidth.*** **FFS: collision rules to prioritize SRS or other transmissions.**

***Proposal 13 If the SRS for positioning with BW hopping collides with a high priority PUSCH/PUCCH, the colliding slot(s) and the remaining SRS slot(s) in the hopping sequence are dropped.*** |

### Round 1

 We can start the discussion by discussing whether a UL window, or collision rules, or both, should be supported.

**Proposal 3.3-1: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping support one or more of the following, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Support an UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
* **Support collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules, including only dropping the UL SRSs in colliding hops.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.3-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| InterDigital | Our suggestion is to change the proposal to the study since we need to understand the details for each option.**Proposal 3.3-1: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping ~~support~~ ~~one or more of~~ study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:*** **Option 1 : ~~Support an~~ UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : ~~Support~~ collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules~~, including only dropping the UL SRSs in colliding hops.~~**
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support the window. It should be up to network configuration following the existing priority rule between SRS and other signals/channels. |
| ZTE | We prefer to delete the first bullet, in our understanding the first bullet is a special case of the second bullet.**Proposal 3.3-1: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping support ~~one or more of~~ the following, according to UE capabilities:*** **~~Support an UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.~~**
* **Support collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules, including only dropping the UL SRSs in colliding hops.**
	+ **FFS: Support an UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
 |
| CMCC | We are supportive to discuss the collision rules, but we prefer to change “support” to “study” at this stage.For the 1st bullet: Note that in R16/17 positioning, the priority of SRS is lower than other UL signals/channels and no optimization on the prioritization has been supported. From this perspective, we don’t see strong need to prioritize SRS frequency hopping for RedCap UE by defining a time window.For the 2nd bullet: We are open to discuss a collision rule/timeline, and we think that a similar mechanism of the collision timeline for UE processing DL PRS within a PPW can be considered as a starting point. |
| Ericsson | Fine with study and agree on the options later.  |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to write both options hannelsgn and hannels options („collusion rules“ and „UL time window“) and discuss during next meeting further details.  |

### Status before GTW (Monday, week1)

There are only a few companies commenting on the issue, but if time allows, let’s try to advance the proposal with the update from interdigital:

**Proposal 3.3-2: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

### Round 2

Since the proposal was not discussed, let’s continue from the version 3.3-2:

**Proposal 3.3-2: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

**Proposal 3.3-2:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| CATT | OK with the proposal.We support Option 1, the motivation of the UL time window for hopping as follows:In Rel-17, when the UL SRS-Pos conflicts with other uplink channels/signals (e.g., PUSCH and PUCCH), the SRS-Pos are dropped without affecting the transmission of PUSCH/PUCCH. For RedCap UEs Positioning with UL frequency hopping, it may take 5 frequency hoppings to achieve a desired positioning performance, which requires that the time interval between two adjacent hops should be small enough. |
| Vivo | Generally OK, in addition to the collision between other UL signals/channels and SRS frequency hopping, maybe collision with other DL signals/channels for HD-FDD UEs can also be considered. Therefore, some modifications**Proposal 3.3-2: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL and DL sigals/channels and the UL SRS with frequency hopping, study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:*** **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels ~~transmissions~~**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**
 |
| LGE | We support both options and to discuss further details, hannel both options have necessities as follows:For the Option 1: If the SRS-pos resource has lower priority than other signals/channels, it may cause positioning performance degradation. So it is necessary to define the UL time window for the case that high positioning accuracy performance should be guaranteed. For the Option 2: In UL time window of Option 1, UE cannot transmit/receive other signal/channels and it cause latency issue. So it is necessary to define the collision rules for the case that UE needs to prioritize data traffic. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For Option 2, the collision rule to study means that the current collision rule does not apply? |
| NEC | Support. Both options are OK for us to study further details. |
| Samsung | Generally ok for both. But it’s not very clear on option 1 that in such SRS hannelsgn window, whether SRS tx is high priority or not, or we will discuss what if the other singals are indeed happened in the window. So hannel to make it clear:* **Option 1 : UL time window where transmission of SRS for positioning is higher priority than other signals/hannels, e.g., the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal to list options.  |
| Futurewei | Ok to study both options.  |
| Intel | We are fine to study both options. For Samsung’s update, our understanding is that if a UL time window is defined, there would be some restriction on the scheduling. Similar to MG, we may not need to consider prioritization between SRS and other channels/signals.For Option 2, our understanding is that this is additional collison handling rule between SRS with frequency hopping and other channels/signals, on top of existing collision handling rule. For instance, whether some or all the hops are dropped due to collision. It would be good to clarify this.   |
| Qualcomm | OK to study both options |
| IIT Kanpur, CEWiT | We are fine with proposal |
| ZTE | OK with vivo’s modification. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK to study both options. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with vivo’s modification. We prefer Option 2. |
| Ericsson | We support both options. In our view, option 1 may be a simpler solution for FH across slots.  |
| SONY | OK to study both options |
| Apple | Fine to study both options |
| InterDigital | Support the modification from vivo. |

### Round 3:

Most companies are ok with studying both options. The proposal is updated based on feedback from vivo and Samsung:

**Proposal 3.3-3: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL and DL sigals/channels and the UL SRS with frequency hopping, study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where transmission of SRS for positioning is higher priority than other signals/channels, e.g., the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
| LGE | Support the proposal.For Option 1, we have same view with Intel. We don’t think it is necessary to consider priority for UL time window, hannel to MG. So we propose modification as following:* **Option 1 : UL time window where ~~transmission of SRS for positioning is higher priority than other signals/hannels, e.g.,~~ the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the update from Intel/LGE |
| Samsung  | It seems with LGE deletation, we back to original wording which we have concern on. Because, the description „UE is expected/ not expected“ is not clear to us. Because it did not prevent the hannelsg and also not defining whatif UE faces the actual transmission. Note that SRS transmission really has general low hannels in the system, could be easily to cancelled. So that the idea of option1 is good to protect the SRS tx but we are afraid it’s not really helpful to ask UE to prioritize the tx of SRS. We have same debating on Rel17 PPW design and we notice the use of it in existing spec. But in this new WI, we are trying to avoid the unclearness. So we are kind of insisting have the wording in proposal 3.3-3, or if company hannelsg defining complicated priority handling as in PPW, we can simply it as „**UL time window where UE priorize the transmission of SRS for positioning over other signals/hannels**“, and then FFS details. |
| Ericsson | Ok to study the two options. We are ok with LGE’s update on option 1in our understanding, the change by LGE makes opt 1 similar to an UL MG. To samsung: isn’t the case of a high priority SRS over every other signal one oft he collision rules possible in opt 2? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK for the study. However, we think that even if we do not specify anything in the end, the current collision rule should also be fine. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal.We support Option 1, the motivation of the UL time window for hopping as follows:In Rel-17, when the UL SRS-Pos conflicts with other uplink channels/signals (e.g., PUSCH and PUCCH), the SRS-Pos are dropped without affecting the transmission of PUSCH/PUCCH. For RedCap UEs Positioning with UL frequency hopping, it may take 5 frequency hoppings to achieve a desired positioning performance, which requires that the time interval between two adjacent hops should be small enough. |
| NEC | OK for the further study options. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the update from LGE for Option 1. For Option 2, we would like to point out that this is for additional collision handling rule on top of existing rule as defined in the spec. If this is correct understanding, we suggest to update * **Option 2 : additional collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**
 |
| ZTE | Support the update from LGE and ok to study those two options. |
| Spreadtrum | We supoort the proposal. We prefer Option 2. |
| vivo | We are fine with the update from LGE for Option 1, and Ok to study the two options. |

### Status before GTW (Wednesday, week2)

Based on the received feedback, the proposal looks stable. Regarding the comment for Samsung, I would say that option 1 says exactly the same thing that the proposal from Samsung, the SRS has in effect the highest priority, since there is no other signal considered in the window. Therefore, since the proposal is stable, I would like to ask Samsung if a compromise toward the LGE wording supported by the majority is possible.

I also corrected a typo (expecting -> expected) in the first option.

**Proposal 3.3-4: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL and DL sigals/channels and the UL SRS with frequency hopping, study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expected to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : additional collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

If you have any strong concern, please enter your comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.2-2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Support of aperiodic PRS / SRS [paused]

### Background

Two companies propose to consider how to handle aperiodic transmission of the SRS for positioning with respect to frequency hopping.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [20] | Proposal 7: Support frequency hopping of SRS-pos is activated/deactivated by MAC-CE or DCI. |
| [9] | Proposal 10: RAN1 should discuss the way to reduce the time gap and unnecessary signalling overhead of RedCap FH for positioning (e.g., support a single DCI triggering all the switching). |

### Round 1

 From the FL perspective, it is preferable to treat the issue once the design of the SRS configuration for frequency hopping has progressed further. If a MAC CE is preferred to trigger the SRS with frequency hopping, RAN2 should be consulted on the feasibility. The discussion on the issue is thus paused until progress is made on the SRS configuration.

Comments can be entered in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

## Power control [LOW]

### Background

 In [21] power control for the SRS while hopping is discussed, and it is proposed to use the same pathloss estimate across the hopping procedure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal** |
| [16] | Proposal 12 UE uses same pathloss estimation for SRS transmission during one SRS frequency hopping duration if uplink power control is configured. |

### Round 1

As only a single company has discussed the issue, we can start by collecting views.

**Proposal 3.5-1: UE uses same pathloss estimation for SRS transmission during one SRS frequency hopping duration if uplink power control is configured.**

Comments can be entered in the table below:

**Proposal 3.5-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comment** |
|  |  |

# GTW sessions

## Monday (week 1)

High priority proposals:

**Proposal 2.4-1: (for conclusion) for RedCap UEs, measurements on DL PRS with frequency hopping using PPW (gapless measurements) are not supported.**

**Proposal 1.1-2: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:**

* **A measurement based on combining all hops**
* **FFS: A measurement based on combining some of the hops**
* **FFS: One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop.**

**Proposal 3.1-2: for RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured:**

**Alt 1: within one SRS for positioning resource**

**Alt 2: across resources, within one SRS for positioning resource set**

**Alt 3: across resource sets, with all resources in a set corresponding to the same hop sub-bandwidth**

**Alt 4: across BWPs.**

**Proposal 3.3-2: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL sigals and the UL SRS with frequency hopping study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL transmissions**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

Proposals to be treated if time allows:

**Proposal 1.4-2**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the overlap in frequency is between two time domain consecutive hops.**

 **FFS: how to configure the overlap for UL SRS Tx hopping.**

**Proposal 1.5-2: (for conclusion) For the positioning of redcap UEs, for the DL PRS reception and UL SRS transmission, the maximum hopping bandwidth for a single hop is 20MHz for FR1 and 100MHz with FR2.**

## Friday (week 1)

**Proposal 3.1b-1**

**For RedCap UEs, SRS for positioning Tx frequency hopping is configured within one SRS for positioning resource**

**Proposal 1.1-5:**

**Updated proposal: For DL Rx hopping or UL Tx hopping, support the UE or gNB to report the following:**

* **A single measurement based on receiving the DL PRS or UL SRS for positioning**
	+ **Note: this corresponds to a legacy measurement definition.**
	+ **Note: RAN4 may provide a new requirement for redcap UEs.**
	+ **FFS: indication of how many hops / which hops where used for the single measurement in the measurement report.**
* **One or more measurements where each measurement is associated with a single received hop**

**Proposal 1.4-3**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops which may or may not be adjacent.**

* **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported**

**Proposal 3.3-3: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL and DL sigals/channels and the UL SRS with frequency hopping, study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where transmission of SRS for positioning is higher priority than other signals/channles, e.g., the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expecting to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

## Wednesday (week 2)

**Proposal 1.4-4**

**For UL SRS Tx hopping, the frequency hopping pattern is configured with overlapping hops.**

* **FFS: exact patterns to be supported**
* **FFS: whether the case of no overlap can be supported**
* **FFS: whether the overlapping hops may not be adjacent in the time domain**

**Proposal 3.2-2: For the support of Tx hopping, the configuration of the SRS for positioning resource at least includes:**

* **The number of hops**
* **The hop bandwidth**
* **FFS: The time between hops**
* **FFS: overhead reduction for multiple SRS transmissions with the same parameters.**
* **FFS: For the overlap configuration of SRS Tx hopping:**
	+ **Alt1: include the starting PRB for each hop**
	+ **Alt2: include the starting PRB for the first hop and a parameter for the configured overlap**

**Proposal 3.3-4: For RedCap UEs positioning transmitting the UL SRS with frequency hopping, regarding the collisions between other UL and DL sigals/channels and the UL SRS with frequency hopping, study whether to support one or both of the following options, according to UE capabilities:**

* **Option 1 : UL time window where the UE is not expected to receive/transmit other signals/channels and is only expected to transmit FH SRS for positioning.**
	+ **FFS details of an UL time window**
* **Option 2 : additional collision rules between the UL SRS with frequency hopping and other UL and DL signals/channels**
	+ **FFS: details on the collision rules**

# Conclusion

TBD
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