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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT113bis-e][607][POS] LPP proposals (CATT)

Scope: Discuss the proposals in R2-2103129 and conclude on which are agreeable.

Intended outcome: Report to comeback session, in R2-2104411

Deadline: Tuesday 2021-04-20 0800 UTC

In this email discussion the following contributions are discussed to decide if these contributions or proposals in the contributions can be agreed. Please see [R2-2103129](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103129.zip) for a summary of these contributions and for Rapporteur’s comments/suggestions. Please also check the contribution themselves before answering the questions in this email discussion.

1. [R2-2102920](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102920.zip" \o "C:Usersmtk16923Documents3GPP Meetings202104 - RAN2_113bis-e, OnlineExtracts37355_CR0294_(Rel-16)_R2-2102920.docx) Corrections on the field description of NR-AdditionalPathList and DL-PRS positioning frequency layer related parameters, CATT
2. [R2-2102921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102921.zip) Corrections on NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData, CATT
3. [R2-2102987](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102987.zip) Considerations on missing need codes in LPP, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
4. [R2-2103921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103921.zip) LPP Layer interaction with lower layers for Positioning Frequency layer and Measurement Gap, Ericsson
5. [R2-2103923](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103923.zip) Need of compact expirationTime Indication, Ericsson
6. [R2-2103924](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103924.zip) Correction of field description name, Ericsson
7. [R2-2104049](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip) Correction to PRS configuration, Huawei, HiSilicon
8. [R2-2104050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip) Correction to the uplink LPP message, Huawei, HiSilicon
9. [R2-2104051](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104051.zip) Correction to DL-PRS capability, Huawei, HiSilicon
10. [R2-2104052](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip) Correction on positioning error reporting, Huawei, HiSilicon
11. [R2-2104269](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104269.zip) Correction on the field description of additionPaths, ZTE Corporation, Sanechips
12. [R2-2102786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102786.zip) 37.355 Draft CR on timestamp reference in NR positioning measurement report, vivo

# 2 Contact Information

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yinghaoguo@huawei.com |
| Lenovo | Hyung-Nam Choi (hchoi5@lenovo.com) |
| vivo | yuanyuanwang@vivo.com |
| CATT | Jianxiang Li (lijianxiang@datangmobile.cn) |
| Ericsson | Ritesh.shreevastav@ericsson.com |
| Nokia | mani.thyagarajan@nokia.com |
| ZTE | Liu.yansheng@zte.com.cn |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Field description of NR-AdditionalPathList and PFL related parameters

[R2-2102920](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102920.zip" \o "C:Usersmtk16923Documents3GPP Meetings202104 - RAN2_113bis-e, OnlineExtracts37355_CR0294_(Rel-16)_R2-2102920.docx) addresses the problem related with the field description of IE *nr-RelativeTimeDifference* and positioning frequency layer related parameters configured by *NR-DL-PRS-PositioningFrequencyLayer*, i.e., *dl-PRS-SubcarrierSpacing*, *dl-PRS-CyclicPrefix*, *dl-PRS-PointA*, *dl-PRS-CombSizeN*, *dl-PRS-ResourceBandwidth* and *dl-PRS-StartPRB*. And the following changes are proposed:

1. Add a description for the mapping of reported value and the measured negative value in the field description of *nr-RelativeTimeDifference-r16*.
2. Add a restriction that “all DL PRS resource sets belonging to the same positioning frequency layer have the same value of the parameters configured by *NR-DL-PRS-PositioningFrequencyLayer*” in the field description of the following parameters configured by *NR-DL-PRS-PositioningFrequencyLayer*:

* *dl-PRS-SubcarrierSpacing*,
* *dl-PRS-CyclicPrefix*,
* *dl-PRS-StartPRB*

**Rapporteur’s comments**: This is an essential correction. For the 1st correction, it makes the NW and UE behaviour clear. For the 2nd correction, the corresponding changes are related with the definition of the positioning frequency layer, which makes the definition of the DL-PRS frequency layer clear and aligned with RAN1’s spec. So, rapporteur proposes to agree on this CR.

**Proposal 1: RAN2 to agree adding a description for the mapping of reported value and the measured negative value, and if it is agreeable to add clarification that all DL PRS resource sets belonging to the same positioning frequency layer have the same value of the parameters *dl-PRS-SubcarrierSpacing*, *dl-PRS-CyclicPrefix* and *dl-PRS-PointA*.**

**Question 1**: please provide your views on proposal 1 of whether to add a description for the mapping of reported value and the measured negative value, and to add clarification for the DL-PRS frequency related parameters.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but can be merged to another CR with similar issues | The structure of the PRS signalling already implicitly that these fields are applicable for all the PRS resources under this positioning frequency layer. Not quite essential |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The 2nd change should be consistent:  "DL PRS" 🡪 "DL-PRS"  "positioning frequency layer" 🡪 "Positioning Frequency layer" |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree as proponent | Thanks for QC’s comments and agree to make the improved wording. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree with modification | For the 1st change, the referenced section numbers should be 10.1.23.3.3 and 10.1.25.3.3  For the 2nd change, agree with Huawei that this is not essential because the *nr-DL-PRS-PositioningFrequencyLayer* parameters are per frequency layer parameters per the current ASN.1 definition. If the 2nd change is needed then at least add reference to 38.214 because it was mentioned in the CR cover that this is as per 38.214. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**:

All companies agree with the 1st changes, but some modification is needed. Besides, a clear majority (5/7) to agree with the 2nd change. Two companies think the 2nd change is not essential, since the current ASN.1 definition already implicitly indicate that these fields are applicable for all the PRS resources under this positioning frequency layer. But among these two companies, one company think the 2nd change can be agreeable if add the reference to TS38.214. Thus, we propose the revised CR with some modification can be agreed.

**Proposal 1: CR in** [**R2-2102920**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102920.zip) **can be agreed and revised to** **R2-2104520 with the following modifications：**

**change the reference section number in the 1st change**

**consistent the wordings for the 2nd change, i.e., “DL PRS” to “DL-PRS”, “positioning frequency layer” to “Positioning Frequency layer”**

**add reference to TS38.214 for the 2nd change.**

## 3.2 nr-AdType field in NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData IE

[R2-2102921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102921.zip) points out an issue related with the required assistance data for NR Multi-RTT positioning. *NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData* IE used to request assistance data for NR Multi-RTT positioning. This IE has a field (*nr-AdType*) that indicates the type of assistance data requested. One of the codepoints for this field is ‘*ul-srs*’ which indicates SRS related information is being requested. However, since SRS related information is not provided as part of the assistance data from LMF to UE in the case of multi-RTT positioning, the *nr-AdType* in the request for assistance data for multi-RTT should not have the ‘*ul-srs*’ codepoint. Thus, the following changes are proposed in [R2-2102921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102921.zip):

1. Add a field description for the IE *ul-srs* that this IE should not be included in this version of the protocol.
2. Add a filed description for the IE *nr-AdType* in the *NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData.*

**Rapporteur’s comments**: This is an essential correction and with backward compatible changes. Besides, this question has been discussed in the last meeting RAN2#113e, and most of companies indicate the change can be OK if it is done in a backward compatible way. Thus, Rapporteur proposes to agree the CR.

**Proposal 2: RAN2 to agree** **adding a field description for *nr-AdType* and clarifying in the field description of that the codepoint ‘*ul-srs*’ is not used in this release.**

**Question 2**: please provide your views on proposal 2 to add a field description for *nr-AdType* and clarifying in the field description of that the codepoint ‘*ul-srs*’ is not used in this release.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | During R16, we have agreed that for multi-RTT, SRS confifguration is by gNB instead of LMF. We don’t consider the field is useful in the request assistance data message. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | The SRS configuration is provided by the gNB, but an LMF would still have to instigate the procedure to deliver the SRS to the UE.  Or what should be the expected UE behaviour in the case the UE received a Multi-RTT location request but has no SRS configured/activated?  Or if the UE received a Multi-RTT location request but has neither DL-PRS nor UL-PRS assistance data. Would a request for ad-type='dl-prs' trigger the LMF to always provide both, DL-PRS and UL-PRS? |
| vivo | Disagree | Same with QC |
| CATT | Agree as proponent | UE may send the request data for location measurements per the description in TS 38.305 as below.  However the request on UL-SRS in multi-RTT doesn’t help location measurements because Multi-RTT is not UE-based in Rel-16 and no measurement of ul-srs in UE side.  “Thus, a UE may request assistance data at any time in order to comply with a previous request for location measurements from the LMF; an LMF may instigate more than one request for location information (e.g., measurements or a location estimate) in case location results from a previous request were not adequate for the requested QoS; and the target device may transfer capability information to the server at any time if not already performed.” |
| Ericsson | Field description can be added but UL SRS clarification can be removed | As UE can’t obtain AD for UL SRS from gNB directly; it has to be instigated by LMF so request from UE has to go to LMF so in that sense the correction is not needed. |
| Nokia | See comments | In the last meeting there was no consensus on the usage of *nr-AdType* set to *ul-srs* in the UE request for Multi-RTT assistance data (see summary in R2-2102105). Qualcomm raises the same question here again about the usage of *ul-srs*. I don’t fully follow the CATT explanation above, but this needs to be resolved first before we can agree to the change that *ul-srs* should not be used in this version of the specification. The question is whether UE can send a request for Multi-RTT assistance data to LMF, with *nr-AdType* set to *ul-srs* which would trigger the LMF to instigate sending the NRPPa Positioning Information Request message to serving gNB. We need more time to investigate this. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**:

There is no majority company agree with the CR.

2/6 companies think all of the 2 changes within the CR can be agreed.

3/6 companies disagree with the 2nd change of the CR, since they think UE can initiate a request for UL-SRS to LMF, so that the LMF can initiate the UL-SRS configuration request to the serving gNB.

1/6 company think more time needed to further check whether the *ul-srs* can be used to trigger the LMF initiate UL-SRS configuration procedure to the NG-RAN node.

**Proposal 2: CR in** [**R2-2102921**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102921.zip) **is not pursued, given that there are different views on the usage of code point “*ul-srs*”. Proponent may discuss offline with other companies to see if there is interest to come back to this issue in the next meeting.**

## 3.3 Missing need codes

[R2-2102987](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102987.zip) proposes several overviews of the optional fields and conditional fields for which need codes are missing and the following changes are proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: For Rel-14 and earlier, it is recommended not to add the missing need codes for the time being but to check the existing implementations carefully and decide afterwards whether there is a need to make any changes or not.  Proposal 2: For Rel-15, it is recommended to add the missing need codes but may need to be decided case-by-case (i.e. feature-based) depending on whether there are already existing implementations of UE and network in the field or not. Details of the need codes can be discussed separately.  Proposal 3: For Rel-16, it is recommended to add the missing need codes. Details of the need codes can be discussed separately. |

**Rapporteur’s comments**: The discussion paper makes a general analysis for the optional fields and conditional fields for which need codes are missing. RAN2 can first discuss whether to agree to add the missing need codes and the corresponding version of the specifications based on this discussion paper. Since the details of the need codes to be modified have already been covered by email discussion [Offline-601][POS], thus, if agreed to make such changes, companies can further check these parameters case by case in email discussion [Offline-601][POS].

**Proposal 3: RAN2 to discuss whether to agree to add the missing need codes in principle first and which corresponding version of the specifications need to be modified. And if agreed, companies can further check these parameters case by case in another email discussion [Offline-601][POS].**

**Question 3**: please provide your views on proposal 3 of whether to add the missing need codes in principle first, and if yes, please provide the corresponding version of the specification need to be modified.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  (proponent) |  | Already discussed in 601 |
| Lenovo |  | Proponent; as this contribution is discussed already in [Offline-601][POS] we propose not to duplicate discussion here. |
| Qualcomm |  | I agree that we have been a bit "sloppy" with the need codes in the past. However, we are not aware of any issues in real deployments. We agree with a fix for Rel-16, but not with open up deployed/deeply-frozen Releases. |
| vivo |  | see 601. |
| CATT |  | Agree with the intention to add the missing need codes and prefer to fix from Rel-14 which was discussed in 601. |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with QC; we can only correct from Rel-16 |
| Nokia |  | Let us keep the need codes discussion in one place and cover it as part of email discussion [601]. See our comments under discussion [601]. |
| ZTE |  | Check 601 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**:

Since this topic has already been discussed in another offline email discussion [Offline-601][POS], majority companies think no more discussions are needed here. Thus, we think we can refer to the conclusion of the offline email discussion [Offline-601][POS].There is no proposal here.

## 3.4 LPP and RRC interaction for NR DL PRS measurements

[R2-2103921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103921.zip)[4] is a revised resubmission of CR in R2-2102123 addressing an issue impacting the NR DL PRS measurements requiring measurement gaps. And the following changes are proposed in [R2-2103921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103921.zip):

1. The LPP interaction with RRC and lower layers has been captured 6.4.3*.*

**Rapporteur’s comments**: We have the following description in LTE which is missing in NR under IE *OTDOA-ReferenceCellInfo*: “*If earfcnRef of this assistance data reference cell is different from that of the serving cell, the LPP layer shall inform lower layers to start performing inter-frequency RSTD measurements with this cell and provide to lower layers the information about this assistance data reference cell, e.g. EARFCN and PRS positioning occasion information*”. It is worth considering a similar clarification for NR DL PRS measurements also. This seems to be an essential correction in Rel-16.

**Proposal 4: RAN2 to discuss if it is agreeable to add a clarification about the LPP layer to RRC layer interaction when measurement gap is required for NR DL PRS measurements.**

**Question 4**: please provide your views on proposal 4 of whether to add a clarification about the LPP layer to RRC layer interaction when measurement gap is required for NR DL PRS measurements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No strong view | With the current spec, we cannot see what ambiguity can exist. It is obvious that the lower layer needs to perform measurement based on the PRS configuration provisioned by the LPP layer. And, according to RAN4 spec, the UE starts the measurement only when the UE receives request location information for the UE-assisted positioning  If this is purely editorial, maybe can be merged with the other CRs with the same editorial issues. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The "e.g. ARFCN" should be modified to "e.g., DL-PRS PointA" since there are two different ARFCNs in the assistance data: The ARFCN of the CD-SSB/PCI and the ARFCN of the DL-PRS. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | No strong view | The clarification makes LPP interaction with RRC and lower layers clear, but nothing is broken with the current spec.  We are fine with the clarification if majority support. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with QC modification suggestion  Just to comment to Huawei; it is missing description which is needed similar to OTDOA in LTE. |
| Nokia | Agree | We agree with the CR but if there is any assumption that gaps are always needed for PRS measurements then it would be nice to add some clarification note about it in LPP specification also. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**:

There is majority company agree with the CR (4/6). One company addresses an issue that if there is any assumption that gaps are always needed for PRS measurements, then some clarification note about it should also be added in LPP specification. As for this problem, rapporteur thinks more time needed to further check this problem, and if needed, can be further discussed in the next meeting.

**Proposal 3: CR in** [**R2-2103921**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103921.zip) **can be agreed with some modifications, e.g., "e.g. ARFCN" should be modified to "e.g., DL-PRS PointA".**

## 3.5 ExpirationTime Indication

[R2-2103923](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103923.zip) discusses the need of granular *expirationTime* rather than the UTC time and the following changes are proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| [Observation 1 The ValueTag is not efficient since the posSIB still needs to be decoded. and ExpirationTime in the current form is also difficult to use because it is per SIB and consumes 12 Bytes.](#_Toc68210021)  [Observation 2 Significant signalling savings can be done for broadcast with Light weight ignalling mechanism.](#_Toc68210022)  [Proposal 1 RAN2 to agree to include updateRateTimeUnit and updateRateTime as substitute of expirationTime for some of the posSIBs and in addition to the expirationTime for some of the other posSIBs.](#_Toc68210024) |

**Rapporteur’s comments**: It seems an enhancement on broadcast positioning assistance data instead of essential correction in Rel-16.

**Proposal 5: RAN2 to discuss whether to include *updateRateTimeUnit* and *updateRateTime* as substitute of *expirationTime* or in addition to the *expirationTime* for some posSIBs.**

**Question 5**: please provide your views on proposal 5 of whether to include *updateRateTimeUnit* and *updateRateTime* as substitute of *expirationTime* or in addition to the *expirationTime* for some posSIBs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | This is not a correction, but addition of a new feature. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Not backwards compatible. Expiration time provides the same information as update rate, but expiration time is more flexible. |
| vivo | Disagree |  |
| CATT | Disagree | Not a correction but an enhancement. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Even though expiration time provides the same information; it is 12 bytes per SIB. If any reduction is possible, we should do that. |
| Nokia | Disagree | We prefer to do only essential corrections for Rel-16. This is an enhancement. It also adds complexity by adding yet another way handling posSIB changes. This enhancement seems to be motivated by signalling optimisation. |
| ZTE | Disagree | This is not a correction. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**:

There is majority company (6/7) disagree to include *updateRateTimeUnit* and *updateRateTime* as substitute of *expirationTime* or in addition to the *expirationTime* for some posSIBs, since they think it is an enhancement but not a correction.

**Proposal 4: Proposals of** [**R2-2103923**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103923.zip) **are not pursued.**

## 3.6 Field description name of nr-PositionCalculationAssistance

[R2-2103924](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103924.zip) points out different names exist for the field description *nr-PositionCalculationAssistance*. In 37.355, the IE *nr-PositionCalculationAssistance* is defined to provides position calculation assistance data for UE-based mode. However, in the corresponding field description of assistance data related parameters for DL-TDOA and DL-AOD methods, the wrong IE names of *nr-PositionCalculationAssistanceData* is used. Based on this, the following changes are proposed in [R2-2103924](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103924.zip):

1. The field name has been changed from *nr-PositionCalculationAssistanceData* to *nr-PositionCalculationAssistance.*

**Rapporteur’s comments**: This is an essential correction which is a typo. The rapporteur proposes a CR to include all of such typo corrections.

**Proposal 6: RAN2 to agree the correction to change the field name from *nr-PositionCalculationAssistanceData* to *nr-PositionCalculationAssistance*.**

**Question 6**: please provide your views on proposal 6 to change the field name from *nr-PositionCalculationAssistanceData* to *nr-PositionCalculationAssistance*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | Can be merged to the other CRs with similar editorial corrections |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Can probably be merged into an "editorial CR". |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | Minor corrections, which can be merged to other agreed CRs. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Agree it should be rolled into some other CR instead of having a CR just for three or four editorial changes. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**:

All companies agree with the CR, but majority companies think the change of the CR in R2-2103924 is an editorial correction, which should be merged to another agreed CR. Thus, rapporteur propose to agree with the changes of the CR, but move it to the agreed CR R2-2102920.

**Proposal 5: The changes of the CR in** [**R2-2103924**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103924.zip) **can be pursued and merged to the CR R2-2104520.**

## 3.7 Corrections to DL PRS configuration related IEs/fields

[R2-2104049](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip) addresses corrections related with the PRS configuration relevant parameters and the following changes are proposed:

1. Accept the changes regarding DL-PRS related IEs.

* Clarify that the numbering space for *NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* is per TRP across multiple frequency layers
* Modify the sentence "*qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specifies the DL-PRS Resource Set ID" to "*qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specifies DL-PRS Resource Set configured for the same TRP whose DL-PRS resource serve as the source reference signal for the DL-PRS"
* Change the name *nrMaxSetsPerTRP* to *nr-MaxSetsPerTRP-PerFrequencyLayer*
* In the sentence "The IE *NR-SelectedDL-PRS-IndexList* is used by the location server to provide the selected Frequency Layer index of *nr-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataList* to the target device.", it should be the index of PRS resources

1. Accept the following changes regarding the *associated-DL-PRS-ID*.

* In the IE NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo
  + In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, remove the sentence "The beam information from the associated TRP is considered to be in GCS if the lcs-gcs-translation-parameter field is not provided, and to be in LCS if the lcs-gcs-translation-parameter field is provided."
  + In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, clarify that when the field is present, the fields *lcs-GCS-TranslationParameter* and *dl-PRS-BeamInfoSet* shall be absent.
  + In the field desctiption for *lcs-GCS-TranslationParameter*, clarify that the field’s fucntion for the current TRP is applicable only when the field associatedDL-PRS-ID is absent
* In the IE *NR-TRP-LocationInfo*
  + In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, clarify that when the field is present, the field *trp-Location* shall be absent.

**Proposal 7: RAN2 to discuss whether to agree the following corrections proposed by** [R2-2104049](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip)**.**

**Question 7**: please provide your views on proposal 7 of whether to agree the above corrections proposed by [R2-2104049](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Ageee/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  (proponent) | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The CR should be based on the latest version of the spec on the server.  *dl-PRS-QCL-Info*: Not clear what "configured under the same TRP" means.  The *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specfies the DL-PRS Resource Set ID of the *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceID*. Not clear why the proposed change is needed.  New Table entry for *nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* should be the first row of the field description Table.  "DL-PRS resource set ID"🡪"DL-PRS Resource Set ID  "DL-PRS source set" 🡪 "DL-PRS Resource Set"  "under the same TRP"🡪"of the TRP"?  "selected DL-PRS resource" 🡪 "selected DL-PRS Resource" |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree with modification | 1. Changing the name to *nr-MaxSetsPerTRP-PerFrequencyLayer-r16* is not essential since the *DL-PRS-BeamInfoSet-r16* for a TRP is for TRP from one frequency layer according to the ASN.1 definition i.e. *dl-PRS-BeamInfoSet* is inside *NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfoPerTRP* which is inside *NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfoPerFreqLayer*.  2. dl-PRS-QCL-Info sub-field description can be updated as follows:  ***dl-PRS*** indicates the PRS information for QCL source reference signal and comprises the followings sub-fields:  - ***qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceID*** specifies DL-PRS Resource ID of the DL-PRS resource used as the source reference signal ~~for the DL-PRS~~.  - ***qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID*** indicates the DL-PRS Resource Set ID of the DL-PRS resource set used as the source reference signal. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 7**:

All companies agree with the CR. One company argue that *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specifies the DL-PRS Resource Set ID of the *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceID*, thus the change of the *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* is not needed. Another company thinks that changing the name to *nr-MaxSetsPerTRP-PerFrequencyLayer-r16* is not essential, since the ASN.1 can already implicit that *nrMaxSetsPerTRP* is per TRP per frequency layer.

Since most of the companies agree with changes of the *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* and *nr-MaxSetsPerTRP-PerFrequencyLayer-r16*, thus, the rapporteur propose all the changes of the CR can be pursued with some modifications proposed by QC and Nokia.

**Proposal 6: CR in** [**R2-2104049**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip) **can be agreed with the modifications proposed by QC and Nokia:**

1. **New Table entry for *nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* should be the first row of the field description Table.**
2. **"DL-PRS resource set ID"**🡪**"DL-PRS Resource Set ID**
3. **"DL-PRS source set"** 🡪 **"DL-PRS Resource Set"**
4. **"selected DL-PRS resource"** 🡪 **"selected DL-PRS Resource"**
5. ***dl-PRS-QCL-Info* sub-field, i.e., *dl-PRS* and *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceID* should be updated as proposed by Nokia.**

## 3.8 Need code and conditional presence tags in fields in UL messages

[R2-2104050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip) points out that according to the description in Section 6.1 of the LPP spec 37.355, the conditional presence tag should not be used in the uplink LPP message. However, there are several uplink LPP messages, within which conditional presence tag was used. Thus, the following changes are proposed in [R2-2104050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip):

1. Add field description for the field *nr-dl-tdoa-LocationInformation*, remove the conditonal presence tag *UEB* and its explanation. Move the explanation to the field description.
2. Add field description for the field *nr-dl-AoD-LocationInformation*, remove the conditonal presence tag *UEB* and its explanation. Move the explanation to the field description.
3. Remove the condition presence tag *SameRx* for the field *nr-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements* and *nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex* and remove the explanation for *SameRx*. Add the description to the field description of the field *nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex*

**Rapporteur’s comments**: The motivation for the corrections is supported. Moreover, the similar problems also exist in LTE spec and these conditional presence tags handling for LTE/NR has been there since Rel-9/Rel-15. Besides, except the conditional tags proposed to be changed in [R2-2104050](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip), there still other similar problems in current 37.355, i.e., conditional presence tag *NB-IoT* for NB-IOT positioning specific IEs, or the tag segmentation for the common IEs *CommonIEsProvideLocationInformation*, *CommonIEsRequestAssistanceData* and *CommonIEsProvide Capabilities*.

**Proposal 8: RAN2 to discuss whether it is OK to replace the conditional presence tags for fields used in uplink messages with field description explained the conditions under which the field is present.**

**Question 8**: please provide your views on proposal 8 of whether to replace the conditional presence tags for fields used in uplink messages with field description explained the conditions under which the field is present.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  (proponent) | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Disagree | The proposed changes are technically correct but not critical as the changes don’t impact UE implementations. Therefore, we see no stringent need to fix it. We can take it as lessons learned and for the future we should be more careful not to define conditional tags in UL. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The *nr-dl-tdoa-LocationInformation* etc. should not be connected with the *LocationSource*.  The *LocationSource* was originally introduced for standalone/device-based-hybrid to inform the LMF which positioning method(s) have been used for calculating the fix. However, for UE-based this is not always needed since a e.g. *NR-DL-TDOA-RequestLocationInformation* results in a *NR-DL-TDOA-ProvideLocationInformation* anyhow, and therefore, the *locationSource* is implicit.  If a field description is needed, it should be added for all fields in the *NR-DL-TDOA-ProvideLocationInformation-r16*, etc.  E.g., we don't have a field description for *A-GNSS-ProvideLocationInformation* either.  Maybe:  "This field provides location information for UE-based DL-TDOA." or similar should be sufficient – if not obvious. But the other field descriptions should then also be added.  I don't know if this is a Word issue or if the wrong version of the spec is used: When I open the specification on the server, it looks different compared to the version used for the CR (i.e, the ASN.1 alignments are muddled). |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | Agree with the intention to remove all the conditional tags and translate the into the field description, since UL message should not include any need code. However, we think the corrections provided by this CR are not complete, and prefer to check all the fields need to be corrected case by case. |
| Ericsson | No strong view | agree with Lenovo. If agreed can be combined with another CR |
| Nokia | Agree with modification | The newly added field descriptions could just reuse the same text from the corresponding explanation texts for the conditional presence tags that was deleted i.e. no need to go in to details of which field is set to 1 in which field in an IE. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 8**:

There is majority company (6/8) agree with the CR with some modifications proposed by QC, i.e., "This field provides location information for UE-based DL-TDOA." etc. One company thinks that no need to go in to details of which field is set to 1 in which field in an IE. However, according to rapporteur’s view, except to clarify the configuration conditions, the field description should also indicate the bit string mapping relations as other similar fields in TS37.355.

**Proposal 7: CR in** [**R2-2104050**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip) **can be agreed, without the change for the field description for nr-dl-tdoa-LocationInformation and nr-dl-AoD-LocationInformation. .**

## 3.9 Corrections to DL-PRS capability related IEs/fields

[R2-2104051](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104051.zip) addresses the corrections related with the DL-PRS capability and the following changes are proposed:

1. Clarify that *NR-DL-PRS-ProcessingCapabilityPerBand* is defined for a single positioning frequency layer on a certain band
2. In the field description for *NR-DL-TDOA/DL-AoD-ProvideCapabilities*

* For the field nr-DL-TDOA/AoD-mode, clarify that the bit for standalone should always be set to “0”
* In the field description for periodical reporting, clarify that the bit for standalone should be set to 0 and what are the meanings for the other bits for ue-based and ue-assisted
* remove the sentence” If this field is absent, the target device does not support *periodicalReporting* in *CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation*.”

1. In *NR-DL-AoD-MeasurementCapability*, remove “*srs-PosResource*” and clarify that it is “UE Multi-RTT measurements”

**Proposal 9: RAN2 to discuss whether it is OK to make above corrections proposed by** [**R2-2104051**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104051.zip)**.**

**Question 9**: please provide your views on proposal 9 of whether to agree above corrections proposed by R2-2104051.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  (proponent) | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The meaning of the bits for *PositioningModes* is not needed in all field descriptions, since described in the Common IEs anyhow.  The change for the *periodicalReporting* description is not needed, since this is currently aligned with all other methods.  I don't know if this is a Word Issue or if the wrong version of the spec is used: When I open the specification on the server, it looks different compared to the version used for the CR (i.e, the ASN.1 alignments are muddled). For example, the ASN.1 of the version used for the CR cannot compile. There is not even a space between e.g.,  nr-DL-TDOA-MeasurementCapability-r16NR-DL-TDOA-MeasurementCapability-r16.  So it seems the CR is not based on the spec version on the server. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree with modification | We do not agree with the second bullet of the 2nd change, since the original field (heightened as yellow) description already specify the meanings of each bit.  ***periodicalReporting***  This field, if present, specifies the positioning modes for which the target device supports *periodicalReporting.* This is represented by a bit string, with a one‑value at the bit position means *periodicalReporting* for the positioning mode is supported; a zero‑value means not supported. If this field is absent, the target device does not support *periodicalReporting* in *CommonIEsRequestLocationInformation*. |
| Ericsson | Agree with QC | The only change needed would be correction of perBand. So, this can be combined with other CR |
| Nokia | Disagree | We don’t see this CR as essential corrections. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 9**:

2/6 company think all the changes of the CR can be agreed;

1/6 company think that only the 1st change should be pursued;

2/6 company think that changes of the *periodicalReporting* is not needed since this is currently aligned with all other methods.

1/6 company think that changes of the *PositioningModes* is not needed since already described in common IEs.

1/6 company think the CR cannot be agreed, since all of the changes are not essential.

Given the above reasons, rapporteur propose that the 1st change and the 2nd change can be pursued.

**Proposal 8: The 1st change and the 3rd change of the CR in [R2-210405](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104050.zip)1 can be pursued.**

## 3.10 Clarifications for positioning error reporting

[R2-2104052](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip) points out the problem about the error cause for E-CID, DL-AOD, DL-TDOA and multi-RTT methods. Since the error for E-CID is only reported in *provideLocationInforamtion* for this version of LPP spec sent from device to the server. Hence, the following changes are proposed in [R2-2104052](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip):

1. Add in the IE description of *NR-ECID-Error* that in this version of specification, only *NR-ECID-TargetDeviceErrorCauses* can be chosed
2. Add in the IE description of *NR-DL-TDOA-Error*, *NR-DL-AoD-Error*, *NR-Multi-RTT-Error* that when *DL-TDOA-Error*, *DL-AoD-Error*, *Multi-RTT-Error* is included in *provideAssistanceData*, *locationServerErrorCauses* is chosen; while under *ProvideLocationInformation*, *targetDevidceErrorCauses* is chosen

**Rapporteur’s comments**: Except the proposed changes in [R2-2104052](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip), the same problems also exist in other positioning methods in both NR and LTE (NR since Rel-15, LTE since Rel-9), too much corrections but not essential need to be introduced if agreed. Besides, according to rapporteur’s view, there is no need to do such clarification since nothing is unclear or broken according to the current spec.

**Proposal 10: RAN2 to discuss whether need to further clarify the cases under which the two error types (*locationServerErrorCauses*, *targetDevidceErrorCauses*) should be included.**

**Question 10**: please provide your views on proposal 10 of whether need to further clarify the cases under which the two error types (*locationServerErrorCauses*, *targetDevidceErrorCauses*) should be included.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  (proponent) | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | The current text is used for all positioning methods and the CHOICE is obvious. |
| CATT | Disagree | Not essential, error types should be used in each of the LPP message is clear, i.e., *targetDevidceErrorCauses* always be used within UL LPP message, and *locationServerErrorCauses* always be used within DL LPP message. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | There is no need of this CR |
| Nokia | Disagree | We don’t see this CR as essential corrections. |
| ZTE | Disagree | The current text can be used for all positioning methods. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 10**:

There is no majority company agree with the CR. Opponents think this is not essential corrections, and the current text is used for all positioning methods.

**Proposal 9: CR in** [**R2-2104052**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip) **is not pursed.**

## 3.11 Add field description of additionalPaths

In [R2-2104269](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104269.zip) the following changes are proposed:

1. Add the field description of *additionalPath*s in *NR-DL-TDOA-RequestLocationInformation* and *NR-Multi-RTT-RequestLocationInformation*.

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to discuss whether it is agreeable to add the field description of *additionalPaths*.**

**Question 11**: please provide your views on proposal 11 of whether it is agreeable to add the field description of *additionalPaths*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | Not really useful. The values of the field “requested” is already self-explanatory. Can be merged to the other CRs with similar editorial corrections |
| Qualcomm | Agree with modification | The description should be aligned with other similar fields. E.g.,  This field, if present, indicates that the target device is requested to provide …  The CR should be based on the spec on the server. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | Minor corrections, can be merged to another similar editor CRs. |
| Ericsson | Agree | We are fine with wording.  But it seems everything is Optional for UE in LPP which is another problem as how it is written.  May need another full spec review/revision as companies are doing for need codes😊 |
| Nokia | Agree with modification | We suggest the following text proposal:  “This field, if present, indicates the target device should provide any additional detected paths timing values.” |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 11**:

All companies agree with the changes of the CR. Some companies think the wordings should be improved to align with other similar field descriptions. Besides, most companies think this is minor corrections and should be merged to another agreed CR. Thus, rapporteur propose to agree with the changes of the CR, but move it to the agreed CR R2-2102920.

**Proposal 10: The changes of the CR** [**R2-2104269**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104269.zip) **can be pursued with some modification proposed by QC, and can be merged to the CR R2-2104520.**

## 3.12 Timestamp reference

[R2-2102786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102786.zip) points out that the reference for generation of timestamp in NR positioning measurement report is based on information provided *nr-DL-PRS-ReferenceInfo*. However, the clarification is missing in TS37.355. Thus, [R2-2102786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102786.zip) proposes to make the following changes:

1. Add description of the construction of timestap and clarify these parameters come from reference cell.

**Rapporteur’s comments**: *nr-TimeStamp* is reported not only in DL-TDOA, but also in DL-AoD and Multi-RTT measurement which has no reference cell for measurement report. *nr-TimeStamp* is a common IE which doesn’t not only come from reference cell. So it seems no need to add this clarification.

**Proposal 12: The CR to add description of the construction of timestamp and clarify these parameters comes from reference cell is not agreed, since *nr-TimeStamp* is also reported in DL-AoD and/or Multi-RTT measurement which has no reference cell for measurement report.**

**Question 12**: please provide your views on proposal 12 to not add description of the construction of timestamp and clarify these parameters come from reference cell.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | No strong view, the reference in nr-DL-PRS-ReferenceInfo seems already clear. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Agree with Rapporteur’s comments. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | The IE *NR-TimeStamp* is a common IE. If there are restrictions/requirements on setting the fields, it should be described in the IEs where the *NR-TimeStamp* is used. |
| vivo | Agree with modification. | We still need this clarification, but can move it under DL-TDOA |
| CATT | Disagree | *nr-TimeStamp* is reported not only in DL-TDOA, but also in DL-AoD and Multi-RTT measurement which has no reference cell for measurement report. *nr-TimeStamp* is a common IE which doesn’t not only come from reference cell. |
| Nokia | Disagree | NR time stamp use is described in the parent IE where the time stamp is referenced. No need for this CR. It is also not correct. DL-TDOA signal measurement information IE, for example, defines clearly that the time stamp info depends on the cell involved in the measurement. It is not always the reference cell alone. DL-AoD and Multi-RTT measurement reports also use time stamp. Although, for those methods the timestamp is not described well, it is quite clear how the UE has to set the timestamp (based on descriptions already in DL-TDOA measurement report IE). Specification could be improved but it is not an essential correction. |
| ZTE | Disagree | Share the same view with Rapporteur. The clarification is not needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 12**:

There is no majority companies agree with the CR. They think that *nr-TimeStamp* is reported not only in DL-TDOA, but also in DL-AoD and Multi-RTT measurement which has no reference cell for measurement report. *nr-TimeStamp* is a common IE which doesn’t not only come from reference cell.

**Proposal 11: CR in** [**R2-2102786**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102786.zip) **is not pursued.**

# 4 Conclusion

Need to revise CRs:

* Merged into one CR:

**Proposal 1: CR in [R2-2102920](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102920.zip" \o "C:Usersmtk16923Documents3GPP Meetings202104 - RAN2_113bis-e, OnlineExtracts37355_CR0294_(Rel-16)_R2-2102920.docx) can be agreed and revised to R2-2104520 with the following modifications：**

1. **change the reference section number in the 1st change**
2. **consistent the wordings for the 2nd change, i.e., “DL PRS” to “DL-PRS”, “positioning frequency layer” to “Positioning Frequency layer”**
3. **add reference to TS38.214 for the 2nd change.**

**Proposal 5: The changes of the CR in [R2-2103924](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103924.zip) can be pursued and merged to the CR R2-2104520.**

**Proposal 10: The changes of the CR [R2-2104269](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104269.zip) can be pursued with some modification proposed by QC, and can be merged to the CR R2-2104520.**

* Revised CRs:

**Proposal 3: CR in [R2-2103921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103921.zip) can be agreed with some modifications, e.g., "e.g. ARFCN" should be modified to "e.g., DL-PRS PointA".**

**Proposal 6: CR in [R2-2104049](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104049.zip) can be agreed with the modifications proposed by QC and Nokia:**

1. **New Table entry for *nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* should be the first row of the field description Table.**
2. **"DL-PRS resource set ID"**🡪**"DL-PRS Resource Set ID**
3. **"DL-PRS source set"** 🡪 **"DL-PRS Resource Set"**
4. **"selected DL-PRS resource"** 🡪 **"selected DL-PRS Resource"**
5. ***dl-PRS-QCL-Info* sub-field, i.e., *dl-PRS* and *qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceID* should be updated as proposed by Nokia.**

**Proposal 7: CR in R2-2104050 can be agreed, without the change for the field description for nr-dl-tdoa-LocationInformation and nr-dl-AoD-LocationInformation.**

**Proposal 8: The 1st change and the 3rd change of the CR in R2-21040501 can be pursued.**

Not agreed CRs:

**Proposal 2: CR in [R2-2102921](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102921.zip) is not pursued, given that there are different views on the usage of code point “*ul-srs*”. Proponent may discuss offline with other companies to see if there is interest to come back to this issue in the next meeting.**

**Proposal 4: Proposals of [R2-2103923](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2103923.zip) are not pursued.**

**Proposal 9: CR in [R2-2104052](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2104052.zip) is not pursed.**

**Proposal 11: CR in [R2-2102786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113bis-e/Docs/R2-2102786.zip) is not pursued.**