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**Introduction**

In the latest approved/revised Rel-18 SID on study on expanded and improved NR positioning [1], an objective to evaluate and study the low power high accuracy requirement provided by SA1 was justified as follows.

|  |
| --- |
| * + Study the requirements on LPHAP as developed by SA1 and evaluate whether existing RAN functionality can support these power consumption and positioning requirements. Based on the evaluation, and, if found beneficial, study potential enhancements to help address any limitations [RAN2, RAN1]     - Study is limited to a single representative use case (use case 6 as defined TS 22.104). The choice of selected use case can be reviewed at the start of the study.     - Study is limited to enhancements to RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state |

This contribution provides a summary of the submitted contributions, issues for discussions and outcomes in RAN1#110bis-e meeting.

**Collection of proposals for online / email approval**

## 2.1 Proposals for Thursday online session

**[High] Proposal 4.1-2 (II)**

* From evaluations for a LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life required by LPHAP use case 6 in the majority of the evaluation scenarios that were examined.
* Based on the evaluations, potential enhancements to meet the target battery life in Rel-18 are necessary.
* Note: Send LS to RAN2 of the above outcome.

**[High] Proposal 4.1-1 (II)**

Capture the following in TR as an observation:

* For the evaluation on the battery life of the baseline LPHAP Type A device with battery capacity C2 of 800mAh:
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with baseline implementation factor K = 1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by 13 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [10/Sony], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [16/Samsung], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm], [21/Ericsson]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 13 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[10],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 13 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[10],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by 10 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 10 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[18],[20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 10 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[18],[20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by 12 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [16/Samsung], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm], [21/Ericsson]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 12 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 12 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source ([20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
* For the evaluation on the battery life of the optional LPHAP Type B device with battery capacity C2 of 4500mAh:
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with the baseline implementation factor K=1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by 8 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [10/Sony], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 6 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 ([4],[5],[6],[10],[13],[20]) and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for reporting and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 8 sources ([4],[5],[6],[10],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by 7 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2 , and is not achieved by 5 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 ([4],[5],[6],[13],[20]) and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 7 sources ([4],[5],[6],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by 7 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 5 sources ([4],[5],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 7 sources ([4],[5],[6],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source ([20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K < 4;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 1 source ([20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K < 4.
* Note: The implementation factor K is a factor related to the reference device in the model to convert the relative power unit to the battery life. Four values are introduced for K with K = 1 as the baseline and K = 0.5, 2, 4 as optional values. The model is captured in the Annex A.4.
* Note: Without otherwise noted, “high SINR” in the observation refers to the evaluation case that no intra-/inter-frequency RRM and single SSB for sunchronization purpose is considered.
* (Not captured in TR) Note: The number of sources and the references can be further updated in next meeting depending on companies’ updates of simulation results.

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-2 (I)**

* Evaluations show that UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain SRS (re)configuration significantly increases power consumption;
* Initial results also show that assuming no SRS (re)configuration is beneficial to improve battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

**[High] Proposal 5.1 (II)**

* For UL and DL+UL positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE, study the potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements on SRS for positioning in order to avoid frequent SRS (re)configuration, including at least the following:
  + The (pre-)configuration of SRS for positioning. FFS details, e.g., signaling and procedure, whether/how it is applicable to an area across multiple cells, consideration of UL overhead/capacity implied by (pre-)configuration and multiple cells, etc;
  + SRS for positioning activation/request procedure(s), e.g., NW activation of SRS via paging, UE request to obtain/update SRS via RACH-based procedure;
    - FFS: Events of invalidity of SRS configuration to trigger the UE request procedure.
  + FFS whether it is applicable to UEs in RRC\_IDLE state.

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-1 (I)**

* Evaluations show that extending paging DRX cycles beyond 10.24s provide power saving gains with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s and is beneficial to towards meeting the battery life requirement;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-3 (I)**

* Evaluations show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting/synchronization RS is beneficial to improve the battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-4 (I)**

* Evaluations show that paging and PEI triggered positioning measurement/transmission/reporting are beneficial to improve the battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

**[High] Proposal 5.2 (II)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements and potential RAN1 specification impact with respect to DRX and/or paging reception:
  + Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state
  + Paging optimizations, e.g., UE suspend monitoring paging occasions
    - FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.
  + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission
    - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, etc.
* Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress.

## 2.2 Proposals for 1st check point (Oct. 14th)

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-3 (II)**

* Evaluations show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting/synchronization RS ~~is beneficial to improve the battery life~~ reduces the power consumption;
* Note: This intermediate conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided and to add information about the number of sources.

**Remaining issues of evaluation methodology**

***Background:*** This agenda item aims to evaluate whether current RAN functionalities can meet the LPHAP requirement on battery life, and also potential enhancements to maximize the battery life. To better align the power consumption results for different evaluation cases from different companies and properly identify the performance gap and make conclusions, the evaluation methodology and power consumption models should be defined.

In RAN1#110 meeting, all remaining issues on the evaluation assumption were resolved except the power model of ultra-deep sleep.

## 3.1 Power model of ultra-deep sleep state

***Background:*** In RAN1#110 meeting, it was agreed to consider ultra-deep sleep state for the purpose of LPHAP evaluation. Two options of the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep state were proposed for further study, along with all the values in the power model:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  For the purpose of LPHAP evaluation, an ultra-deep sleep state is considered. The following options of the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep state can be further discussed:   * Option 1:   + The relative power unit: 0.015   + Additional transition energy: 2000   + Total transition time: 400ms * Option 2:   + The relative power unit: 0.01   + Additional transition energy: 450;   + Total transition time: 25ms   + FFS: restrictions in processing associated with option 2 after the UE comes out of ultra-deep sleep state * Notes: the values above can be further discussed   Agreement  For option 1 in the agreement above, the value of additional transition energy is changed to “a value between 2000 and 20000”. FFS which value. |

During the discussion in the last meeting, companies supporting each option have the following understanding:

* Option 1: Considers the evaluation assumption of “Power Saving State” in the study of NB-IoT as a starting point, where a UE consumes less power than that in RRC\_IDLE state by shutting down most of its power supplies to maintain a very low current, and accurate time/frequency synchronization with the network is not guaranteed.
* Option 2: Assumes a UWB-like LPHAP UE with limited communication functionalities and dedicated positioning capabilities, which can quickly wake up from an ultra-deep sleep mode to perform positioning operation only and hence has an optimized value for transition energy and time.

3.1.1 Summary of inputs

Based on the submitted contributions in this meeting, 11 companies (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson) discuss the power model of ultra-deep sleep state and/or adopt some of the models to provide evaluation results of battery life:

* **Issue #1: Whether down-selection of the two options is pursued**
  + 1 company (HW/Hisilicon) proposes to adopt both options as they refer to different wake-up states:
    - For Option 1, it is assumed that UE would be capable of the legacy “communication” service and the UE is expected to be ready to perform regular operations for communication when leaving from the sleeping mode, such as cell access, data transmission/reception, etc.
    - For Option 2, it is assumed that UE is implemented dominantly for positioning purpose so UE is only expected to be ready for positioning operation only when leaving from the sleeping mode.
  + 7 company (vivo, Nokia/NSB, Intel, ZTE, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm) mention in their contributions to adopt either one of them, due to the reason that, e.g., to avoid over-complicating the evaluations.
* **Issue #2: Option 1 vs Option 2**
  + Supporting Option 1: 10 companies (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson), in which,
    - 4 companies (vivo, Intel, Samsung, Qualcomm) explicitly propose to adopt Option 1 and show concerns on Option 2:
      * More justification is required on the feasibility and applicability of ultra-deep sleep option 2 in practical applications, as in the ultra-deep sleep, most of the hardware components are expected to be turned off which implies longer transition time.
      * No accurate synchronization is maintained in the ultra-deep sleep state, and it is not practical for a UE to wake up from ultra-deep sleep to only perform positioning functionalities without processing SSBs.
      * Option 2 assumes specialized device(s) with only positioning capabilities beyond the already defined devices (e.g. regular device or Redcap device), which is not in the study scope.
    - 3 companies (CATT, xiaomi, Ericsson) simply use Option 1 in their evaluations.
  + Supporting Option 2: 3 companies (HW/Hisilicon, ZTE, CMCC), in which,
    - Option 1 refers to the evaluation assumption of power saving states for NB-IoT, which shares different UE capabilities and bandwidth with that of the LPHAP device. It is not reasonable to take the assumptions for NB-IoT as a starting point.
    - Option 2 assumes a dedicated UE dominantly for positioning purpose, which is only expected to be ready for positioning operation when leaving from the sleeping mode.
* **Issue #3: Values of ultra-deep sleep state Option 1**
  + Additional transition energy
    - 3 companies (Intel, ZTE, CMCC) oppose to reuse the value of 20000 as defined in the study of NB-IoT, the rational include:
      * NB-IoT power model has only 2 sleep states (light sleep and deep sleep for idle state), and LPHAP has 4 sleep states (ultra-deep, deep, light, micro-sleeps). Assumption on which hardware components are turned off for the sleep state with normalized power value 1 are not the same in the two UEs.
      * NB-IoT needs looser synchronization, much less support bandwidth, and lower UE capability than NR UE.
      * From the evaluations, assuming 20000 as additional transition energy is no way to meet the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months for baseline LPHAP device. Please refer to the summary of results in Section 4.2.
    - The proposed additional transition energy is summarized below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Values | 2000 | 5000 | 20000 | 10000 |
| Source | CATT, Intel, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung | vivo | Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB | HW/Hisilicon |

* + Relative power unit: 1 company (HW/Hisilicon) prefers to align the relative power unit of the two options to 0.01.
* **Issue #4: Values of ultra-deep sleep state Option 2**
  + 2 companies (ZTE, CMCC) propose different values on Option 2:
    - Additional transition energy: ZTE proposes 480; CMCC proposes [800].
    - Transition time: CMCC proposes [50]ms.

3.1.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** Though only a few companies are supportive of Option 2 of the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state, seems that most companies do not realize the assumptions on Option 2 (e.g., a dedicated device with dominantly positioning capabilities and limited communication requirements), or do not think this kind of device type is in the study scope, or are not convinced by the processing restrictions (e.g., go strict to process positioning without get synchronized). FL suggest to have a round of discussion on Option 2 to let companies understand each other before going straight to Option 1.

In addition, regarding the values of the additional transition energy of Option 1, majority of companies admit the drawbacks of reuse 20000 as defined for NB-IoT. For values other than 20000, 2000 that proposed by 5 companies is taken as a starting point.

Therefore, the following proposal is formulated:

**[High] Proposal 3.1 (I)**

* For the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep type, down-select from the following two alternatives:
  + Alt. 1: Adopt the following option (modified option 1 from RAN1#110 meeting)
    - The relative power unit: 0.015
    - Additional transition energy: 2000;
    - Total transition time: 400ms
  + Alt. 2: Adopt the following options for different wake-up states
    - Option 1:
      * The relative power unit: 0.015
      * Additional transition energy: 2000;
      * Total transition time: 400ms
    - Option 2 (an optimized wake-up state):
      * The relative power unit: 0.01
      * Additional transition energy: 480;
      * Total transition time: 25ms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt.** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | 1 with 20000 and NOT 2000 | Sorry for the confusion in the paper. Our view is to use 20000. We don’t agree with the arguments above on using 2000. The reasoning of 2 states vs 4 states, we don’t think that makes a difference. It hasn’t been discussed what synchronization is needed for NR UE for an ultra-deep sleep state. There hasn’t been any related discussion in the Power Saving subagenda.  The fact that with 20K we don’t meet the requirements should not be an argument. It is enough to show gains and that the gap closes to motivate an enhancement. These models are either way very simplistic, and it is the reason there is also the implementation factor that can go up to “4”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt2 in principle | We would also like to clarify that supporting Option 2 does not mean that we discussing a positioning-only device without communication capability. In fact, we think this device should have communication capability as a regular NR IoT device (e.g. RedCap), but it can have an enhanced capability of operating in or being configured by the network to be in a positioning time duration when its communication capability is disabled within that duration to improve the power efficiency.  We think that both options should be adopted for a communication capable UE that is optimized for positioning power saving.  Option 1 is needed when UE wakes up to support communication type service, and option 2 is an optimizition when UE wakes up only to support positioning measurement or transmission.  Regarding the modified values of option 1, we do not think transition energy of 2000 is realistic with the transition time of 400ms, which effectively means 5 power unit per msec. During the transition time, UE is actually reloading full memories to a state that is completely communication capable, which is power hungry to our understanding. We think 10000 power unit for that case is more reasonable. |
| vivo | Alt.1 with larger than 2000 | Regarding ultra-deep sleep option 1, we still have strong concerns about current additional transition energy of 2000.  Firstly, the proponents think normalized power value 1 is not the same in the two UEs, and the reasoning about 2 states vs 4 states. Based on the understanding, we can find the LPHAP ultra sleep power may be lower than the NB-IoT ultra sleep power since it is relative to deep sleep. In this case, we can not understand why the transition power can be 10 times smaller than NB-IoT.  In addition, even the optional ultra sleep state that agreed to NB-IoT with relative power of 0.05, the transition power is 2500 and larger than 2000. So we are difficult to accept the transition power lower than 2500.   |  | | --- | | * + **(Baseline) Ultra-deep sleep** (according to the agreed ‘deep sleep’ assumptions for NB-IoT power consumption for power saving signal/channel [4]) * Relative power: 0.015 * Transition power unit: 20000 (50 per ms) * Total transition time: 400ms (200ms ramp up time and 200ms ramp down time)   + **(Optional) Ultra-deep sleep** (according to the agreed ‘deep sleep’ assumptions for NB-IoT power consumption for power saving signal/channel [4]) * Relative power: 0.05 * Transition power unit: 2500 (50 per ms) * Total transition time: 50ms |   lastly, when UE wakes up from ultra-deep sleep, the transition energy may consider the energy of boot, memory load and cold start. We would like to ask the majority whether the cold start procedure includes the cell selection or initial cell selection procedure or not since only one SSB procedure is evaluated in the subsequent process and when UE wakes up from the state of "almost off" and moves to some extent in an interval of 30 seconds, the UE may need to perform cell selection or initial cell selection during the process of waking up, which needs multiple instances measurements of SSB |
| Samsung | Alt 1 | For Alt 2, it’s true that there could be some difference on the power consumption based on the wake-up purpose, but we don’t think the difference is such huge as Option 1 vs Option 2.  For Alt 1, we are ok with the current numbers in the FL proposal, and can also be a little flexible on the transmission time if companies have concern that it’s too long. The value 400 ms is basically from NB-IoT, but we believe the NR device can be better than that. |
| Intel | Alt-1 | We do not see any clear arguments why NB-IoT power model should be applicable for NR device which may have different capabilities. We think it is important to choose transition energy carefully so that results/observations are not influenced in such a way that the battery life requirement can only be met under special or optional conditions.  @Qualcomm, it was indeed assumed during Rel-17 UE PS WI that UE may be out of sync when UE comes out of deep sleep in idle/inactive mode where DRX cycles are in the order of seconds. It is a common understanding that UE needs to receive sync or tracking signal before processing PDCCH or PDSCH signals. For ultra-deep sleep state, the necessity to establish sync after waking up is expected to be even more. |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt 1 with 20000 | Our view was not properly captured in the FL summary, and we added it into the table above. It does not make sense if we set the value to meet the requirement. We think the number should based based on the exisinting reference unless a clear justrifcation is provided. |
| CATT | Alt 1 | We are fine to consider larger than 2000 is the majority companies consider it is too small to be realistic. |
| ZTE | Alt 1 | We are open for the power consumption model selection, and prefer not to select Alt2. If have to choose between the two alternatives, we can support Alt1, to promote the relevant progress of the agreement. |
| Sharp | Alt 1 | We are open to have the transition power larger than 2000 for Alt 1. |
| CMCC |  | Regarding the 2 alternatives, our first preference is to select only one power model to avoid over-complicate the evaluation.  For the values of additional transition energy of option 1 power model, we’re not convinced by the reason why the value of NB-IoT should be reused. NB-IoT UE has different UE capabilities and bandwidth with that of a NR UE. Considering the comment that the power unit per msec of the transition is not reasonable when dditional transition energy of 2000 and transition time of 400ms are assumed, we are open to smaller value of transition time. |
| LGE | Alt 1 with larger than 2000 | During the power consumption modelling in NB-IoT, characteristic of NB-IoT device and power consumption of the other channel was studied in detail. We believe that NB-IoT and LPHAP device have differenent characteristic, thus applying power consumption model in NB-IoT without modification to LPHAP case seems not make sence for us. |
| Xiaomi |  | Actually we evaluate both Alt 1 and Alt 2 in our contribution. And Alt 2 can meet the requirement of 12 months batterly life. While Alt 1 can meet the requirement of 6 months battery life with eDRX 20.48s and 2000 as additional transition energy.  We are also fine to consider larger than 2000 for Option 1.  While for Option 2, the total transition time is really short. But we are open to study it, e.g., consider a longer transition time. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt 1 |  |

3.1.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***

Based on the inputs, though companies’ views are diverse, it would be good that we can understand each other better:

* **Alt. 1 vs. Alt. 2:** 12 companies support Alt. 1 except that 1 company (HW, Hisilicon) prefers Alt. 2. Though only 1 company are supportive of considering both Option 1 and Option 2 in the evaluation, it was mentioned that Option 1 refers to the procedure when UE wakes up to perform communication related service (e.g., paging reception) and Option 2 refers to an optimized procedure when UE wakes up to perform positioning measurement and/or transmission only. It seems a valid argument to me and I see no clear arguments to this point from companies. To my understanding, this issue is also coupled with some discussions in Section 5.10, 5.11 and 4.2. Some companies are concerned that this optimized procedure of UE may lead to the consideration of a new device type, which is clarified that no new UE type will be touched, it is just an existing UE (e.g., eMBB, R17/18 RedCap) operating in a power efficient mode for positioning without consideration of communication services. In such a case, the UE may not need to perform paging reception and the UE is then able to wake up from ultra-deep sleep to perform positioning measurement and/or transmission using Option 2 power model.
* **Option 1 of the ultra-deep sleep state:**
  + 2 companies (Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB) prefer to reuse 20000 that defined in NB-IoT;
  + 5 companies (vivo, Intel, CMCC, Samsung, LGE) think that it is not reasonable to resue the power model defined for NB-IoT UEs, in which 3 companies are fine with using 2000; while 2 companies are not convinced by 2000 in the proposal and prefers to have values larger than that;
  + 5 companies (HW/Hisilicon, CATT, ZTE, Sharp, xiaomi) are open to discuss or propose any values equal to or larger than 2000;

Therefore, the proposal is reformulated accordingly:

**[High] Proposal 3.1 (II)**

* For the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep type, adopt the following option:
  + The relative power unit: 0.015
  + Additional transition energy: 5000;
  + Total transition time: 400ms
* Note: When UE wakes up from the ultra-sleep state to perform positioning measurement and/or transmission only, Option 2 as agreed in RAN1#110 meeting can be adopted to evaluate the benefits of optimized paging reception.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with 5000 energy as a compromise.  Not quite clear of the intention of the note, since at least from our perspective, it’s impossible to achieve 0.01 power unit with such small transition time and energy, and this observation is not related to any UE behaviour after waking-up. If some companies have confidence in achieving Option 2, we are ok to make it an optional evaluation assumption, but no need to mandate its usage. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree with 5000. It is not based on any reference from a previous related work, we think it is too small and there hasn’t been technical discussion on a previous SI/WI yet in 3GPP. Gains can be shown from the enhancements even with larger values.  We also don’t agree with the note that Option 2 can be adopted. It is a very specific implementation that we don’t think it needs to be added for the purpose of showing gains and driving conclusions. |
| Nokia/NSB | We have similar view with Qualcomm. In case there are not clear references, the compromization way was to average the suggested values from other companies. We suggest 10,000 as a compromise. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the compromise. |
| intel | We can accept 5000 as compromise. We do not support the note. Option 2 is not agreed, it was listed as an Option in RAN1 110 for further discussion. |
| ZTE | We are generally open for the value of additional transition energy. But actually if we take too large transition energy, the battery life requirement cannot be satisfied. Whether further evaluation is needed for this revised value before making final agreement? |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with 5000 as compromise. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the compromised.  To ease the concern on the Note, we want to clarify that we do not have any intention to mandate ultra-deep sleep option 2. There indeed exists implementation optimization for positioning, which is feasible both based on our internal feasibility check and based on the other positioning communities.  Using larger K values as 4 would effectively means that all power states can be reduced by 3/4 power consumption, even for ultra-deep sleep state including the transition energy, which is not feasible to our understanding.  We suggest to the following modification with respect to the Note.   * Note: When UE wakes up from the ultra-sleep state to perform positioning measurement and/or transmission only, Option 2 as agreed in RAN1#110 meeting can be optionally adopted to evaluate the benefits of optimized paging reception. |
| vivo | In general, we are okay with the value considering it is larger than optional transition power at least. For example, the relative power is reduced from 0.05→0.015, correspondingly, the transition energy may be added from 2500→5000.   * + **(Optional) Ultra-deep sleep** (according to the agreed ‘deep sleep’ assumptions for NB-IoT power consumption for power saving signal/channel) * Relative power: 0.05 * Transition power unit: 2500 * Total transition time: 50ms   To ZTE, at least, 5000 can satisfy the requirement in most cases based on our evaluation. |
| LGE | We have similar view with Qualcomm and Nokia. The value should be determined based on technical discussion but we are not sure ‘5000’ can be a proper value due to the lack of discussion.  Also, we prefer to remove the note. Any company who prefer to investigate special implementation case can assume option 2, but it seems majarty think it is not a normal case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If we look at the evaluation results with Option 1 ultra-deep sleep with 5000 power unit per transition or higher from the submitted papers as follows:.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Companies | Percentage of power consumption of transition energy of ultra-deep sleep Option 1 | | vivo | 62-91% | | ZTE | 89-94% | | CMCC | 73-94% | | Qualcomm | 82-92% |   Clearly most of UE power is consumed in the transition period from such results in the table, which is not ecomonic for UE performing positioning with 1 yr battery life. Instead, UE performing postioning (e.g., transmitting SRS) accounting for the highest proportion of the total power should make more sense.  Even from the power contribution percentage analysis, adopted in general power saving SI/WI, it should not be difficult to realize that the transition energy needs optimization for positioning.  We are in positioning related study item, and such optimization for positioning should be encouraged but rather precluded without good reason. |

3.1.4 Round 3 discussion

***Summary from the 2nd round discussion***

Based on the inputs from the 2nd round, the overall situation did not change too much, as the comments were still quite controversial:

* For the note to optionally consider Option 2,
  + Concerns (4 companies): Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia, Intel, LGE, in which 2 companies have softer tones:
    - Samsung seems OK to optionally take Option 2 if supporting companies are able to achieve it;
    - LGE expressed that any company who prefer to investigate special implementation can assume Option 2;
  + OK to compromise (2 companies): HW, Ericsson;
* For the value of additional transition energy of Option 1,
  + Concerns on 5000 (3 companies): Qualcomm, Nokia (can live with 10000), LGE (as the rational of 5000 is not clear);
  + OK to compromise (7 companies): Samsung, Ericsson, Intel, ZTE, HW, xiaomi, vivo

I’d like to share some of my thinkings on this issue:

* I notified that in the 2nd round, companies did not insist on reusing the value of 20000 as defined in NB-IoT, it is possible that some companies are taking into account the argument of why reusing NB-IoT is not 100% reasonable. In this sense, we can further try to find a compromised value that are acceptable to all. Regarding the value of 5000 proposed in the last round, some companies mentioned that they were not sure about the technical rationale behind 5000. In fact, vivo raised a point that 5000 can be treated as a tradeoff value based on the optional transition power in NB-IoT (where the relative power decreases from 0.05 to 0.015, and hence the additional transition energy increases from 2500 to 5000). On the other hand, some companies expressed that they can compromise to the value of 10000. From the comments by vivo under Proposal 4.1-1, this value may be related to what procedures are considered during the transition, e.g., main radio hardware turn on, coase sync, cell search, etc., please take these into account when we discussing the value.
* Regarding the note, my feeling is that this should be based on technical considerations and we should try to avoid simply taking majority views. For the comments by HW on why Option 2 should not be completely precluded in the email, again, I still didn’t see any valuable arguments towards that.

The proposal is then updated as below.

**[High] Proposal 3.1 (III)**

* For the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep type,
  + Adopt the following option as the baseline:
    - The relative power unit: 0.015
    - Additional transition energy, down-select to one of the following:
      * Alt. 1: 5000;
      * Alt. 2: 10000
        + Note: The additional transition energy may be related to the procedures (e.g., main radio hardware turn on, coase sync, cell search, etc.) that are included within the transition time.
    - Total transition time: 400ms
  + Optionally, when UE wakes up from the ultra-sleep state to perform positioning measurement and/or transmission only, Option 2 in RAN1#110 meeting may be adopted to evaluate the benefits of optimized paging reception.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | First, we appreciate all the hard word that the FL is doing to progress in the subagenda and especially this topic. Unfortunately, we still have technical concerns with both 5K and 10K values. We don’t see the technical merit of using these over the established 20K value.  Furthermore, pointing out that Option 2 may be adopted is too much to agree on. Companies are allowed to evaluate Option 2 if they are interested, but now the above statement it appears as if all companies (i.e. RAN1 collectively) puts the Option 2 in the bucket of “optional” configurations. We don’t think that there is such consensus at this point, especially if it just a single company.  If the proposal is written as: “Power consumption analysis from individual companies with Option 2 can be captured in the TR”, or something similar, we ll be OK. Similar approach is happening in the other subagenda (e..g Redcap) where a few companies want to capture the CPP results but there is no majority to look into it further. |
| Vivo | How about taking two values for the evaluation, e.g 5000, and 20000. |
| ZTE | We are generally open for the value of additional transition energy. But we prefer only adopt one option for battery life evaluation.  From another perspective, the additional transition energy of ultra-deep sleep should be greater than that of deep sleep, even if the LPHAP device only wake up to perform positioning only, but the second bullet adopted option 2, where the additional transition energy of ultra-deep sleep is the same as that of deep sleep. So we suggest to delete the second subbullet.  Or if have to use option 2, we can agree on the revised additional transition energy as 480, which is greater than that of deep sleep.  If the power consumption model cannot be decided we are OK to do more evaluation to choose a more appropriate value towards transition energy for ultra-deep sleep. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FL’s effort on moderating this issue for moving forwared is really appreciated.  As the second comment made in Round-2, we observed from other companies’ resultes as summaried in the table, most of UE power is consumed in the transition period but not in transmission or reception for performing positioning, which to us does not justify USD option1 as the baseline but rather justify option2 as the baseline, to reach the LPHAP target.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Companies | Percentage of power consumption of transition energy of ultra-deep sleep Option 1 | | vivo | 62-91% | | ZTE | 89-94% | | CMCC | 73-94% | | Qualcomm | 82-92% |   With that said, we are not against to evaluate USD option 1 since it has a majority support, but precluding USD option2 or lower its importance by “optionally may be adopted” looks unfair, at least we don’t see the technical reasoning to do so.  For moving forward, instead of down-selection/prioritization, I’d like to suggest we focusing on spelling out the difference for two options, e.g., what functions are assumed to be powered on after waking up from the USD and the associated transition time/energy, etc, so that companies can provide the feasibility investigation for each interested option(s), which is supposed to be what we need to do in the study item. |
| FL | Thanks for the inputs so far. Here are some of my replies:  To Qualcomm: Regarding the values of 5k and 10k, I think these are values relaxing from 20k in NB-IoT, as pointed out by some companies, they don’t think reusing 20k in NB-IoT is reasonable. For example, NR and NB-IoT UEs have many differences (e.g., UE capabilities, bandwidth, etc.), and NB-IoT has two sleep states while LPHAP has four sleep states, basically, they have different assumptions and charateristics (e.g., whether sync is maintained) on the sleep state having the normalized relative power unit, and hence, the power supplied to be ON and procedures to be operated during transition time is quite different.  To vivo: Thanks for the suggestion. My feeling is that having two values will further complicate the evalutions and captureing observations, so my first preference is still to have 1 value, but if we have no way out, maybe we can consider 2 values at most.  To ZTE: My suggestion is that we make the decision in this meeting and do not postpone this issue to the next meeting; otherwise, it would be difficult to make observations in the next meeting. In fact, there are many companies try evaluate multiple values in the last meeting, and I don’t think the situation would change in three weeks.  To HW: I somehow have a feeling that it is the values of Option 2 that some companies have concerns on. To some companies, even a UE performs the optimized wake-up procedure to perform positioning only, the transition energy and time of Option 2 are still too small to be rational.  The comments are still quite controversial, Qualcomm thinks that Option 2 may be adopted is too much to agree on (which is basically Alt. 1 in Round 1) while HW suggests to consider both without further down-selection as these two options refer to different wake-up procedures (which is basically Alt. 2 in Round 1). I’m wondering if I can figure out something that is acceptable to both sides…  Let’s hear more views till the end of Round 3, maybe we have to bring this situation online to see how the group stands. |
| LGE | For option 1, as commented by several companies, reusing NB-IoT power consumption model directly seems not be reasonable since the NR device has different characteristic from NB-IoT. Meanwhile, QC’s comment regarding K factor assumption seems reasonable as well; we already have very flexible power consumption model which allows considering various type of implementations. From these perspective, we think 10K value would be acceptable as a compromise way since it can cover both 5K and 20K value by applying different K value. However we are open to hear other companies view to determine the value with more technical background.  For option 2, we tend to agree with QC’s view. If few companies prefer to consider this option, we may not need to make agreement on it. |
| Intel | Alt-1 5000 was already a compromise. We cannot accept 10000 or 20000. Capability- and the device architecture-wise, there are quite significant gaps between an NB-IoT UE and an NR UE, and thus, transition energy cannot be blindly copied from that for NB-IoT devices. To reiterate the these points, there are significant differences in number of sleep states between the NB-IoT and NR UE power consumption models, and, more importantly, on the definition of the state with normalized power consumption value of one unit – for NB-IoT, this corresponds to a “light sleep” state with sync maintained, while for NR, this corresponds to a “deep sleep” state without sync maintenance. Thus, transition energy expended for a NR UE in transitioning from an ultra-deep sleep state to deep sleep state should be much smaller than that for NB-IoT UE that transitions from the “deep sleep” state to “light sleep” state. For a UE implementing an optimized ultra-deep sleep state, from a technical standpoint, it is rather reasonable to expect a transition mechanism that is relatively more efficient than an assumption corresponding to about half decade ago.  Regarding Option 2, we can be open to the proposal that companies can report the model and capture results based on that in TR for progress. However, we suggest to clearly clarify and capture the following point as part of the ultra-deep sleep power model.   * No new device type or RAN1 impact is expected based on ultra-deep sleep power modeling |
| Samsung | We are ok with 5000 as the transition energy, and we echo the comment that NR device may not have to follow the same values as LTE NB-IoT device. Anyway, we prefer to make a decision within this meeting on this number, which is essentially helpful for providing stable simulation results to the TR.  Regarding the use of Option 2, LP-WUS has similar discussion of ultra deep sleep, and the minimum transition energy is 2000, so we still believe the number in Option 2 is too small for implementation. Even with optimization of waking up with particular purpose, it’s not easy to optimize the energy consumption in ramping down procedure, which may already take the level 1000 energy unit in our undertstanding. |

## 3.2 Other considerations

3.2.1 Summary of inputs

In [6/Nokia, NSB], it is proposed to add the following note to the conclusion on positioning accuracy made at RAN1#109-e meeting:

**Proposal 1:** Add the following note to the conclusion made at RAN1#109.

* Note: This does not imply anything about if the Rel-16/17 positioning technique can achieve the target horizontal positioning accuracy requirement based on the baseline assumption for power consumption evaluation of LPHAP.

The intention is that the baseline assumption on the power model of the DL PRS measurement considers 4 TRPs in the LPHAP evaluation; while in Rel-17 InF scenario for evaluation of positioning accuracy, UE needs to measure 18 TRPs. Hence, it may have risk of achieving the target requirement of accuracy with the baseline assumptions of LPHAP evaluation.

3.2.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** Though the baseline assumption on the power model of the DL PRS measurement is not aligned with that in the accuracy evaluation in Rel-17 InF scenario with 18 TRPs, my suggestion is not to add this note. We can consider the LPHAP baseline assumption as TDMed measuring 18 TRPs across 5 I-DRX cycles (within 1 I-DRX cycle, 4 TRPs are measured), where with the baseline assumption of I-DRX cycle = 1.28s, we have 5 cycles = 6.4s. In addition, we also agreed that the UE mobility is up to 3km/h, then with a duration of 6.4s, the UE moves about 5.3m, which is trivial, and the overall environment and configuration can be considered as the same.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | For the accurate location estimation, the measurements should be obtained within short time. Although we could consider TDM to measure 18 TRPs, the location where the UE got the measurement could be different. If the majority does not want to revisit the previous conclusion, at least we would like to ask companies to keep in mind the baseline assumption for power reduction is not aligned with the baseline assumption for the accuracy evaluation of Rel-17. |
| FL | Please continue provide your views on this issue, if any. |
| ZTE | Generally agree with Nokia’s view. Actually I-DRX cycle=1.28s is the baseline assumption, and in many evaluations, DRX cycle greater than 1.28s, e.g., 10.24s, is considered to meet the battery life requirement. Thereupon, the measurement duration will be greater. |

**Evaluation results**

## [Closed] 4.1 Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning

4.1.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing submitted contributions in this meeting, ~~12~~13 (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Sony, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, ZTE) out of 20 companies provide evaluations for baseline Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning. The results for each positioning method are summarized below.

Note: Without otherwise noted, “High SINR” refers to the case that no intra-/inter-frequency RRM is considered, and “Low SINR” refers to the case that multiple SSB bursts are used for synchronization, intra-frequency, and inter-frequency RRM.

**Table 1: Summary for results of UE-assisted DL positioning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Evaluation case description | Target requirement are met – Yes/No | |
| 6 months | 12 months |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Spreadtrum [4] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| vivo [5] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, RA-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, RA-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, RA-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, RA-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Nokia,NSB [6] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| CATT [8] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Sony [10] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| ZTE[11] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| xiaomi [12] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| CMCC [13] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| Samsung [16] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, Low SINR, RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR, RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| LGE [18] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| Qualcomm [20] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Ericsson [21] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   8 TRP receptions; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   8 TRP receptions; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |

**Table 2: Summary for results of UE-based DL positioning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Evaluation case description | Target requirement are met – Yes/No | |
| 6 months | 12 months |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Spreadtrum [4] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| vivo [5] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Nokia,NSB [6] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| CATT [8] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| ZTE[11] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| xiaomi [12] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| CMCC [13] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| LGE [18] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Qualcomm [20] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |

**Table 3: Summary for results of UL positioning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Evaluation case description | Target requirement are met – Yes/No | |
| 6 months | 12 months |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Cell access procedures per 10.24s | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Spreadtrum [4] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| vivo [5] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Nokia,NSB [6] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| CATT [8] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| ZTE[11] | I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| xiaomi [12] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| CMCC [13] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| Samsung [16] | I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, Low SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| I-DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| LGE [18] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; No inter-frequency RRM; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, Low SINR;   Gap between paging and PRS is minimized; BWP switching; | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 0.5, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 0.5, Type B: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| Qualcomm [20] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| Ericsson [21] | I-DRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |

**Table 4: Summary for results of DL+UL positioning**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Evaluation case description | Target requirement are met – Yes/No | |
| 6 months | 12 months |
| Qualcomm [20] | 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   No SRS (re)configuration; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |
| 1. DRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;   RA-SDT for SRS (re)configuration per power cycle; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |

To sum up, evaluation results on Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state are provided by ~~12~~13 sources (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Sony, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson; ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:

* For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (12 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~12~~13** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); Sony (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Samsung (K = 1); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); Ericsson (K = 1); ZTE (K = 4)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~12~~13** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); Sony (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Samsung (K = 1); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); Ericsson (K = 1); ZTE (K = 4)];
* For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (9 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~9~~10** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); ZTE (K = 4)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~9~~10** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); ZTE (K = 4)];
* For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (11 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~11~~12** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Samsung (K = 1); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); Ericsson (K = 1); ZTE (K = 4)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: ~~11~~12** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CATT (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Samsung (K = 1); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4); Ericsson (K = 1); ZTE (K = 4)];
* For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 1,4)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES 0; NO: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 1,4)];
* For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (7 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: ~~5~~6** [Spreadtrum (K = 4); Nokia/NSB (K = 4); CMCC (K = 4); LGE (K = 2,4); Qualcomm (K = 4)]; ZTE (K = 2,4); **NO: 7** [Spreadtrum (K = 1,2); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1); Sony (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2); LGE (K = 0.5,1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: ~~2~~3** [LGE (K = 4); Qualcomm (K = 4); ZTE (K = 4)]; **NO: ~~7~~8** [Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia (K = 1,4); Sony (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2); Qualcomm (K = 1); ZTE (K = 2)];
* For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (6 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: ~~5~~6** [Spreadtrum (K = 4); Nokia/NSB (K = 4); CMCC (K = 4); LGE (K = 2,4); Qualcomm (K = 4); ZTE (K = 2,4)]; **NO: 6** [Spreadtrum (K = 1,2); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2); LGE (K = 0.5,1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: ~~2~~3** [LGE (K = 4); Qualcomm (K = 4); ZTE (K = 4)]; **NO: ~~6~~7** [Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K = 1,4); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2); Qualcomm (K = 1); ZTE (K = 2)];
* For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (6 sources in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: ~~5~~6** [Spreadtrum (K = 4); Nokia/NSB (K = 4); CMCC (K = 4); LGE (K = 2,4); Qualcomm (K = 4); ZTE (K = 2,4); **NO: 6** [Spreadtrum (K = 1,2); vivo (K = 1); Nokia/NSB (K =1); CMCC (K = 1,2); LGE (K = 0.5,1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: ~~2~~3** [LGE (K = 4); Qualcomm (K = 4); ZTE (K = 4)]; **NO:  ~~6~~7** Spreadtrum (K = 1,2,4); vivo (K = 1); Nokia (K = 1,4); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); LGE (K = 0.5,1,2); Qualcomm (K = 1); ZTE (K = 2)];
* For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
  + Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 1)];
  + Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 1)];

Based on the submitted evaluation results, we can safely conclude that the existing RAN functionality cannot meet the target requirement with baseline evaluation assumptions and devices, and it is necessary to study enhancements to improve the battery life.

4.1.2 Round 1 discussion

From the inputs, the following initial observations can be made:

**[High] Proposal 4.1-1 (I)**

Capture the following in TR as an observation:

* For the evaluation on the battery life of the baseline LPHAP Type A device:
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state;
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by ~~12~~13 sources (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Sony, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~12~~13 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~12~~13 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by ~~9~~10 sources (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, xiaomi, CMCC, LGE, Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~9~~10 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~9~~10 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by ~~11~~12 sources (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~11~~12 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by ~~11~~12 sources even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source (Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
* For the evaluation on the battery life of the optional LPHAP Type B device:
  + Based on the results provided by a majority of sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state;
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by ~~7~~8 sources (Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, Sony, CMCC, LGE, Qualcomm, ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by ~~4~~5 sources with the implementation factor K = 4 and by ~~1~~2 source with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 6 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 and by 1 source with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by ~~2~~3 sources with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for reporting and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 7 sources with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by ~~6~~7 sources (Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, LGE, Qualcomm, ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by ~~4~~5 sources with the implementation factor K = 4 and by ~~1~~2 source with the implementation factor K >= 2 , and is not achieved by 5 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 and by 1 source with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by ~~2~~3 sources with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 6 sources with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by ~~6~~7 sources (Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, LGE, Qualcomm, ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by ~~4~~5 sources with the implementation factor K = 4 and by ~~1~~2 source with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 5 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 and by 1 source with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by ~~2~~3 source with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 6 sources with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source (Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 1 source with implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source with implementation factor K < 4;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 1 source with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source with implementation factor K < 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It should be good if the conclusion could mention or cite the definition of Type A/Type B and implementation factor K, because we assume that this observation will appear in the main body of the TR, while the definition of Type A/Type B and K appears in the annex. |
| Vivo | Generally okay  But we prefer the baseline (K=1)can be summarized separately and point out whether the requirement can be satisfied based on baseline assumption. |
| FL | Valid points are raised from HW and vivo, we can make the observation clearer and more straightforward. Let me update the proposal accordingly. Note that the observation is quite long, the unchanged part is omitted to make things concise:  **Proposal 4.1-1 (I)**  Capture the following in TR as an observation:   * For the evaluation on the battery life of the baseline LPHAP Type A device with battery capacity C2 of 800mAh:   + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requiremet of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with baseline implementation factor K = 1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;   + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;   + [unchanged part omitted]; * For the evaluation on the battery life of the optional LPHAP Type B device with battery capacity C2 of 4500mAh:   + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requiremet of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with the baseline implementation factor K=1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;   + Based on the results provided by a majority of sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;   + [unchanged part omitted]; * Note: The implementation factor K is a factor related to the reference device in the model to convert the relative power unit to the battery life. Four values are introduced for K with K = 1 as the basline and K = 0.5, 2, 4 as optional values. The model is captured in the Annex A.4. * Note: Without otherwise noted, “high SINR” in the observation refers to the evaluation case that no intra-/inter-frequency RRM is considered. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the great efforts. A couple comments:   1. We regard to Type B device, we think that the first subbulet (shown below) is oversimplifying the outcome of the evaluation. For example, for a 6 month target, there are 4 companies out of the 7 that meet the requirements for K=4, so it is a majority for that scenario.    1. “Based on the results provided by a majority of sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;”   We suggest to remove it and keep just the remaining bullets that are more precise. Note that the corresponding bullet for Type A is OK because for all sub-scenarios indeed majority of sources didn’t meet the requirements.   1. Suggest in the Type-B device summary, when we say “4 companies” to also add the names of the companies, so that it is a bit easier for each company could check that their results has been counted |
| Samsung | In general ok with the proposal. We should add a note that the number of sources and source names can be further updated in the next meeting. |
| Intel | OK with FL’s updated proposal. Perhaps in the following bullet, it can be made clear that “provided by X out Y sources “ instead of majority of sources   * + Based on the results provided by a majority of sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions; |
| CATT | The revised version provided by the FL is fine to us. |
| ZTE | We added Rel-17 related power consumption evaluation result in the revised proposal [11], and the statistical data in this summary (Sections 4.1.1-4.1.2) is modified in this doc, which is marked in red. Generally OK with the revised version, two small typos in the FL reply, ‘requiremet ’->’requirement’, ‘basline’->’baseline’ |
| Sharp | The updated FL proposal seems OK. |
| LGE | We are generally fine with FL’s updated proposal.  One minor comment is that it would be better clarifying that these observations are for RRC\_INACTIVE STATE to avoid misunderstanding.   * For the evaluation on the battery life of the baseline LPHAP Type A device in RRC\_INACTIVE state with battery capacity C2 of 800mAh: * For the evaluation on the battery life of the optional LPHAP Type B device in RRC\_INACTIVE state with battery capacity C2 of 4500mAh: |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| Sony | Fine with the FL’s updated proposal. We can discuss the further detailed refinements during online session. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the updated proposal. |

**[High] Proposal 4.1-2 (I)**

Capture the following in TR:

* From evaluations for the baseline LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life developed by LPHAP use case 6, potential enhancements to meet the target battery life should be pursued in Rel-18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes. |
| vivo | OK |
| Qualcomm | We think that we need to be more specific on which enhancements and it may be looked at a case-by-case basis in which enhancement should be pursued. We also suggest that change it such that it reflects that for the majority of scenarios we cannot satisfy the battery life. Also, we don’t see why we need to only talk about “baseline LPHAP device”.   * From evaluations for a ~~the~~ ~~baseline~~ LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life developed by LPHAP use case 6 in the majority of the evaluation scenarios that were examined. ~~potential enhancements to meet the target battery life should be pursued in Rel-18.~~ |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal in general. May be the last sentence should be reformulated as “RAN1 recommends to support potential enhancements to meet the target battery life in Rel-18”, instead of directly determining the working scope which is not the RAN1 discussion. |
| Intel | OK. We think it is important to identify what is baseline, what is optional assumption in the observations. Suggest to keep them. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| CATT | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Sharp | OK |
| LGE | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

**[High] Question 4.1**

* In RAN2#119-e meeting, the following agreement was made that RAN2 will wait for RAN1’s conclusion on whether the existing RAN functionality can satisfy the requirement:

RAN2 shall wait for RAN1 conclusions from evaluations on UE power consumption with respect to baseline functionality and whether enhancements are needed. RAN2 will study potential areas for higher layer enhancements that may result in reduction of UE power consumption.

* Do your think that RAN1 should send LS to RAN2 with observations and agreements that are going to be made on existing RAN functionality in this meeting?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | OK with the LS, but we do not think that is the most efficient way. Anyway RAN2 delegates can be informed even without an LS given this is RAN2-led objective anyway. |
| vivo | Yes | In our SID objective, it was said ‘Based on the evaluation, and, if found beneficial, study potential enhancements to help address any limitations’, therefore, it is better to send LS to RAN2 for them to identify potential enhancements. |
| Qualcomm |  | OK to send an LS after this meeting, but no strong view. We are OK also to not send an LS. |
| Samsung |  | OK with the LS, although it may not be essentially needed, since RAN2 should be able to check RAN1 chairman notes anyway. |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | We are okay to send an LS. RAN1 is trying to capture observations based on the evaluation based on baseline assumption, and the above proposal 4.1.2-(I) mention “potential enhancmenets should be pursued”. In the first sentence of RAN2 agreement, we think RAN2 wait this conclusion from RAN1. |
| CATT | Yes | OK to send an LS to RAN2. |
| Sharp |  | OK with the LS. We are also OK to not send the LS. |
| CMCC | Yes | We believe that RAN2 waits this conclusion from RAN1. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Fine to send an LS to RAN2 |
| Sony | Yes | In principle, we support to send LS. The question is whether to send the LS in this meeting or wait until RAN1#111 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |

4.1.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion:***

* **On Proposal 4.1-1 (I)**: Majority of companies are fine with the layout and provide comments to refine the observations, including:
* Definition of LPHAP Type A/B devices and implementation factor K should be cited;
* Explicitly pointing out the results of baseline K = 1 and evaluation assumptions;
* Highlight of the outcome of Type B device regarding the optional K and assumptions are over-simplified;
  + @Intel suggests to use “x out of y sources” instead of “a majority of sources”, however, it happens that results provided by some sources show that part of optional cases can meet the target requirement while the others not. In this sense, I guess we can just remove this highlight bullet and let the remaining details show the precise situation, as suggested by Qualcomm.
* Adding source names instead of vaguely saying number of sources;
* Adding a note that number of sources and source names can be further updated in the next meeting;
* Updates of results by 1 source;
* Typos in the observation;
* Adding “in RRC\_INACTIVE state” in the 2 main bullets
  + @LGE: It is commonly known that this observation is for the baseline Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state, and in the bullets to highlight outcomes for each LPHPA device type, it is explicitly state that “the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved **by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state**”. I guess it should be clear and hopefully it addresses your concern.

The comments are reflected in the updated Proposal 4.1-1 (II).

* **On Proposal 4.1-2 (I):** Majority of views are fine with the proposal and some companies raise the point that which enhancements are needed should be more specific and determined case-by-case. I agree; however, the intention of this proposal is as per the RAN2 agreement, in which RAN2 will wait for RAN1 conclusions from evaluations on UE power consumption with respect to baseline functionality and **whether enhancements are needed**. I guess we can structure a general conclusion saying that target requirement cannot be met for most scenarios, and enhancements are indeed required.
* **On Question 4.1:** Companies are either think that a LS should be sent or OK/no strong views on informing RAN2. I think in this sense, there seems no harm to send a LS to RAN2 on the agreement and observations made by RAN1 regarding the existing RAN functionality.

Based on the comments, the following proposals are updated:

**[High] Proposal 4.1-1 (II)**

Capture the following in TR as an observation:

* For the evaluation on the battery life of the baseline LPHAP Type A device with battery capacity C2 of 800mAh:
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with baseline implementation factor K = 1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by 13 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [10/Sony], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [16/Samsung], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm], [21/Ericsson]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 13 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[10],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 13 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[10],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by 10 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 10 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[18],[20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 10 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[18],[20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by 12 sources ([2/HW,Hisilicon], [4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [8/CATT], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [16/Samsung], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm], [21/Ericsson]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 12 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 12 sources ([2],[4],[5],[6],[8],[11],[12],[13],[16],[18],[20],[21]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source ([20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 0 source, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) even with the most power efficient case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4.
* For the evaluation on the battery life of the optional LPHAP Type B device with battery capacity C2 of 4500mAh:
  + Based on the results provided by all sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with the baseline implementation factor K=1 and baseline evaluation assumptions;
  + ~~Based on the results provided by a majority of sources, the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state with optional implementation factor K or optional evaluation assumptions;~~
  + For UE-assisted DL positioning, results are provided by 8 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [10/Sony], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 6 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 ([4],[5],[6],[10],[13],[20]) and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, CG-SDT for reporting and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 8 sources ([4],[5],[6],[10],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UE-based DL positioning, results are provided by 7 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2 , and is not achieved by 5 sources with the implementation factor K < 4 ([4],[5],[6],[13],[20]) and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 7 sources ([4],[5],[6],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For UL positioning, results are provided by 7 sources ([4/Spreadtrum], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia,NSB], [11/ZTE], [13/CMCC], [18/LGE], [20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 4 sources ([4],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K = 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K >= 2, and is not achieved by 5 sources ([4],[5],[6],[13],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4 and by 2 sources ([11],[18]) with the implementation factor K < 2;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 3 sources ([11],[18],[20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 7 sources ([4],[5],[6],[11],[13],[18],[20]) with the implementation factor K < 4.
  + For DL+UL positioning, results are provided by 1 source ([20/Qualcomm]) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - The target requirement of 6 months is achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K < 4;
    - The target requirement of 12 months is achieved by 1 source ([20]) with the case that I-DRX cycle of 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX cycle, high SINR, no SRS (re)configuration, CG-SDT for measurement reporting, and implementation factor K = 4, and is not achieved by 1 source ([20]) with implementation factor K < 4.
* Note: The implementation factor K is a factor related to the reference device in the model to convert the relative power unit to the battery life. Four values are introduced for K with K = 1 as the baseline and K = 0.5, 2, 4 as optional values. The model is captured in the Annex A.4.
* Note: Without otherwise noted, “high SINR” in the observation refers to the evaluation case that no intra-/inter-frequency RRM is considered.
* Note: The number of sources and the references can be further updated in next meeting depending on companies’ updates of simulation results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal in general.  For the note of “high SINR”, at least in our evaluation, we also refer to single SSB for synchronization purpose after waking up, which is used in Rel-17 UE power saving evaluation as well. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Thanks for all your efforts. We are okay with this proposal, but we believe the last note will not be captured in the TR. |
| Intel | OK |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Support the proposal  To Samsung and all, we would like to confirm whether the cell selection procedure or initial cell selection procedure is needed from ultra sleep to wake up. If it is needed, whether the transition procedure includes the cell selection or initial cell selection procedure or not since a single SSB is considered after waking up. |
| LGE | Generraly OK  For the FL’s answer regarding our 1st round comment, our intention was to make it clear that all the subbullets in the observation is for RRC\_Inactive state. The text “the target requirement of 6~12 months is not achieved by the existing Rel-17 positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE state” is captured in a subbullet and it seems for me that the text is applied for the subbullet only. However, if it does not cause misinterpretation to all others, we are fine with current proposal. |
| Sharp | OK |
| OPPO | Fine |
| FL1 | To vivo:  This proposal is regarding baseline Rel-17 inactive positioning, and no ultra-deep sleep state is considered.  Whether the cell selection procedure is required when UE wakes up from ultra-deep sleep, I’m not sure if companies share common understanding. I think it is related to the additional transition energy we are trying to converge. Maybe we can ask companies’ views under Proposal 3.1, and I hope it would also help companies align their understanding on the candidate value.  I’ll reflect this comment under Proposal 3.1 after today’s online. |
| FL2 | Most companies are fine with the proposal. The proposal is revised based on minor comments from Samsung and Nokia on the last two notes.  **[High] Proposal 4.1-1 (II)**  [Unchanged part omitted]   * Note: Without otherwise noted, “high SINR” in the observation refers to the evaluation case that no intra-/inter-frequency RRM and single SSB for sunchronization purpose is considered. * (Not captured in TR) Note: The number of sources and the references can be further updated in next meeting depending on companies’ updates of simulation results. |
| FL | Consensus has been reached during Thursday GTW online. Let’s close this issue. |

**[High] Proposal 4.1-2 (II)**

* From evaluations for a LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life developed by LPHAP use case 6 in the majority of the evaluation scenarios that were examined.
* Based on the evaluations, RAN1 recommends to support potential enhancements to meet the target battery life in Rel-18.
* Note: Send LS to RAN2 with the observations on evaluation results of the Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | In the general, the modified proposal is okay. One question is if the note means the LS includes the long observations on the evaluation result of the above proposal. We think RAN2 just needs conclusion from RAN1, and it might be enough to include the first two bullet in the LS. |
| Ericsson | OK with the principle, but the last sentence sounds too much like the conclusion of the SI. We propose the following rewording:   * From evaluations for a LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life required by LPHAP use case 6 in the majority of the evaluation scenarios that were examined. * Based on the evaluations, potential enhancements to meet the target battery life in Rel-18 are necessary. |
| Intel | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | OK |
| LGE | Ok |
| Sharp | OK |
| OPPO | OK |
| FL | Seems that companies are fine with this proposal, meanwhile, several companies pointed out that no need to send the overall observations to RAN2, a conclusion is good to go.  Revised proposal for online:  **[High] Proposal 4.1-2 (II)**   * From evaluations for a LPHAP device, RAN1 acknowledges that the existing Rel-17 positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state cannot satisfy the target battery life required by LPHAP use case 6 in the majority of the evaluation scenarios that were examined. * Based on the evaluations, potential enhancements to meet the target battery life in Rel-18 are necessary. * Note: Send LS to RAN2 of the above outcome. |
| FL | Consensus has been reached during Thursday GTW online. Let’s close this issue. |

## 4.2 Rel-18 potential enhancements

4.2.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing submitted contributions in this meeting, 12 (HW/Hisilicon, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Sony, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson) out of 20 companies provide evaluations for Rel-18 potential enhancements to maximize the battery life. The results are summarized below.

**Table 5: Summary for results of Rel-18 potential enhancements**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Evaluation case description | Target requirement are met – Yes/No | |
| 6 months | 12 months |
| Enhancements | eDRX | | |
| Nokia, NSB [6] | UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR;  BWP switching | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| CATT [8] | UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| xiaomi [12] | UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Samsung [16] | UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Enhancements | ultra-deep sleep state | | |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | Option 1 (10000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Cell access procedures per 10.24s;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (10000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Cell access procedures per 10.24s;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (10000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Cell access procedures per 10.24s;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No paging reception;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No paging reception;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| vivo [5] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (15000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (15000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (15000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (15000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (15000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (15000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (10000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (5000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES |
| CATT [8] | Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Intel [9] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| ZTE [11] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type B: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (480); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (480); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (480); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (480); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| xiaomi [12] | Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| CMCC [13] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No optimization on gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting in PTW; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Samsung [16] | Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Qualcomm [20] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); DL+UL positioning;  eDRX= 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Ericsson [21] | Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  DRX = 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  DRX = 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 DRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  DRX = 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  DRX = 30.72s, 1 RS per 1 DRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| Enhancements | SRS mobility enhancements | | |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No paging reception; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| Enhancements | Minimizing the gaps between paging/PRS/SRS/reporting | | |
| Sony [10] | UE-assisted DL positioning;  I-DRX = 1.28s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Sleep states in TR 38.840 | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  I-DRX = 1.28s, 1 RS per 8 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Sleep states in TR 38.840 | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| UE-assisted DL positioning;  I-DRX = 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 I-DRX, High SINR, CG-SDT for reporting;  Sleep states in TR 38.840 | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO |
| CMCC [13] | Option 1 (20000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (20000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UE-based DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES  K = 2, Type A: YES  K = 4, Type A: YES  K = 1, Type B: YES  K = 2, Type B: YES  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| Enhancements | Paging or PEI triggered positioning operation | | |
| Samsung [16] | Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UE-assisted DL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR; CG-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: NO | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  Paging triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Option 1 (2000); UL positioning;  eDRX= 20.48s, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, Low SINR; RA-SDT for reporting;  PEI triggered positioning operation; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO |
| Enhancements | TRS-based synchronization | | |
| HW, Hisilicon [2] | Option 2 (450); UL positioning;  eDRX= 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  No paging reception; SRS mobility enhancements; | K = 1, Type A: YES | K = 1, Type A: YES |
| Enhancements | SDT for SRS pre-configuration with minimum delay | | |
| Qualcomm [20] | UL positioning;  eDRX = 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Sleep states in TR38.840; Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES |
| DL+UL positioning;  eDRX = 10.24, 1 RS per 1 eDRX, High SINR;  Sleep states in TR38.840; Gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is minimized; | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: YES | K = 1, Type A: NO  K = 4, Type A: NO  K = 1, Type B: NO  K = 4, Type B: NO |

To sum up, the following aspects on enhancements are identified:

***Ultra-deep sleep state***

Evaluations results on different options/values of the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state are provided by 10 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson) out of 20 sources. To be specific,

* For Option 1 of the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state:
  + Results with additional transition energy of 20000 are presented by 5 sources (vivo, Intel, ZTE, CMCC, Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 5** [vivo (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); QC (K = 1,4)];
    - For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 2** [ZTE (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [ZTE (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)];
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (4 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [CMCC (K = 2,4); QC (K = 4)]; **NO: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1); QC (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (4 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [CMCC (K = 2,4); Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (4 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [CMCC (K = 2,4); Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
    - For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 2** [ZTE (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [Qualcomm (K = 4)]; **NO: 2** [ZTE (K = 1); Qualcomm (K = 1)];
  + Results with additional transition energy of 2000 are presented by 6 sources (CATT, Intel, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Ericsson) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 2,4); Samsung (K = 1)]; **NO: 2** [CMCC (K = 1); Ericsson (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 4)]; **NO: 5** [Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2); Samsung (K = 1); Ericsson (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (4 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [CATT (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 2,4)]; **NO: 4** [CATT (K = 1); Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 5** [Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4); Samsung (K = 1); Ericsson (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [CMCC (K = 2,4); Ericsson (K = 1)]; **NO: 4** [Intel (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1); Samsung (K = 1)];
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
  + Results with additional transition energy of 15000 are presented by 1 source (vivo) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
  + Results with additional transition energy of 10000 are presented by 2 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
  + Results with additional transition energy of 5000 are presented by 1 source (vivo) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [vivo (K = 1)];
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [vivo (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
* For Option 2 of the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state,
  + Results with additional transition energy of 450 are presented by 5 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (4 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 3** [vivo (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 2,4)]; **NO: 2** [ZTE (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 5** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K =1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 3** [vivo (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1)];
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (5 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 4** [vivo (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1); xiaomi (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 1** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 3** [vivo (K = 1); xiaomi (K=1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 2** [HW/Hisilicon (K = 1); ZTE (K = 1)];
    - For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type B device (2 sources in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 2** [vivo (K = 1); CMCC (K = 1,2,4)]; **NO: 0**;
  + Results with additional transition energy of 480 are presented by 1 source (ZTE) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:
    - For UE-assisted DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)];
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)];
    - For UE-based DL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
    - For UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)];
    - For DL+UL positioning with LPHAP Type A device (1 source in total):
      * Target requirement of 6 months: **YES: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)]; **NO: 0**;
      * Target requirement of 12 months: **YES: 0; NO: 1** [ZTE (K = 1)];

***Extended DRX cycle***

Evaluation results of extended DRX cycle (with and without ultra-deep sleep state) are provided by 11 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson) out of 20 sources, the following is observed:

* Results with extended DRX cycle without consideration of ultra-deep sleep state are provided by 4 sources (Nokia/NSB, CATT, xiaomi, Samsung) out of 20 sources, and power saving gain based on slot-averaged relative power unit with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s is acquired;
* Results with extended DRX cycle and ultra-deep sleep state are provided by 10 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson) out of 20 sources, the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

***Minimized gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting***

Evaluation results of minimized gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting are provided by 9 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, the following is observed:

* Results with and without optimization of gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting are provided by 2 sources (Sony, CMCC) out of 20 sources, and power saving gain based on slot-averaged relative power unit of the minimized gaps with respect to that without minimized gaps is acquired, in which
  + Results in [13/CMCC] show that without minimized gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting, the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months cannot be met; while with minimized gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting, the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.
* In addition, results in [2/HW, Hisilicon], [5/vivo], [9/Intel], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [16/Samsung], [20/Qualcomm] imply that the gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting are optimized, and the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

***SRS enhancement***

Evaluation results of SRS (re)configuration enhancement are provided by 11 sources (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson) out of 20 sources, the following is observed:

* Results with and without are provided by 3 sources (HW/Hisilicon, CMCC, Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, in which,
  + Results in [13/CMCC] and [20/Qualcomm] show that the power consumption significantly increases considering UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain SRS (re)configuration in every power cycle;
  + Results in [2/HW, Hisilicon] show that without SRS (re)configuration enhancement, the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months cannot be met; while with SRS (re)configuration enhancement, the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.
* In addition, results in [5/vivo], [6/Nokia, NSB], [8/CATT], [9/Intel], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], [16/Samsung], [20/Qualcomm], [21/Ericsson] imply SRS (re)configuration enhancement in the enhanced cases, and the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

***No paging reception***

Evaluation results without paging reception are provided by 1 source (HW,Hisilicon) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:

* Without requirement of paging reception, UE may implement ultra-deep sleep Option 2 to wake-up to perform positioning only, and the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

***Paging or PEI triggered positioning***

Evaluation results of paging or PEI triggered positioning are provided by 1 source (Samsung) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:

* Paging and PEI triggered positioning are beneficial in improving the battery life, and the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

***SDT with minimum delay for SRS (pre)configuration***

Evaluation results of SDT procedure with minimum delay for SRS (pre)configuration are provided by 1 source (Qualcomm) out of 20 sources, and the following is observed:

* Reducing the latencies involved in the legacy SDT procedure may significantly reduce the power consumption, and the target requirement of battery life of 6~12 months can be met.

4.2.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** From the inputs, several aspects on enhancements are identified, and the target battery life of 6~12 months can be met together with some options of the ultra-deep sleep state, but as the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state is still under discussion in this meeting, the observations on potential enhancements should wait until we have consensus on the ultra-deep sleep.

Alternatively, a work flow in Rel-17 study item stage can be followed. First, we can conclude in this meeting the performance benefits on the identified enhancements so that it can encourage interested companies to provide additional evaluations with the agreed ultra-deep sleep state. Then, in the next meeting, final observations will be made to be captured in the TR.

**[High] Question 4.2**

* Do you think that it is necessary to make some intermediate conclusions on performance benefits of the identified enhancements in this meeting (as what we have done in Rel-17 study item), to encourage interested companies to provide additional evaluations so that the discussions in the next meeting would be facilitated? See below some of the examples of the conclusions:
* *Example #1 of proposed conclusion:* 
  + Evaluations show that extending DRX cycles provide power saving gains with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s and is beneficial to improve the battery life;
  + Note: Additional evaluations need to be performed before deciding whether and how to capture the above in the TR
* *Example #2 of proposed conclusion:* 
  + Evaluations show that UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain SRS (re)configuration significantly increases power consumption;
  + Initial results also show that assuming SRS (re)configuration enhancement is beneficial to improve battery life;
  + Note: Additional evaluations need to be performed before deciding whether and how to capture the above in the TR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We think evaluation results would be helpful to justify the enhancement techniques. |
| vivo | Yes | We are OK to make some intermediate conclusions in this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For the note, what if there are no additional evaluations, there we are not going to capture them in the TR? We think the Note could change to:  “This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided” |
| Samsung | Yes | The focus of this study is to identify the essential issue restricting battery life for positioning, not a general enhancement for power saving in positioning. The bottleneck of battery life should be clearly identified first, and then discuss the potential solutions. The solutions should be considered in a non-trivial way – improving the battery life to meet the target or being a significant component to meet the target, at least for some evaluation scenarios considered. |
| Intel | yes |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | OK. It would facilitate further study. |
| CATT | yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Making some intermediate conclusions could provide some future study directions. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | It would facilitate the discussion in the next meeting. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | yes | We are fine to make some intermediate conclusions in this meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes | This exercise in preparing the conclusions would be beneficial and we should conclude by RAN1#111 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |

4.2.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: Companies are supportive of having some intermediate conclusions in this meeting, so that the evaluations and discussion on potential enhancements in the next meeting will be facilitated.

Therefore, I provide the following proposed conclusions based on the evaluations from the submitted contributions:

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-1 (I)**

* Evaluations show that extending DRX cycles provide power saving gains with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s and is beneficial to improve the battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Sevasral general comments about all proposals in this session and the session for potential enhancement:   * It’s better to combine the observation of limitations on battery life and considered potential enhancement into a single proposal, so people can better understand what issue is the potential enhancement trying to address. * Also, we don’t think it’s sufficient to directly state some potential enhancement is beneficial for battery life improvement. For some of the proposals, it’s obvious that there is power saving gain, but this is not the focus (or not the only focus) from the RAN1 perspective. RAN1 shall provide detailed evaluation results on how much gain the potential enhancement can provide, which could be served as a basis to be considered as part of the TR and recommendation to the WI. * The proposals without specification impact may not need to be captured in the TR (thought this is the common understanding), so some description on the spec impact of the proposal may be needed if it’s not obvious from the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with this based on the evaluation results from multiple companies. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Intel | Taking Proposal 4.1-2 into consideration**,** we can be more specific towards suggesting an enhancement. We think improving gain but not meeting the battery life requirement is not sufficient.   * Evaluations show that extending DRX cycles beyond 10.24s provide power saving gains with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s and is beneficial to towards meeting the battery life requirement;   + Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided. |
| FL | @Samsung: Thanks for the comments, let me try to provide some of my thinking.  Regarding combining the observation of limitations on battery life and considered potential enhancement into a single proposal, sure, that would be one way to go. In general, the intention of proposed conclusion in this section is to provide directions and encourage interested companies to show results in the next meeting, while the proposals in Section 5 are more focused on detailed solutions and specification impact. Maybe we can discuss and agree with them in pair, for example, proposed conclusion 4.2-2 with proposal 5.2, proposed conclusion 4.2-1/2/3 with proposal 5.3, etc.  Regarding the 2nd comment, I agree, that’s what we should try to capture in the observations in the next meeting, but we need to first agree on the power model of ultra-deep sleep in this meeting before we do that. That’s why I call them intermediate conclusion, just to provide some directions to companies what we are focusing on, rather than agree these aspects. If in the next meeting, more companies provide results which shown that some benefits are marginal, then the corresponding enhancements may not be recommended. |
| ZTE | We agree longer DRX cycle can further reduce power consumption for UE. However, it may have some other impacts, including synchronization, e.g. whether UE can still get sufficient synchronization, SFN indication, e.g. in the current specification, the length of system frame number (SFN) is 10 bits, ranges from 0 to 1023, and 20.48s/30.72s eDRX cycle may need MIB or SIB modification to inform UE in which Paging Hyperframe (one hyperframe is 10.24s) it is.  If this proposal only focus on the battery life requirement, we are OK with it. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the conclusion |
| vivo | We prefer Intel’s version.  Based on the agreed assumptions as below, companies evaluated power consumption under eDRX cycle of 20.48s and 30.72s, and the required power saving gain is obtained. So, the power saving gain by eDRX cycle larger than 10.24s should be clearly captured.  Agreement  For the purpose of LPHAP evaluation, the following assumptions on eDRX configuration and/or paging reception can be optionally considered:   * + The eDRX cycle to evaluate: 20.48s; 30.72s;   + For paging reception:     - 1 paging occasion is included in one eDRX cycle     - 10% paging rate   + No paging reception can be optionally evaluated;   + 1 DL PRS and/or UL SRS for positioning occasion per 1 eDRX cycle   Minimizing the gap between PRS measurement, SRS transmission and/or measurement reporting with paging monitoring in time domain can be evaluated. |
| LGE | We are fine with the proposed conclusion. One minor comment is it would be better to use “paging DRX cycle” or “paging cycle” or “I-DRX cycle” instead of “DRX cycle”. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with FL proposal. |
| FL | Revised proposal for online:  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-1 (I)**   * Evaluations show that extending paging DRX cycles beyond 10.24s provide power saving gains with respect to that with the baseline DRX cycle of 1.28s and is beneficial to towards meeting the battery life requirement; * Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided. |
| FL | Consensus has been reached during Thursday GTW online. Let’s close this issue. |

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-2 (I)**

* Evaluations show that UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain SRS (re)configuration significantly increases power consumption;
* Initial results also show that assuming SRS (re)configuration enhancement is beneficial to improve battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with this based on the evaluation results from multiple companies. |
| Ericsson | We would like to be more specific as to what is meant by configuration enhancements. |
| ZTE | Support. Enhancement on SRS configuration can be further studied. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the conclusion |
| vivo | Support |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal, and tend to agree with Ericsson’s comment. |
| OPPO | Similar view as Ericsson. Hopefully the SRS (re)configuration enhancement can be further clarified. |
| FL | @Ericsson and OPPO: Detailed solutions regarding SRS (re)configuration enhancements are going to be discussed in Proposal 5.3 (I), to avoid ambiguous, the 2nd bullet is updated.  Revised proposal for online:  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-2 (I)**   * Evaluations show that UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain SRS (re)configuration significantly increases power consumption; * Initial results also show that assuming no SRS (re)configuration is beneficial to improve battery life; * Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided. |
| FL | Consensus has been reached during Thursday GTW online. Let’s close this issue. |

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-3 (I)**

* Evaluations show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting is beneficial to improve the battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with this based on the evaluation results from multiple companies. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| ZTE | Support. Our evaluation results also verified this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the conclusion |
| vivo | Support |
| LGE | Ok |
| Sharp | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | synchronization reference signals can also be added so that it could read:  Evaluation show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/Paging/Reporting/synchronization RS is beneficial to improve the battery life. |
| OPPO | Support |
| FL | Seems that companies are fine with the proposal, and one update from HW is revised accordingly.  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-3 (I)**   * Evaluations show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting/synchronization RS is beneficial to improve the battery life; * Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided. |
| FL2 | The proposal is updated according to the online discussion:  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-3 (I)**   * Evaluations show that minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging/reporting/synchronization RS ~~is beneficial to improve the battery life~~ reduces the power consumption; * Note: This intermediate conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided and to add information about the number of sources. |
| SONY | Support FL2 version |

**[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-4 (I)**

* Evaluations show that paging and PEI triggered positioning operation are beneficial to improve the battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Not sure about this observation. Can it be clarified what it means? |
| ZTE | Reply to Qualcomm:  In Rel-17, DCI 2\_7 has been introduced to notify the paging early indication (PEI) and TRS availability indication for one or more UEs. PEI is used to indicate whether UE needs to wake up and monitor its paging occasion. If no paging for the UE, then power reduction gain is achieved. |
| FL | To Qualcomm: Based on my reading of companies’ contributions, the intention of this paging and/or PEI triggered positioning operation is to align the positioning measurement/transmission/reporting with the paging reception so that UE can wake up to perform all necessary operation in a burst. The solution may have effect that if PEI indicates that some paging occasion does not need to be monitored, then UE can omit PRS measurement as well. In the evaluation, as we assume 10% paging rate, I think for companies assuming paging/PEI triggered positioning operation, only 10% of positioning measurement/transmission/reporting is considered.  @Companies provide results of paging and/or PEI triggered positioning operation, please correct me if I understand wrong.  Revised version to make it clearer:  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-4 (I)**   * Evaluations show that paging and PEI triggered positioning measurement/transmission/reporting are beneficial to improve the battery life; * Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided. |
| vivo | We are not sure it is beneficial for all cases. At least, for us, more studies from more companies may be needed. |
| LGE | The reference case to compare the performance with proposed scheme is not clear. Also we prefer to disucss further on this method to understand it more clearly. |
| FL | Seems that companies are still have some questions, maybe we can try resolve this online, if time permits. |
| FL2 | From the comments, several companies are confused about what paging and PEI triggered positioning means, and what’s the reference case to acquire gains. My understanding of it is that by doing this, when PEI indicates a UE to wake up monitoring paging, UE can also perform positioning operation in a burst, and when PEI indicates a UE not to wake up, then UE keeps sleeping and therefore no positioning operation is performed. As we have listed this as an example in the corresponding Proposal 5.3, I think it would be good to have such conclusion and let more companies provide results in the next meeting.  The proposal is updated according to the online discussion:  **[High] Proposed conclusion 4.2-4 (I)**   * Evaluations show that paging and PEI triggered positioning measurement/transmission/reporting ~~are beneficial to improve the battery life~~ reduces the power consumption; * Note: This intermediate conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided and to add information about the number of sources. |
| SONY | We have similar understanding as FL. Furthermore, the indication can be in paging or PEI. We support FL2 version |

**[Low] Proposed conclusion 4.2-5 (I)**

* Evaluations show that without requirement of paging reception, UE may implement ultra-deep sleep Option 2 to wake-up to perform positioning only, which is beneficial to improve battery life;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Do not support |
| ZTE | The revised power consumption model removed option 2. Even if without paging reception requirement, the LPHAP device still have to wake up to receive PRS/SSB blocks, or execute other measurement activities (for UE-based positioning).  We prefer not support this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If controversial, maybe we would wait for the progress of ultra-deep sleep Option 2, because it is likely the proposal will be updated, e.g.  *Evaulations shows that in order to improve battery life, a smaller transition energy is beneficial for the case without requirement of paging reception* |
| FL | Let’s postpone this discussion till we have progress under Section 3.1. |

**[Medium] Proposed conclusion 4.2-6 (I)**

* Evaluations show that reducing the latencies involved in the legacy SDT procedure may significantly reduce the power consumption;
* Note: This conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| ZTE | OK to further study if necessary. |
| FL | The proposal is updated according to the online discussion:  **[Medium] Proposed conclusion 4.2-6 (I)**   * Evaluations show that reducing the latencies involved in the legacy SDT procedure ~~may significantly~~ reduces the power consumption; * Note: This intermediate conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided and to add information about the number of sources. |

4.2.4 Round 3 discussion

***Summary from the 2nd round discussion***:

* **On Proposal 4.2-3 (I)**: From the inputs, most companies are fine with the proposal. Based on the discussion during online, Samsung’s concern was raised and the wording is then updated accordingly to what we have agreed online. I think it would be fine to everyone, and let’s try if it can be approved by email.
* **On Proposal 4.2-4 (I)**: The inputs from last round of email discussion is limited, and seems that some companies have difficulty in understanding the meaning of paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning. With further clarification and discussions via email, companies still think it is premature to capture this conclusion in this meeting. Let’s defer the discussion to the next meeting.
* **On Proposal 4.2-5 (I):** As this proposed conclusion is related to ultra-deep sleep state option2, let’s wait till we have progress under Section 3.1.
* **On Proposal 4.2-6 (I)**: Again, limited inputs from last round, let’s have another round to see if the conclusion is required.

**[Medium] Proposed conclusion 4.2-6 (III)**

* Evaluations show that reducing the latencies involved in the legacy SDT procedure ~~may significantly~~ reduces the power consumption;
* Note: This intermediate conclusion may be updated before capturing it in the TR if new/different evaluations are provided and to add information about the number of sources.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | In our view, more inputs from more companies are needed, otherwise, we cannot achieve common understanding of this conclusion. |
| ZTE | Support vivo’s view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A more concrete formulatation would be more preferrd for further discussion, for example, it should be in the context of DL or UL+DL positioning? In addition, the problem of reducing SDT procedure is on network side, including core network response to the initial UL transmission. gNB cannot directly release UE from the reception of RRCResumeRequest. |
| LGE | We share similar view with vivo |
| Intel | This is not critical issue to capture observation this meeting and it can be updated anyways next meeting. Agree with vivo |
| Samsung | The amount of power saving gain is not clear from the proposal. Only based on the proposal, the gain seems only coming from replacing some light sleep to ultra sleep (by shrinking the latency between some modules in SDT), then the power saving gain may not be essential in our view. |

**Potential enhancements**

***Background:*** As clarified by the objective, potential enhancements will be studied if found necessary based on evaluations. In this section, the potential enhancements on positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE states are summarized.

## [Closed] 5.1 Clarification on study scope

5.1.1 Summary of inputs

As described in the SID [1], the study scope of the potential enhancements is limited to enhancements to RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state. In [13/Samsung], it is mentioned that further clarifications on the study scope of whether positioning for RRC\_IDLE state is within the scope is required. As the clarification should be made by RAN2, it is proposed that RAN1 to wait for RAN2’s clarification on the scope.

5.1.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** This issue was raised at the online session in the last RAN1 meeting, and it was clarified that at the study item phase, enhancements in both RRC\_INACTIVE and RRC\_IDLE state are within the study scope, and the “OR” in the objective may imply that one or the other is included/recommended in the normative work.

***FL observations:*** Seems that companies’ understandings are aligned. Let’s close this issue.

## [Closed] 5.2 SRS enhancements for UL/DL+UL positioning

***Background:*** In Rel-17 positioning, UL SRS for positioning transmissions in RRC\_INACTIVE state was specified. The UE keeps using the SRS configuration obtained via RRCRelease unless validity criteria fails (e.g., upon cell re-selection, TA invalidation, etc.).

5.2.1 Summary of inputs

Based on the submitted contributions in this meeting, 10 companies (HW/Hisilicon, vivo, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Intel, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Qualcomm, Ericsson) discuss the enhancements on SRS for positioning to support UE mobility in RRC\_INACTIVE state, such that the UE does not need to frequently enter RRC\_CONNECTED state to update the SRS (re)configurations and hence the power consumption is reduced.

* In [2/HW/Hisilicon], [5/vivo], [6/Nokia, NSB], [12/xiaomi], [13/CMCC], and [21/Ericsson], enhancements on SRS (pre)configurations applicable to multiple cells (a positioning area) are proposed. In addition, [8/CATT], [7/Intel], [11/ZTE], [12/xiaomi], and [20/Qualcomm] propose to study solutions to prevent the UE from (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode to update the SRS configuration when it moves to a new cell.
* Furthermore, [5/vivo], [8/CATT], [12/Xiaomi] and [20/Qualcomm] discuss activation/request enhancements of SRS configuration, e.g., allows the NW to activate and/or the UE to request SRS configuration by paging or RACH procedure, etc.
* A solution to enable SRS beam sweeping is proposed in [5/vivo] to address the validation failure of spatial relation info.

5.2.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** The frequent power state transition to enter RRC\_CONNECTED mode to update SRS configurations in RRC\_INACTIVE state and the corresponding power consumption is harmful to meet the expected battery life. From the inputs, companies are interested in support of SRS enhancements for UL/DL+UL positioning. Therefore, the following proposal is formulated:

**[High] Proposal 5.1 (I)**

* For UL and DL+UL positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state, the enhancements on SRS for positioning will be studied in order to avoid UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode to obtain SRS (re)configuration if validation criteria fails, including at least the following:
  + The (pre-)configuration of SRS for positioning. FFS details, e.g., signaling and procedure, whether/how it is applicable to an area across multiple cells;
  + SRS for positioning activation/request procedure(s), e.g., NW activation of SRS via paging, UE request to obtain/update SRS via RACH-based procedure;
    - FFS: Events of invalidity of SRS configuration to trigger the UE request procedure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Generally okay, and prefer to remove ‘and/or RRC\_IDLE’, since the SRS transmission in idle state is controversial. |
| Qualcomm | We are generally supportive, but we still think the first sentence could be a bit more generally written. For example:   * For UL and DL+UL positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state, study ~~the~~ enhancements on SRS for positioning ~~will be studied~~ in order to avoid frequent ~~UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode to obtain~~ SRS (re)configuration ~~if validation criteria fails~~, including at least the following:   + The (pre-)configuration of SRS for positioning. FFS details, e.g., signaling and procedure, whether/how it is applicable to an area across multiple cells;   + SRS for positioning activation/request procedure(s), e.g., NW activation of SRS via paging, UE request to obtain/update SRS via RACH-based procedure;     - FFS: Events of invalidity of SRS configuration to trigger the UE request procedure. |
| Samsung | We wonder how avoiding UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED mode to obtain SRS configuration can significantly improve the battery life? We don’t think current evaluation assumption covers this aspect, so how the power saving gain was evaluated? |
| Intel | Support. We suggest to keep RRC\_IDLE state since it is in the SID objective |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally fine, but we have one question about the intention of this proposal. To avoid the re-configuration of SRS, does this study include whether to allow the Rel-18 UE to still use the configured SRS resource even if it is not valid?  Also, we would like to separately discuss positioning support for RRC\_IDLE UE. We prefer to restrict this enhancement for DL only. |
| CATT | Support. Share the same view as Intel that RRC\_IDLE state should be kept since it is in the SID objective |
| ZTE | Support. Absolutely, cell-reselection and SRS reconfiguration is really power-consuming for LPHAP device. |
| Sharp | Support. |
| CMCC | Support |
| LGE | We are generally fine with the proposal, but prefer to remove “and/or RRC\_IDLE’ in the main bullet. Whether to consider RRC\_IDLE state or not shall be discussed separately. |
| Xiaomi | Support and prefer QC’s version |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |

5.2.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: Most companies are generally supportive of this proposal:

* Qualcomm suggests to make the main sentence more general, and the revised version seems fine to some companies.
* A few companies have different views on whether RRC\_IDLE should be kept or removed from the main sentence. An FFS bullet is added accordingly.
* Samsung raises a point on how the current evaluation covers this aspect.
  + To my understanding, our evaluation assumptions implicitly assume that no SRS (re)configuration is applied for simplicity. From the submitted contributions in this meeting, at least three companies (e.g., HW/Hisilicon, CMCC, Qualcomm) additionally provide results of SRS (re)configuration is obtained via RA-SDT procedure every power cycle and initial results show that the power consumption significantly increases. Details please refer to the summary of results in Section 4.2.1. In addition, the related issue is also covered by the proposed intermediate conclusion 4.2-2 (I), to encourage interested companies provide additional evaluations in the next meeting. The wording in the main sentence is revised, please check if it addressed your concern.
* Nokia questions about whether the proposal includes the case to allow the Rel-18 UE to still use the configured SRS resource even if it is not valid anymore.
  + Not sure if I fully understand the question, in my views, it shouldn’t be the case. Once the SRS configuration is not valid, reconfiguration should be performed. The intention is to study potential enhancements to avoid frequent SRS (re)configuration to save power, and also potential optimizations on procedures / ignaling to request and/or activate SRS resources so that UE (re)entering RRC\_CONNECTED state to obtain valid SRS configurations may be avoided. Anyways, the study is not limited to the listed bullets, please feel free to provide your views if I didn’t answer your question properly.

The proposal is updated using Qualcomm’s version as a starting point for the 2nd round:

**[High] Proposal 5.1 (II)**

* For UL and DL+UL positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE ~~and/or RRC\_IDLE state~~, study the potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements on SRS for positioning in order to avoid frequent SRS (re)configuration, including at least the following:
  + The (pre-)configuration of SRS for positioning. FFS details, e.g., signaling and procedure, whether/how it is applicable to an area across multiple cells;
  + SRS for positioning activation/request procedure(s), e.g., NW activation of SRS via paging, UE request to obtain/update SRS via RACH-based procedure;
    - FFS: Events of invalidity of SRS configuration to trigger the UE request procedure.
  + FFS whether it is applicable to Ues in RRC\_IDLE state.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We thank the FL’s response.  About the evaluation assumption companies used, we wonder why a gNB operates in such a way to artificially increase the power consumption, with the target of trying to save power? This is more like an inproper configuration that results in high power consumption, and it can be avoided by proper operation from the gNB. |
| Qualcomm | OK. To Samsung: a UE may be moving and the validity criteria are not in the “proper operaton of the gNB”. If the RSRP changes, what can the gNB do? The UE, in the current specification has to stop transmitting the urrent SRS configuration and start from the beginning the process. |
| Nokia/NSB | Thank FL for the clarification on our questions. We are supportive of this modified proposal. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal to study, but we see many aspects that need to be considered regarding the enhancements. We would like to include interference issues and TA adjustment, consideration to UL overhead/capacity implied by pre-configuration and multiple cells, LMF complexity increase (e.g. managing the list of listening TRPs when the UE moves between cells) to the list of FFS. |
| intel | Support |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal |
| ZTE | Support, OK to further study. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal |
| Sharp | We are OK wit the proposal. |
| FL | @Ericsson To me, some of the points such as TA adjustment and LMF complexity increase seems have nothing to do with RAN1, but anyways it is said “include at least following” in the main bullet and nothing is precluded.  Revised proposal for online:  **[High] Proposal 5.1 (II)**   * For UL and DL+UL positioning for Ues in RRC\_INACTIVE, study the potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements on SRS for positioning in order to avoid frequent SRS (re)configuration, including at least the following:   + The (pre-)configuration of SRS for positioning. FFS details, e.g., signaling and procedure, whether/how it is applicable to an area across multiple cells, consideration of UL overhead/capacity implied by (pre-)configuration and multiple cells, etc;   + SRS for positioning activation/request procedure(s), e.g., NW activation of SRS via paging, UE request to obtain/update SRS via RACH-based procedure;     - FFS: Events of invalidity of SRS configuration to trigger the UE request procedure.   + FFS whether it is applicable to Ues in RRC\_IDLE state. |
| FL | Consensus has been reached during Thursday GTW online. Let’s close this issue. |

## 5.3 Enhancements on DRX/paging

5.3.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the submitted contributions in this meeting, 12 companies (HW/Hisilicon, Quectel, vivo, CATT, Intel, Sony, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Lenovo, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO) provide their views on DRX and/or paging related considerations/enhancements.

* In [2/HW,Hisilicon], [5/vivo], [9/Intel], [12/xiaomi], and [13/CMCC], benefits/enhancements of a DRX cycle longer than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state to help reduce the power consumption are acknowledged/proposed. Corresponding UE behaviors and coordination among positioning nodes (e.g., to allow the LMF to recommend appropriate SRS configuration to the gNB according to the eDRX configuration) are suggested for further study in [6/vivo]. In [11/ZTE], however, it is opposed to consider eDRX enhancements under positioning agenda item.
* 3 companies (HW/Hisilicon, CATT, CMCC) acknowledge the benefits of reduced/no paging reception to further acquire power saving gain. Specifically, in [2/HW, Hisilicon], it is suggested to revisit the necessity of paging reception, considering that the LPHAP device as a device with little mobile terminated service requirement. Similarly, CATT considers to stop paging monitoring for MT-LR.
* Moreover, 10 companies (Quectel, vivo, Sony, ZTE, xiaomi, CMCC, Lenovo, Samsung, LGE, NTT DOCOMO) discuss solutions regarding paging reception , PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, which allows a UE to wake-up once to perform all necessary operations and reduces the power consumption by extending the sleep duration. 4 companies (vivo, Sony, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO) generally propose to align the PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission with paging monitoring. Specific solutions are proposed by [11/ZTE], [16/Samsung] and [18/LGE], where ZTE and Samsung propose to study paging/PEI triggered positioning operation, and the solution is to define a time window in [18/LGE]. Furthermore, [5/vivo] and [14/Lenovo] propose to allow the LMF to be aware of the DRX configuration of a positioning UE for the adaptation of the PRS/SRS configuration.

5.3.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments***: Based on the evaluations and analysis provided by companies, enhancements on DRX and/or paging are critical to maximize the battery life to meet the target requirement developed by SA1. Therefore, the following proposal is formulated:

**[High] Proposal 5.2 (I)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements with respect to DRX and/or paging reception:
  + Extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state
  + UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions
    - FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.
  + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission
    - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In general we are fine with the proposal for study in RAN1 and we assume RAN2 will also investigate these techniques as well. |
| Qualcomm | We are generally supportive to study these aspects. However, we think the topic is really RAN2-centric and we prefer to avoid too much overlap on specific RAN2/SA2-centric discussions in RAN1. So, to be more specific:   1. We think it is useful to point out that much of these are within RAN2, or even SA2 scope. So we would like to add the following note:   Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress.   1. Also, we think the “UE suspends monitoring the paging” is too specific. In the corresponding discussion in RAN2 (see R2-2209405), the whole topic is more generally written as: Optimized paging (See section 3.1 and corresponding discussions in there, e.g. Proposal 1). So we prefer to change the specific solution of “UE suspends paging” to the following, since relaxing/suspending paging monitoring is one of the topics discussed in RAN2.    * ~~UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions~~ Paging Optimizations |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| Intel | We agree with first bullet below which seems to have the most potential in meeting the requirement.   * + Extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state   We need to discuss first whether observed gains are meaningful for the schemes in second and third bullets. |
| CATT | Support |
| ZTE | Towards the first bullet:  Considering the eDRX feature was introduced for RedCap in Rel-17 (finally can be used for non-RedCap UE as well), and to avoid redundant discussion between RedCap agenda and positioning agenda, we suggest not to further discuss the enhancement/evaluation on eDRX with >10.24s in positioning agenda. So we suggest remove the first bullet.  Towards the second bullet:  We prefer suspends monitoring the paging occasions together with PRS. Because, in general, the LPHAP device has to wake up while receiving PO or PRS. Even if we suspend the PO, the UE still have to wake up to receive the PRS. From another perspective, the power consumption for PO is 50 (PPDCCH)/120(PPDCCH+PDSCH), and the transition power consumption of deep sleep is assumed to be 450 power unit, which is much greater than that of PO. Therefore, we suggest revise the second bullet as follows:   * + UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions together with PRS |
| CMCC | Support |
| LGE | We are fine with further studying on the third sub-bullet regarding PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission.  However, issues related paging reception and procedure shall be discussed in RAN2 if is really required. Moreover it is strage for me discussing paging enhancement at positioning agenda item; there is no enhancement from positioning method perspective. |
| Xiaomi | We think most of them are not RAN1 topics. It is better to make it clear that what will be studied in RAN1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Sony | Generally Okay. However, On UE suspends monitoring PO, we have similar view as QC.Hence, we propose:   * + Paging optimizations (e.g., UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions)     - FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.     - FFS on the impact of UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions to UE’s reachability |
| Lenovo | Fine with the proposal. We share Qualcomm’s view that overlap wit RAN2 work should be largely avoided though. |

5.3.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***:

* Several companies (HW/Hisilicon, Qualcomm, xiaomi, Sony, Lenovo) mention that this aspect is a RAN2-centric issue and RAN2 will also investigate it, especially on the first two sub-bullets.
* 1 company (ZTE) prefers to delete the 1st sub-bullet, as similar discussion may be under RedCap AI, and redundant discussion in positioning AI should be avoided; while 1 company (Intel) prefers to keep it and think this has the most potential in meeting the requirement.

As majority of views thinks that the first two bullets are RAN2-centric issues, let’s focus on the 3rd bullet that has RAN1 impact. Regarding the comments from Intel on the 1st bullet, I think RAN1 can acknowledge the performance benefits of extending DRX cycle, and it is covered by the proposed conclusion 4.2-2 (I).

Therefore, the proposal is reformulated as below:

**[High] Proposal 5.2 (II)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements with respect to DRX and/or paging reception:
  + ~~Extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state~~
  + ~~UE suspends monitoring the paging occasions~~
    - ~~FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.~~
  + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission
    - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, etc.
* Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We still think that something needs to be said about “Paging Optimizations” even if RAN2 is also discussing it, otherwise it may appear as if RAN1 is against it. Our comment before meant that we can be a bit more general and by capturing the “Note” it is understood that we may not need to do much work in RAN1 on the paging-related optimizations.  Having said the above, we still think we need to keep a bullet on “Paging Monitoring Optimization” |
| Ericsson | Ok with the proposal, but the enhancements mentioned seem to be more for RAN2 to consider, so we should send an LS with a question on their applicability and then perform the evaluation. |
| Intel | We think we need to discuss the observations on evaluations first. Moreover, we suggest to discuss enhancements related to minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging etc and paging/PEI triggered positioning separately. |
| ZTE | Generally OK with the revised proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Removing the second bullet is interpreted by us that it is included in the third bullet, so we prefer to add example to it.  We would want to clarify that the behaviour that UE suspends/stops monitoring paging is already supported in NB-IoT (PSM) and 5G (MICO). More RAN awareness may be needed for RRC\_INACTIVE state.   * + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission     - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, UE suspend monitoring paging, etc. |
| vivo | We don’t support the direct deletion of ‘Extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state’. As captured by the previous observations based on companies’ evaluation, eDRX cycle larger than 10.24s is one of key solutions toward the LPHAP target requirement.  We acknowledge that the detailed designing of eDRX cycle larger than 10.24s in inactive state may not be RAN1 scope. But potential positioning related issues/solutions based on eDRX enhancement is our scope. We propose to modify the first sub-bullet as follows   * + Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state |
| LGE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL | From the inputs, seems that different compaies have different views on which bullets have or have not RAN1 impact, or may or may not be listed. I think as this is the first meeting we are trying to agree some potential enhancements, let’s further study what we had in the initial round including its potential RAN1 specificatoin impact. If no particular RAN1 impact is found, then in the next meeting, we will not recommended such enhancement from RAN1 perspective. Note that those with RAN2 impact will be studied by them.  To Intel: Regarding the comment to discuss enhancements related to minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging etc and paging/PEI triggered positioning separately, my intention of the time domain adaptation refers to minimizing gaps between PRS/SRS/paging (including alignment of configuration of DRX/PRS/SRS), and the paging/PEI triggered positioning is a further solution based on that. That is why I listed it as sub-bullet. Hope it clarifies.  **[High] Proposal 5.2 (II)**   * For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements and potential RAN1 specification impact with respect to DRX and/or paging reception:   + Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state   + Paging optimizations, e.g., UE suspend monitoring paging occasions     - FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.   + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission     - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, etc. * Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress. |
| FL2 | From the debate in todays GTW, companies’ concerns are towards the first two sub-bullets, with two main concerns:  a) They are RAN2-centric issues and RAN1 specification impact is not clear;  b) They are enhancements regarding DRX and/or paging reception, and not within the study scope of positioning AI.  My view is that, as also commented by Qualcomm during online, the main sentence explicitly says for the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, and hence positioning related enhancements will be studid for sure. RAN2 colleagues are under the discussion of these issues, that’s the proof. Regarding the concerns on the study has nothing to do with RAN1, I admit that these bullet may be largely belong to RAN2, that’s the reason why I added “potential RAN1 specification impact” is added to the main sentence and also the note. As there are companies provide strong views to keep these two bullets, let me propose a way forward to say if it’s acceptable to both sides:  **[High] Proposal 5.2 (II)**   * For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements and potential RAN1 specification impact with respect to DRX and/or paging reception:   + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission     - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS, etc.   + FFS: Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state   + FFS: Paging optimizations, e.g., UE relaxes monitoring paging occasions     - ~~FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.~~ * Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress. * Note: If no RAN1 impact is identified, the corresponding enhancements will not be recommended for normative work from RAN1’s perspective. |

***FL observations:*** Based on the discussion via email, companies keep debating on what should or should not be included for further study. As suggested by HW, this issue can be deferred a bit later, nothing is included or precluded for now, and anyways enhancements for recommendation will be discussed in the next meeting with evaluations shown with gains. Let’s close this issue in this meeting.

5.3.4 Round 3 discussion

With further comments received by email, let’s reopen this issue. If no consensus is reached on this issue at the end of the meeting, nothing is included or precluded for the time being. Companies will provided evaluations and discussions in the next meeting, and we then further discuss the enhancements to be recommended.

**[Medium] Proposal 5.2 (III)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements and potential RAN1 specification impact ~~with respect to (e)DRX and/or paging reception~~:
  + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission
    - FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission~~, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS~~, etc.
  + FFS: Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending (e)DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state
  + FFS: Paging optimizations, e.g., UE relaxes monitoring paging occasions
    - ~~FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.~~
* Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress.
* Note: If no RAN1 impact is identified, the corresponding enhancements will not be recommended for normative work from RAN1’s perspective.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As commented, if we need such kind of proposal to be agreed, we suggest adding FFS: UE supports larger BW for positioning than the BW for communication.  This we believe is more falling in RAN1 businiess than the other enhancement techniques. |
| LGE | Our preference it to remove FFS bullets, but if majority prefer to capture it than we would like to suggest following modifications:  First, we don’t think paging optimization itself could be a target for the positioning enhancement item neither RAN1 nor RAN2 perspective. Thus we prefer to remove 2nd FFS bullet at least, or alternatively add “positioning related issues / enhancements based on”.  Second, we prefer to modify the last note to “If no RAN1 impact from positioning enhancement perspective is identify, ~~” . |
| Intel | We commented on this in the email reflector. Just reiterating again for companies consideration with some additional revisions. We understand that Rel-18 RedCap intends to specify eDRX > 10.24s. But it is RAN1 that does the power consumption evaluation and observe performance gains for different schemes. It is important to observe and capture in TR which technique holds the most potential for gain/improving battery life for LPHAP use-casesso that RAN1 and RAN2can recommend solution**s** accordingly. That does not necessarily mean RAN1 or this agenda item will specify it. Appropriate WG can do the normative work following RAN Plenary decision eventually. We do not see any conflict or overlap as far as evaluation efforts are concerned. Similarly, we also have concern on the Notes. Potential technique, that has the highest gain, may have RAN2 impact only but that does not necessarily mean it cannot be recommended from RAN1’s perspective (in fact, it happened before RAN1 recommended semi-static solution for an issue during a SI).  Regarding time domain adaptation of paging or PRS/SRS and paging optimizations, we are open to study. We think it is important to identify which technique has the highest potential for improving battery life. Certainly different techniques can all save power but a comparative study is needed before recommending a solution. For example, how much additional gain is achieved for these techniques on top of extending DRX cycle beyond 10.24s.  To this end, we suggest following revision. We do not need to capture FFS details since main bullet is for study anyways. We think identifying RAN1 impact is integral part of any SI and there is no need to repeat it in every proposal. P 5.1 didn’t have it. Moreover, evaluation is done by RAN1 based on agreed models and use case, not sure what is meant by in conjunction with RAN2. There is only one meeting cycle left and if any input received by RAN2 before that, of course RAN1 will consider it.   * For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study at least the following enhancements ~~and potential RAN1 specification impact~~ with respect to (e)DRX and/or paging reception:   + Time domain adaptation on paging reception, PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission     - ~~FFS details on how to achieve the adaptation, e.g., paging and/or PEI-triggered positioning, defining time window to restrict UE behavior on PRS measurement and/or SRS transmission, coordination among positioning nodes (LMF, gNB) to align the configurations of DRX, PRS and/or SRS~~, etc.   + ~~FFS:~~ Positioning related issues/enhancements based on extending (e)DRX cycle larger than 10.24s in RRC\_INACTIVE state   + ~~FFS:~~ Paging optimizations, e.g., UE relaxes monitoring paging occasions     - ~~FFS details and applicable conditions, e.g., device type, deferred MT-LR, positioning methods, etc.~~ * Note: The above study aspects may need to be investigated in conjunction with RAN2 study and progress. * ~~Note: If no RAN1 impact is identified, the corresponding enhancements will not be recommended for normative work from RAN1’s perspective.~~ |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |

## [Closed] 5.4 DL Positioning in RRC\_IDLE state

5.4.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, 8 companies (vivo, CATT, Intel, Sony, CMCC, Lenovo, Sharp, Qualcomm) provide views on the study of DL positioning in RRC\_IDLE state.

* 4 companies (vivo, CMCC, Lenovo, Qualcomm) propose that at least DL PRS measurement in RRC\_IDLE state should be supported.
* 4 companies (CATT, Intel, Sony, Sharp) propose to study DL positioning in RRC\_IDLE state, in which [8/CATT] mentions that support of measurements/location estimates reporting in RRC\_IDLE state should be considered.

5.4.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** In Rel-17 SI, the following agreements were achieved in RAN1#103-e meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:  Capture the following in the TR:  From a physical layer perspective, it is feasible for a UE to perform DL positioning measurement in RRC\_IDLE state.   * Note: This does not imply that measurements have to be reported in RRC\_IDLE state.   Conclusion:  It is up to RAN2 to decide whether to support the enhancements of NR positioning reporting of DL positioning measurements and/or positioning estimates for RRC\_IDLE Ues. |

Based on the agreement made in Rel-17 and companies’ proposals, we can try one step further to support DL PRS measurement in RRC\_IDLE state.

Therefore, the following proposal is formulated:

**[High] Proposal 5.3 (I)**

* From RAN1’s perspective, supportive of DL positioning measurements by UEs in RRC\_IDLE state is recommended for normative work.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. Supportive can be changed to support. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | We wonder how supporting DL positioning in IDLE mode can significantly improve the battery life? If not, then what’s the basis for RAN1 to make such recommendation? What RAN1 can do is justify the possibility on DL positioning in IDLE mode, instead of making recommendation. |
| Intel | We think it is already understood that UE can perform DL positioning measurements in IDLE mode and reporting can only be made when UE moves to INACTIVE state later. Hence, from RAN1 perspective for enhancement in IDLE mode, what is important is to identify whether positioning measurement can be reported in IDLE mode and whether UL positioning can be supported in IDLE mode. To this end, RAN1 can conduct a feasibility study first. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK. |
| CATT | Support |
| ZTE | We think it’s not necessary to discuss the measurement behavior in IDLE mode, there are two reasons:  First, as the previous agreement mentioned, this agenda could be discussed in RAN2.  Second, the measurement behavior will not influence the RAN1 spec. The measurement procedure only indicates the UE’s action and has no impact on signaling or protocol details. |
| CMCC | Support |
| LGE | We have similar view with Samsung. It is too early to make decision regarding normative work for RRC\_IDLE state. It is not clear the RRC\_IDLE state positioning can help to enhance battery life. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposed modification by Huawei. Responding to Intel, we may add “Study reporting of DL positioning measurements in RRC\_IDLE.” |
|  |  |

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: Views on this proposal is more like a 5-5 situation, companies that have concerns argued that it is too early to make this recommendation in RAN1 as the benefits is not clear, it is understood the feasibility of UE performing DL measurements in RRC\_IDLE mode, more important issue is whether reporting can be supported in RRC\_IDLE state or not which is totally up to RAN2.

Back in Rel-17 study item phase, RAN1 has already confirmed that it is feasible to perform DL measurement in RRC\_IDLE state. We don’t need to repeat such statement, but as companies have concerns on moving one step further to make the recommendation from RAN1 perspective, I think it would be reasonable to wait for RAN2’s progress as this agenda is led by RAN2. If RAN2 determines to study and specify enhancements on DL positioning for Ues in RRC\_IDLE state in the normative work, RAN1 can then make agreements accordingly and update corresponding spec changes in TS 38.215.

Let’s close this issue for now and wait further progress in RAN2.

## 5.5 Enhancements on PRS/SRS configuration and PHY layer procedure

5.5.1 Summary of inputs

Based on the submitted contributions in this meeting, 5 companies (ZTE, Nokia/NSB, LGE, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO) provide their considerations on PRS and/or SRS configuration and physical layer procedure:

* In [11/ZTE], support of more compact and flexible PRS resource pattern is proposed to save power;
* In [6/Nokia, NSB] and [18/LGE], it suggests to consider the impact of BWP switching on power consumption when SRS outside of initial UL BWP is configured in RRC\_INACTIVE state.
* In [6/Nokia, NSB], it is proposed to study how to reduce UE positioning activities (e.g., PRS reception in DL positioning, or SRS-pos transmission in UL positioning) on demand.
* In [20/Qualcomm], it is proposed to study PRS/SRS configuration restrictions and corresponding new UE capabilities for enabling reduced power consumption for RTT positioning, e.g., same centre frequency of PRS and SRS is requested to avoid extra retuning, to configure PRS and SRS close in time, to have PRS and SRS on different bands.
* In [18/LGE] and [19/DCM], enhancements on priority of PRS and/or SRS is discussed in terms of positioning accuracy and latency. In addition, [18/LGE] considers the enhancement on OPLC of SRS to achieve power saving gain and accuracy requirement.

5.5.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** Multiple companies are interested in enhancements regarding PRS and/or SRS configurations and related PHY layer procedures. As the solutions are quite diverse, the following high-level proposal is formulated based on the inputs:

**[Medium] Proposal 5.4 (I)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study enhancements with respect to PRS and/or SRS configurations and corresponding physical layer procedures and UE capabilities:
  + The study can include PRS and/or SRS resource pattern (e.g. 1-symbol PRS, comb size > 12), PRS and/or SRS configuration restrictions in time and frequency domain, priority of PRS and/or SRS, OPLC of SRS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are supportive of this study item and indeed it can be within RAN1 scope. |
| Samsung | We didn’t see the reasoning that supporting new PRS or SRS pattern can significantly improve the bettary life. Current evaluation assumption didn’t cover this aspect, so we wonder how to show the performance gain of the proposal. |
| Intel | We are open to consider if there is meaningful gain. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would suggest to add reducing positioning activies and impact of SRS BWP switching on power consumption as a part of this study. |
| CMCC | OK to further study. |
| LGE | We are fine with this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |

5.5.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: A few comments are received in the 1st round, and majority views are open for further discussion. Let’s continue the discussion in round 2.

The proposal is revised accordingly from the inputs, as Samsung questions about the performance gains regarding resource pattern, and Nokia suggests to add some contents. Originally, the solution proposed by Nokia is included in the configuration restrictions in time and frequency domain, but I guess it is no harm to list some examples.

**[Medium] Proposal 5.4 (II)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements with respect to PRS and/or SRS configurations and corresponding physical layer procedures and UE capabilities:
  + The study can include PRS and/or SRS resource pattern (e.g. 1-symbol PRS, comb size > 12), PRS and/or SRS configuration restrictions in time and frequency domain (e.g., reducing positioning activities, reducing extra retuning of PRS and/or SRS, etc.), priority of PRS and/or SRS, OPLC of SRS, etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the study, but we doulbt RAN1 agreed any evaluation assumption about the power modelling regarding the PRS or SRS pattern. Is there any follow-up discussion on how to evaluate this? |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| Intel | Ok to study |
| InterDigital | We have a similar question as Samsung |
| ZTE | Reply to Samsung and InterDigital:  If 1-symbol PRS is supported, the PRS duration can be at least half of Rel-17. Then the power consumption will be less. To model the power consumption while configuring shorter PRS duration, for example, can use 0.75 to scale down the power unit, where 0.75 refers to the model of single slot SSB compared with two slot SSB in TR 38.840.  The detailed model can be further studied. |
| LGE | Ok |

5.3.5 Round 3 discussion

***Summary from the 2nd round discussion***: Seems that companies providing comments are basically fine with this proposal. Samsung and InterDigital were wondering how the evaluation will be performed regarding RS resource pattern, I add a note based on ZTE’s response. Nevetheless, beforing we reaching consensus, more inputs should be collected.

**[Medium] Proposal 5.4 (III)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements with respect to PRS and/or SRS configurations and corresponding physical layer procedures and UE capabilities:
  + The study can include PRS and/or SRS resource pattern (e.g. 1-symbol PRS, comb size > 12), PRS and/or SRS configuration restrictions in time and frequency domain (e.g., reducing positioning activities, reducing extra retuning of PRS and/or SRS, etc.), priority of PRS and/or SRS, OPLC of SRS, etc.
  + Note: A scaling factor of 0.75 to the power unit of PRS/SRS power consumption models may be considered for companies interested in the evaluation of PRS/SRS resource pattern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Support. |
| LGE | We are fine with the intention with scaling factor, but the added note confuses us a bit. Is that mean a scaling factor of 0.75 will be applied to 1-symbol PRS ? If so, what is the reference symbol length for it? |
| Intel | We are ok to study. We think it is important to identify which technique has the highest potential for improving battery life. Certainly different techniques can all save power but a comparative study is needed before recommending a solution. For example, how much additional gain is achieved on top of extending DRX cycle beyond 10.24s. |
| Samsung | We are open to the study, and ok to the proposal.  BTW, the detection performance (i.e., accuracy part of LPHAP) should also be evaluated, since this is a new pattern of RS, and whether it can satisfy the accuracy requirement is also questionable. |

## [Closed] 5.6 PRACH-based UL positioning

5.6.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the submitted contributions in this meeting, 3 companies (Quectel, InterDigital, Sharp) propose to study whether/how PRACH can be used for UL positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state.

5.6.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** UL E-CID is enhanced in Rel-17 TEI work, where PRACH preamble can be used to determine the start of a subframe. To extend the PRACH-based UL positioning to UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE and/or RRC\_IDLE state, whether the sub-meter positioning accuracy can be met should be considered as well.

**[Medium] Proposal 5.5 (I)**

* For purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study the enhancements on extending PRACH-based UL positioning for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state and/or RRC\_IDLE state:
  + FFS: whether the positioning accuracy of the PRACH-based UL positioning can meet the sub-meter requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Regarding the use of PRACH in RRC\_INACTIVE or RRC\_IDLE state, we assume that it should be targeting serving cell only right?  Is there any common understanding whether Rel-17 TADV TEI also applies to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state? |
| Qualcomm | First, PRACH cannot meet the accuracy requirements (<1m).  For RRC inactive, we don’t see how PRACH-based positioning could be used when we have already specified SRS based Positioning.  Letting alone the accuracy requirement issue, with regards to RRC Idle Positioning with UL tranmsissions, either with PRACH-based or (SRS-based) Positioning, there are assess stratum (AS) implications. It is not clear to us whether there are power consumption benefits to the extend that will require to trigger such system level discussions. |
| Samsung | How this enhancement can improve the battery life comparing to SRS based UL positioning? |
| Intel | We would like to seek some clarification whether this proposal also includes PRACH procedure enhancements for SRS reconfiguration |
| CMCC | We don’t think the accuracy can be ensured. We prefer to consider enhancements regarding SRS, not PRACH preamble. |
| LGE | Low priority. The power saving benefits from introducing PRACH-based UL positioning is not clear for us. |
| Sony | What does it mean by “extending PRACH” Will it also affect the legacy PRACH format and configuration? We are also not sure whether this will reduce the power consumption. |
| ZTE | Not sure about the performance about the PRACH-based positioning can meet the positioning requirements. From another perspective, whether the PRACH-based positioning can be more power saving compared to SRS-based positioning. |
|  |  |

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***:

* From the inputs, majority companies have concerns on this proposal or treat it as low priority:
  + No common understanding on whether Rel-17 Tadv TEI applies to RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE state;
  + Accuracy performance using PRACH preamble for UL positioning is not ensured, which has no advantage when compared to SRS;
  + The benefits on power consumption is not clear.
* In addition, Intel raised a comment for clarification on whether this proposal includes PRACH procedure enhancements for SRS (re)configuration.
  + My understanding is no, the PRACH procedure regarding SRS (re)configuration is covered and discussed by Proposal 5.1 (II).

Based on the inputs, let’s close this issue in this meeting.

## 5.7 Enhancements on assistance data and/or measurement reporting

5.7.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, enhancements on assistance data delivery and/or measurement reporting to save power are discussed by 2 companies (Nokia/NSB, OPPO):

* In [6/Nokia, NSB], it is proposed to study optimization on the measurement reporting and assistance data delivery, e.g., skip some measurement reports, partial updates or reports of PRS assistance data or measurements of UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE mode.
* In [9/OPPO], it is proposed to study whether to introduce more candidate values for the reporting interval for the UE power saving.

5.7.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** The enhancements on AD and/or measurement reporting seems trivial when compared to other enhancements. In this sense, FL suggests to treat it as low priority for now, interested companies can further provide evaluations and discussion on this issue in the next meeting.

**[Low] Proposal 5.6 (I)**

* For purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study enhancements on assistance data delivery and/or measurement reporting for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state:
  + The study can include partial update of assistance data and/or measurements, introducing more candidate values for reporting interval.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear for us whether there can be power consumption benefits from this study. |
| Samsung | We are not clear of the power saving gain of the proposal, and some mentioned details are not within RAN1 scope. |
| Nokia/NSB | In case the UE is configured with periodic measurement reporting, we think it might be helpful for UE power saving to skip measurement reporting in case the UE has not moved. We suggest the skipping measurement reporting is inlucded in the study. |
| Lenovo | Assistance data may avoid spending power on measurements from unsuitable PRS transmitters or . Of course this needs to be carefully evaluated against the additional effort to receive the assistance data. We are open to study this further, including skipping as mentioned by Nokia. |
| ZTE | Also cannot grasp the power saving gain of the enhancements on assistance data delivery. |

5.7.3 Round 2 discussion

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: Only 4 companies provide inputs to this proposal, two of them are not sure about the benefits; while the other two companies are supportive of further study. Let’s continue the discussion and see if more comments can be collected.

The proposal is revised a bit to reflect the inputs:

**[Medium] Proposal 5.6 (II)**

* For purpose of reducing power consumption for LPHAP, study potential benefits and performance gains of enhancements on assistance data delivery and/or measurement reporting for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state:
  + The study can include partial update or skipping of assistance data and/or measurements, introducing more candidate values for reporting interval.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| ZTE | OK to further study enhancements on partial measurement reporting. |
| FL | Let’s continue the discussion and see if more inputs can be collected. |

## 5.8 TRS-based synchronization

5.8.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the submitted contributions in this meeting, results of using TRS to serve time/frequency synchronization for UL positioning are evaluated in [2/HW, Hisilicon]. In the evaluation, the TRS for synchronization is configured adjacent to SRS occasions. It shows that the power consumption is further reduced. Based on the evaluations, it is proposed to further study the configuration of TRS for synchronization before the SRS transmission for LPHAP in RRC\_INACTIVE state.

5.8.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** The enhancement on TRS-based synchronization in RRC\_INACTIVE seems trivial when compared to other enhancements and only 1 company provide views on it. In this sense, FL suggests to treat it as low priority for now, interested companies can further investigate on this issue in the next meeting.

**[Low] Proposal 5.7 (I)**

* For the purpose of reducing power consumption, study the configuration of TRS for synchronization in adjacent to the SRS for positioning transmission in RRC\_INACTIVE state.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think having a CSI-RS type synchronization signal rather than SSB is beneficial because   * The position is more flexible than SSB * The configuration can be independent from cell ID * The SFN transmission of TRS is more compatible with SRS configuration being valid across multiple cells. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think this is as “trivial”. A UE has optimized SSB engine which can be much more power consumption friendly compared to TRS. So, arguing that it will help with power consumption is not obvious to us. |
| Samsung | We believe the proposal can be up to implementation, by setting proper configuiration of TRS and SRS. |
| Intel | We are not sure whether any additional enhancements needed wrt Rel-17 TRS feature. |
| LGE | TRS for idle/inactive UE is already supported by Rel-17 UE power saving feature and LPHAP UE can take advantage from it. |
| FL | Let’s continue the discussion and see if more inputs can be collected. |
| ZTE | OK to further study. |

## [Closed] 5.9 Enhancements on network-initiated DL message transmission

***Background:*** In Rel-17 positioning, RAN2 agreed that the NW can send DL LCS, LPP message and RRC message to the UE if the UE initiates data transmission using UL SDT beforehand. Otherwise, if the UE does not initiate UL SDT, the NW shall rely on the legacy operation, i.e., transit the UE to RRC\_CONNECTED mode.

5.9.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, 2 companies (ZTE, InterDigital) propose to study and support of network-initiated DL LCS/LPP message transmission via MT-SDT in RRC\_INACTIVE states.

5.9.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** As the support of MT-SDT for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE state is to be studied in RAN2 in Rel-18 SDT agenda item, RAN1 should wait for the progress of RAN2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes. |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| Samsung | Agree with FL assessment. |
| Intel | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| LGE | OK |
| Lenovo | Agree with FL. |
| ZTE | Fine with the comments. |
|  |  |

***Summary from the 1st round discussion***: Seems that all comments are aligned with FL’s assessment. Let’s close this issue in this meeting.

## 5.10 Ultra-deep sleep

5.10.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, 2 companies (HW/Hisilicon, xiaomi) propose to support ultra-deep sleep state in LPHAP. To be specific, in [2/HW, Hisilicon], it is proposed to study the specification impact to support the ultra-deep sleep option 2.

5.10.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments:*** To FL’s understanding, whether specification impact should be considered depends on which power model of the ultra-deep sleep state is considered. If option 1 is used, no particular specification impact seems necessary. In this meeting, we should first try to reach consensus on the two options of the power model of the ultra-deep sleep state. If option 2 is agreed, the specification impact can be further investigated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As said, both options are based on different assumptions for the functionalities activeated when waking from the ultra-deep sleep. Despite which option, we assume the spec impact eventually goes to how to define the LPHAP UE capabilities. It seems premuature to say Zero impact for option1 and we assume the spec impact for both options when identified could be commonly reflected. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t think that there is a spec impact from ultra-deep sleep state. |
| Samsung | In our understanding, no matter which option is adopted, the evaluation assumption is an implementation issue and has no spec impact. |
| Intel | We do not see spec impact for this issue |
| LGE | We think there is no specification impact from ultra-deep sleep mode. |
| ZTE | If we adopt option 1 OR option 2 as the power consumption model, there might not be any spec impact. But if option 1 and option 2 are both adopted, and the LPHAP device has to choose one based on the device status or positioning requirement, there might be minor spec impact concerning the option selection. |

## 5.11 Decoupling of communication and positioning BW

5.11.1 Summary of inputs

From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, in [2/HW, Hisilicon], it is proposed to study the decoupling of bandwidth of communication and positioning for LPHAP, such that a LPHAP UE is able to satisfy high accuracy positioning services, meanwhile, the communication functionality is limited to reduce power consumption and cost.

5.11.2 Round 1 discussion

***FL comments***: To my understanding, from potential enhancements perspective, the specification impact seems too early for this stage to consider. Nevertheless, such LPHAP device type with decoupled communication and positioning BW would be a promising implementation in the industry, and it is also related to several issues, e.g., power model of ultra-deep sleep state, enhancements on eDRX and paging reception, etc. From this perspective, FL suggests companies to keep this in mind when discussing evaluation assumptions and potential enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the evaluation of the power consumption, we are assuming using smaller bandwidth (20MHs for PDCC/PDSCH, etc) and 100MHZ (SRS and PRS) for meeting positioning accuracy target. This is essentially decoupling the BW for communication and positioning, which is helpful for reducing power in inactive state using initial BWP with smaller BW for saving power, so we think it is a noteworthy enhancement and should be discussed.  In addition, with the support of ultra-deep sleep option 2, we believe that LPHAP is still a communication capable UE, which preferably is implemented or accessing the network via a RedCap UE type. However with the communication RF bandwidth of 20MHz for RedCap v.s. the need to achieve high accuracy requirement with the positioning RF bandwidth of 100MHz, such a decoupling feature is an important feature for the LPHAP UE eco-system. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t agree that there is such understanding that a LPHAP device is a new device that needs to be considered with different features. We don’t think there should be a new UE type discussed. |
| Samsung | The proposal may need clarification: is it intended to support two active BWPs for a UE? |
| Intel | Agree with Qualcomm’s view |
| Nokia/NSB | We also don’t think a new type of UEs should be considered for LPHAP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | @Samsung, it is not the support of two active BWPs but rather is basically simiar to UE transmitting SRS outside initial uplink BWP in Rel-17.  A concise answer to the others questions above: it is not proposing a new UE type but rather a combo of features contributing to LPHAP for the target of up to 1yr battery life.  Eventually, FG(s) will be defined for LPHAP and can be optionally supported by any UEs (including eMBB, redcap, Rel-18 redcap) via reporting the support of such FG(s). |
| ZTE | OK to study the mentioned potential enhancement. We prefer introduce LPHAP as a new device type, and in this way, the LMF/gNB can customize differentiated SRS/PRS configuration to further improve the battery life. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | @Samsung, it is not the support of two active BWPs but rather is basically simiar to UE transmitting SRS outside initial uplink BWP in Rel-17.  A concise answer to the others questions above: it is not proposing a new UE type but rather a combo of features contributing to LPHAP for the target of up to 1yr battery life.  Eventually, FG(s) will be defined for LPHAP and can be optionally supported by any UEs (including eMBB, redcap, Rel-18 redcap) via reporting the support of such FG(s). |
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**Appendix A: Summary of contributions**

A.1 Remaining issues on evaluation methodology

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [2] | ***Observation 2: Without the requirement of receiving paging, UE may implement ultra-deep sleep Option 2 for the purpose of waking up to do positioning only.***  ***Proposal 1: On the ultra-deep sleep model***   * ***Adopt a single value of 0.01 power unit per slot for both options*** * ***Both Options can be adopted in the evaluation, where***   + ***Option 2 applies to the case when UE wakes up to only perform positioning transmission or measurement***   + ***Option 1 applies to the case when UE wakes up to perform communication, including receiving paging, initiating SDT, or accessing a cell*** * ***The transition energy of Option 1 takes the value of 10000.*** |
| vivo [5] | ***Proposal 2:***   * ***For ultra-deep sleep option1, support 5000 power units as ultra-deep sleep transition power.*** |
| Nokia/NSB [6] | **Proposal 1:** Add the following note to the conclusion made at RAN1#109.   * Note: This does not imply anything about if the Rel-16/17 positioning technique can achieve the target horizontal positioning accuracy requirement based on the baseline assumption for power consumption evaluation of LPHAP.   **Proposal 2:** RAN1 considers option 1 for the evaluation of the battery life of the LPHAP device with a modification of the transition energy from 2000 to 20000. |
| OPPO [7] | ***Proposal 1: For the study/evaluation of LPHAP, additional target positioning requirements is suggested as***   * ***End-to-end latency for position estimation of UE (< 1 s).***   ***Proposal 2: If RAN1 evaluation is needed for LPHAP, support to reuse the evaluation assumptions of FR1 InF-DH scenario captured in TR 38.857.***  ***Proposal 3: For evaluating the power consumption of LPHAP, suggest to take the power consumption model of [5] as the starting point and further consider the following power states***   * ***For positioning methods based on DL PRS***   + ***Deep sleep***   + ***PRS reception and processing***   + ***UL transmission for positioning reporting*** * ***For positioning methods based on UL SRS resources for positioning***   + ***Deep sleep***   + ***SRS*** ***transmission*** * ***For positioning methods based on both DL PRS and UL SRS resources for positioning***   + ***Deep sleep***   + ***PRS reception and processing***   + ***UL transmission for positioning reporting***   + ***SRS*** ***transmission***     - ***Note: SRS transmission and UL transmission for positioning reporting may be merged into one state*** |
| Intel [9] | **Observation 1: The LPHAP device characteristics for Option 2 in the ultra-deep sleep power model is unclear and transition time of 25ms seems rather too low given relative time is scaled down by factor of 100.**  **Observation 4: NB-IOT power model may not be directly applicable to NR LPHAP model for the following reasons**   * **UE capabilities, operating BWs etc. can be different for NB-IOT and NR LPHAP** * **Group of HW components that can be turned ON/OFF in different sleep states appear to be quite different for NB-IOT and NR LPHAP devices. NB-IoT only defined two sleep states, whereas NR LPHAP model consists of four sleep states.** * **Power states with normalized relative power value of 1 have different characteristics for NB-IOT and NR LPHAP**   + **Light sleep with relative power 1 in NB IOT model can still assume synchronization and accurate timing is maintained**   + **Deep sleep in LPHAP has relative power 1 and it may not observe accurate timing and synchronization**   **Proposal 1: Support Option 1 with additional transition energy 2000 for the ultra-deep sleep state for power consumption evaluation of LPHAP devices.** |
| ZTE [11] | ***Proposal 2: For the power consumption model in ultra-deep sleep state, option 2 is revised as:***   * + - ***The relative power unit: 0.01***     - ***Additional transition energy: 480;***     - ***Total transition time: 25ms*** |
| CMCC [13] | **Proposal 1: For option 1 of ultra-deep sleep state, consider the following power consumption model:**   * **The relative power unit: 0.015** * **Additional transition energy: 2000** * **Total transition time: 400ms**   **Proposal 2: For option 2 of ultra-deep sleep state, consider the following power consumption model:**   * **The relative power unit: 0.01** * **Additional transition energy: 800** * **Total transition time: 50ms**   **Proposal 3: For the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep state, RAN1 strives to down-select between the following two options:**   * + **Option 1:**     - **The relative power unit: 0.015**     - **Additional transition energy: 2000**     - **Total transition time: 400ms**   + **Option 2:**     - **The relative power unit: 0.01**     - **Additional transition energy: [800]**     - **Total transition time: [50]ms** |
| Samsung [16] | **Proposal 2: Support Option 1 for ultra deep sleep study:**   * **Option 1:**   + **The relative power unit: 0.015**   + **Additional transition energy: 2000**   + **Total transition time: 400ms** |

A.2 Evaluations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [2] | ***Observation 1: Rel-17 baseline UL and DL positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE state can approximately achieve 300 – 500 hours battery life, which cannot meet the LPHAP requirements.***   * ***Even with K factor taking the value 4, it still cannot meet the battery life requirement of 6 months.***   ***Observation 3:***   * ***With ultra-deep sleep Option 1***   + ***DL and UL positioning cannot meet the requirement of 6 months*** * ***By further removing paging reception and adopting ultra-deep sleep Option 2***   + ***DL UE-based positioning can meet the requirement of 6 months*** * ***By further enhancing SRS mobility***   + ***UL positioning can meet the requirement of one year*** |
| Spreadtrum [4] | ***Observation 1: When implementation factor K is less than 4, the battery life of LPHAP device Type A and Type B cannot meet the requirement of 6 months.***  ***Observation 2: When implementation factor K is equal to 4, the battery life of LPHAP device Type B can meet the requirement of 6 months.***  ***Observation 3: The battery life of LPHAP device Type A and Type B cannot meet the requirement of 12 months with any values of implementation factor K.*** |
| vivo [5] | ***Observation 1:***   * ***For LPHAP power consumption evaluation, when I-DRX cycle is 1.28s, the evaluation results of baseline cases are as follows*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.44 and 2.48 months for baseline case of UE-based DL positioning under high SINR*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.36 and 2.02 months for baseline case of UE-assisted DL positioning under high SINR with CG-SDT*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.46 and 2.58 months for baseline case of UL positioning under high SINR*** * ***For LPHAP power consumption evaluation, when I-DRX cycle is 10.24s, the evaluation results of baseline cases are as follows*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.68 and 3.84 months for baseline case of UE-based DL positioning under high SINR*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.65 and 3.68 months for baseline case of UE-assisted DL positioning under high SINR with CG-SDT*** * ***the battery life for type A and type B LPHAP devices is 0.68 and 3.87 months for baseline case of UL positioning under high SINR***   ***Observation 2:***   * ***Regardless of I-DRX cycle is selected as 1.28s or 10.24s, the power consumption in inactive state for the cases of existing RAN functionality cannot meet the requirement of 6 months for type A and type B LPHAP devices with implementation factor of 1.*** * ***e.g., even for the lowest power consumption in the case of UL positioning under high SINR and with 10.24s IDRX cycle, the battery life gaps are 5.32 and 2.13 months for type A and type B LPHAP devices respectively, compared to 6 months requirement.***   ***Observation 3:***   * ***For DL positioning in inactive state, UE-based positioning is more power efficient than UE-assisted DL positioning***.   ***Observation 4:***   * ***For UE-assisted DL positioning, CG-SDT report is more power efficient than RA-SDT report.***   ***Observation 5:***   * ***In inactive state, positioning with good channel conditions (such as high SINR) consumes less power than that with bad channel condition.***   ***Observation 6:***   * ***With some enhanced assumptions of ultra-deep sleep and eDRX configuration, the power consumption for baseline cases can meet the battery life requirement of 6 months and 12 months.*** * ***For type A LPHAP device, baseline cases with ultra-deep sleep option 1 with transition power of 5000 and 30.72s eDRX cycle can reach 6 months battery life, while other baseline cases with larger ultra-deep sleep transition power and/or shorter eDRX cycle are hard to reach the 6 months battery life.*** * ***For type A LPHAP device, baseline cases with ultra-deep sleep option 2 and eDRX cycle of 20.48s/30.72s can basically reach the battery life of 12 months.*** * ***For type B LPHAP device, baseline cases with all kinds of enhanced assumptions can achieve 6 months battery life and most of baseline cases with enhanced assumptions can achieve 12 months battery life.***   ***Observation 7:***   * ***For ultra-deep sleep option 1, as the ultra-deep sleep transition power decreases, the UE power consumption decreases, and it is easier to achieve target battery life.*** * ***For type A LPHAP device, in the case of UE-based DL positioning with 30.72s eDRX cycle, the sub-cases with 20000/15000/10000/5000 transition power can reach battery life of 2.04/2.64/3.71/6.26 months respectively.*** * ***For type B LPHAP device, in the case of UE-based DL positioning with 30.72s eDRX cycle, the sub-cases with 20000/15000/10000/5000 transition power can also reach battery life of 11.05/14.83/20.56/35.22 months respectively.***   ***Observation 8:***   * ***For ultra-deep sleep option 1, ultra-deep sleep transition power occupies the largest proportion of the total power consumption.*** * ***Ultra-deep sleep transition power of 20000 occupies more than 90% of the total power consumption, and even the transition power of 5000 occupies about 70% of the total power consumption***   ***Observation 9:***   * ***More justifications may be needed to verify the feasibility and applicability for the assumption of option 2 ultra-deep sleep.***   ***Observation 10:***   * ***At least for ultra-deep sleep option 1, disabling paging monitoring does not bring significant power gain.***   ***Observation 11:***   * ***At least for ultra-deep sleep option 1, as the DRX cycle decreases, the gain of power consumption of ultra-deep sleep compared to regular deep sleep becomes smaller.***   ***Observation 12:***   * ***Ultra-deep sleep is more suitable for DRX with large period, especially for eDRX cycle>10.24s.*** |
| Nokia/NSB [6] | **Observation 1:** For DL-only UE-based positioning with low SINR assumption, average power consumption per slot is 2.470, 1.184, 1.092, and 1.061, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 2:** For DL-only UE-assisted positioning with low SINR assumption, the average power consumption per slot is 3.246, 1.281, 1.140, and 1.094, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 3:** For DL-only UE-based positioning with high SINR assumption, the average power consumption per slot is 1.639, 1.080, 1.040, and 1.027, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 4:** For DL-only UE-assisted positioning with high SINR assumption, the average power per slot is 2.064, 1.133, 1.066, and 1.044, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 5:** For UL-only UE-assisted positioning with low SINR assumption, the average power per slot is 2.696, 1.212, 1.106, and 1.071, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 6:** For UL-only UE-assisted positioning with high SINR assumption, the average power per slot is 1.674, 1.084, 1.042, and 1.028, respectively for DRX cycle of 1.28 s, 10.24 s, 20.48 s, and 30.72 s.  **Observation 7:** The evaluated battery life time for two different types of LPHAP device (unit: days) is as follows:   1. I-DRX cycle with 1.28 s  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Type-A LPHAP device | | Type B LPHAP device | | | K=1 | K=4 | K=1 | K=4 | | DL-only UE-based | Low SINR | 8.99 | 35.98 | 50.60 | 202.42 | | High SINR | 13.55 | 54.23 | 76.26 | 305.06 | | DL-only UE-assisted | Low SINR | 6.84 | 27.38 | 38.51 | 154.03 | | High SINR | 10.76 | 43.06 | 60.56 | 242.24 | | UL-only | Low SINR | 8.24 | 32.97 | 46.36 | 185.45 | | High SINR | 13.27 | 53.09 | 74.67 | 298.68 |  1. I-DRX cycle with 10.24 s  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Type-A LPHAP device | | Type B LPHAP device | | | K=1 | K=4 | K=1 | K=4 | | DL-only UE-based | Low SINR | 18.76 | 75.07 | 105.57 | 422.29 | | High SINR | 20.57 | 82.30 | 115.74 | 462.96 | | DL-only UE-assisted | Low SINR | 17.34 | 69.39 | 97.58 | 390.32 | | High SINR | 19.61 | 78.45 | 110.32 | 441.30 | | UL-only | Low SINR | 18.33 | 73.34 | 103.13 | 412.54 | | High SINR | 20.50 | 82.00 | 115.31 | 461.25 |  1. eDRX cycle with 20.48 s  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Type-A LPHAP device | | Type B LPHAP device | | | K=1 | K=4 | K=1 | K=4 | | DL-only UE-based | Low SINR | 20.35 | 81.40 | 114.46 | 457.87 | | High SINR | 21.36 | 85.47 | 120.19 | 480.76 | | DL-only UE-assisted | Low SINR | 19.49 | 77.97 | 109.65 | 438.59 | | High SINR | 20.84 | 83.38 | 117.26 | 469.04 | | UL-only | Low SINR | 20.09 | 80.36 | 113.01 | 452.07 | | High SINR | 21.32 | 85.30 | 119.96 | 479.84 |  1. eDRX cycle with 30.72 s  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Type-A LPHAP device | | Type B LPHAP device | | | K=1 | K=4 | K=1 | K=4 | | DL-only UE-based | Low SINR | 20.94 | 83.77 | 117.81 | 471.25 | | High SINR | 21.63 | 86.55 | 121.71 | 486.85 | | DL-only UE-assisted | Low SINR | 20.31 | 81.25 | 114.26 | 457.03 | | High SINR | 21.28 | 85.14 | 119.73 | 478.92 | | UL-only | Low SINR | 20.74 | 82.99 | 116.71 | 466.85 | | High SINR | 21.61 | 86.46 | 121.59 | 486.38 |   **Observation 8**: Type-A LPHAP device can’t achieve the target requirement for battery life without further enhancement beyond just e-DRX.  **Observation 9**: The gains from e-DRX of 20.48 s and 30.72 s are marginal compared with the existing I-DRX configurations.  **Observation 10**: Type-B LPHAP device can’t achieve the target requirement for battery life with the baseline *K* value of 1.  **Observation 11**: In order to achieve the LPHAP battery life requirement, enhancement of Rel-17 functionality is necessary. |
| CATT [8] | **Observation 1: The UE-based DL positioning with eDRX (eDRX cycles with 30.72 sec) and ultra-deep sleep could meet the target requirement of 6 months, where battery life is 7.71 months.**  **Observation 2: The major power consumption is caused by sleep state.** |
| Intel [9] | **Observation 2: For the baseline evaluation scenario of type A LPHAP device, assuming transition energy 2000 in Option 1 of the ultra-deep sleep power model meets the 6 months battery life requirement when 20.48s and 30.72s DRX cycles are assumed for the three positioning methods.**  **Observation 3: For the baseline evaluation scenario of type A LPHAP device, assuming transition energy 20000 in Option 1 of the ultra-deep sleep power model does not meet the 6 months battery life requirement when 20.48s and 30.72s DRX cycles are assumed for the three positioning methods.** |
| Sony [10] | [Observation 1 – The battery life of the LPHAP device is limited to 4 – 12 days for the studied scenarios and with C2 =800 mhA, much significantly lower than the long 6 – 12 months battery life requirements. The battery life of LPHA device increases linearly when increasing its battery capacity to 4500 mAh.](#_Toc115347992)  [Observation 2 – Looking at the power consumption break-down, it is observed that the dominant source of energy cost is different depending on the I-DRX periodicity and positioning occasion periodicity](#_Toc115347993)  [Observation 3 - Aligning the DRX on duration and DL assisted PRS procedure provide power saving gain.](#_Toc115347994)  [Observation 4 – When aligning the DRX on duration and DL assisted PRS procedure, the power saving gain is higher for the scenarios where the DRX cycle are short and DL positioning and paging have the same periodicity.](#_Toc115347995) |
| ZTE [11] | ***Observation 1: The maximum additional transition energy suggested in option 1 accounts for a very large portion in a eDRX cycle, which is too large to meet the battery lift requirement.***  ***Observation 2: The additional transition energy of ultra-deep sleep should be greater than that of deep sleep.***  ***Observation 3: In Rel-17, the battery life requirement of LPHAP device cannot be satisfied while applying device type A.***  ***Observation 4: In Rel-17, the evaluated battery life can meet the requirement for 12 months only when K=4 with device Type B.***  ***Observation 5: In Rel-17, the evaluated battery life can meet the requirement for 6 months when K≥2 with device Type B.***  ***Observation 6: In Rel-17, the power consumption of deep sleep accounts for very large proportion in the total power for LPHAP device.***  ***Observation 7: In Rel-18, the battery life requirement of LPHAP device cannot be satisfied in some evaluation cases, e.g. with too large transition energy for ultra-deep sleep mode, or with too short DRX cycle, or with too small C2.***  ***Observation 8: In Rel-18, the power consumption of LPHAP device is lower when PRS is configured close to SSB and PO.***  ***Observation 9: In Rel-18, the evaluated battery life of option 1 can meet the requirement only when the DRX cycle is configured larger than 10.24s with device Type B.***  ***Observation 10: In Rel-18, the requirement of battery life for LPHAP device can be satisfied in most cases while adopting option 2 and revised option 2 with 10.24s DRX cycle for device Type A.***  ***Observation 11: Smaller additional transition energy of ultra-deep sleep increases the battery life of LPHAP device.***  ***Observation 12: Longer DRX cycle configuration can improve the battery life of LPHAP device.***  ***Observation 13: In Rel-18, the number of transition times resulting in the power consumption accounts for very large proportion in the total power for LPHAP device.***  ***Observation 14: Support of 1-symbol PRS can further reduce the power consumption of PRS measurement.*** |
| xiaomi [12] | ***Observation 1: For UE-based DL positioning***   * ***Case ID#4 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 2) can meet the target requirement 12 months.*** * ***Case ID#5 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can almost meet the target requirement 6 months.*** * ***Case ID#6 with 1 eDRX cycle (30.72s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can meet the target requirement 6 months.***   + ***If the value of additional transmission energy changed to more than 3000, it will not be able to meet the target requirement 6 months.***   ***Observation 2: For UE-assisted DL positioning***   * ***Case ID#10 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 2) can meet the target requirement 12 months.*** * ***Case ID#11 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can almost meet the target requirement 6 months.*** * ***Case ID#12 with 1 eDRX cycle (30.72s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can meet the target requirement 6 months.***   + ***If the value of additional transmission energy changed to more than 3000, it will not be able to meet the target requirement 6 months.***   ***Observation 3: For UL positioning***   * ***Case ID#16 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 2) can meet the target requirement 12 months.*** * ***Case ID#17 with 1 eDRX cycle (20.48s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can almost meet the target requirement 6 months.*** * ***Case ID#18 with 1 eDRX cycle (30.72s) and Ultra sleep state (Option 1 with 2000 as additional transmission energy) can meet the target requirement 6 months.***   + ***If the value of additional transmission energy changed to more than 3000, it will not be able to meet the target requirement 6 months.*** |
| CMCC [13] | **Observation 1: With baseline evaluation assumptions, none of the existing Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning functionalities meets the target requirement of 6~12 months battery life.**  **Observation 2: For UL positioning, frequent (re)configuration for UL SRS significantly increases the power consumption:**   * **The slot-averaged relative power unit increases from 1.85 to 4.11 for a power cycle of 1.28s;** * **The slot-averaged relative power unit increases from 1.51 to 1.79 for a power cycle of 10.24s.**   **Observation 3: By extending the DRX cycle and RS periodicity, the power consumption significantly reduced, as the UE is able to go into a deeper sleep state and stays asleep as much as possible.**  **Observation 4: Minimizing the gap between paging reception, DL PRS/UL SRS occasion, and measurement reporting helps reduce the power consumption, as the UE reduces the number of transitions from active to ultra-deep sleep and stays asleep as much as possible**  **Observation 5: For option 1 of ultra-deep sleep state with additional transition power 20000:**   * **None of the UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning techniques meets the battery life of 6 nor 12 months for LPHAP Type A device.** * **The battery life of 6 and 12 months can be met with UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning for LPHAP Type B device.**   **Observation 5: For option 1 of ultra-deep sleep state with additional transition power 2000:**   * **The battery life of 6 and 12 months can be met with UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning for LPHAP Type A device.** * **The battery life of 6 and 12 months can be met with UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning for LPHAP Type B device.**   **Observation 6: For option 2 of ultra-deep sleep state:**   * **The battery life of 6 and 12 months can be met with UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning for LPHAP Type A device.** * **The battery life of 6 and 12 months can be met with UE-assisted DL positioning, UE-based DL positioning and UL positioning for LPHAP Type B device.** |
| Samsung [16] | ***Observation 1: For Type A LPHAP device with implementation factor K=1:***   * ***For a same evaluated configuration case, DL positioning consumes more power than UL positioning.*** * ***For all evaluated configuration cases in both DL and UL positioning, deep sleep cannot achieve the target battery life of 6 to 12 months.*** * ***For all evaluated configuration cases in both DL and UL positioning, ultra deep sleep can improve the battery life.***    + ***Especially, the improvement is significant for long DRX cycle (e.g., Case 3 and 4 in the evaluations).***   + ***For eDRX cycle (e.g., Case 4 in the evaluations), the target battery life of 6 to 12 months can be achieved for high SNR scenario.*** * ***For all evaluated configuration in both DL and UL positioning with low SNR scenario (or bad synchronization), the target battery life of 6 to 12 months still cannot be achieved.***   ***Observation 2: For Type A LPHAP device with implementation factor K=1:***   * ***Paging and PEI triggered positioning are beneficial in improving the battery life.***    + ***Especially for low SNR scenario, PEI triggered positioning can remarkably improve the battery life and achieve the target of 6 months.*** |
| LGE [18] | ***Observation #1: Type A LPHAP device (i.e. C2=800mAh) cannot meet the target battery life.***  ***Observation #2: Type B LPHAP device (i.e. C2=4500mAh) cannot meet the target battery life in most of cases. Meanwhile when 10.24s I-DRX cycle and K≥2 are assumed, there are some cases that can meet the target requirement for battery life.*** |
| Qualcomm [20] | ***Observation 1: Reducing the latencies involved in the legacy SDT procedure may significantly reduce the power consumption.***  ***Observation 2: Time-domain proximity of the PRS/SRS/Paging/Reporting-Opportunity reduces the power consumption by ensuring the UE stays in sleep mode longer times and reducing the need of sleep mode switches.***  ***Observation 3: Increasing I-DRX and/or SRS periodicities would reduce the power consumption while keeping the latency-related QoS within the required targets (e.g. 20.48, 30.72 SRS periodicities and/or I-DRX).***  ***Observation 4: If the location is needed at the UE, the smallest Power consumption is achieved for UE-based DL Positioning***  ***Observation 5: If the location is needed at the network, the smallest Power consumption is achieved for UL-only Positioning***  ***Observation 6: Positioning-related (re-)configuration(s) (e.g. SDT) increase significantly the power.*** |
| Ericsson [21] | Observation 1: For the baseline of K=1 and Type A LPHAP UE with C2=800mAh, the average PU consumption target is 0.0608  Observation 2: With 8 TRP measured per DRX, it is possible to completely sound the indoor factory deployment in 3 10.24s DRX cycles, and still be within the reporting periodicity budget of use case 6 (30 secs).  Observation 3: Knowledge of the DRX pattern configured to the UE by the LMF is beneficial in order to optimize the assistance data.  Observation 4: Short SRS is sufficient to provide UL coverage in InF cases  Observation 5 : The proposed ultra deep sleep option 1 profile, together with 10.24s DRX cycle with a single SRS transmission per DRX, fulfill the power requirements for 6 months battery life  Observation 6 : The proposed ultra deep sleep option 1 profile, together with 30.72s DRX cycle with a single SRS transmission per DRX, fulfill the power requirements for 12 months battery life  Observation 7: SDT procedure for synching of the UL SRS may introduce addition power consumption that need to be taken into account if needed frequently.  Observation 8: The configuration of SRS in multiple cell to allow SRS mobility for RRC\_INACTIVE UE is not efficient from the resource utilization perspective. |

A.3 Potential enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon [2] | ***Proposal 2: RAN1 should further study the impact to support ultra-deep sleep Option 2, where UE ramping up from ultra-deep sleep is only for positioning transmission or measurement.***  ***Proposal 3: RAN1 acknowledges the benefit of DRX enhancement (e.g. no paging reception or eDRX in RRC\_INACTIVE state) to reduce the power consumption for LPHAP.***  ***Proposal 4: RAN1 should further study decoupling bandwidth between communication and positioning for LPHAP.***   * ***Note: decoupling bandwidth between communication and positioning includes at least a larger positioning bandwidth (PRS and/or SRS) than the communication bandwidth.***   ***Proposal 5: RAN1 should further study the configuration of SRS that is applicable to an area consisting of multiple cells, where the SRS configuration is not released as long as the cell UE is camping on belongs to the area.***  ***Proposal 6: RAN1 should further study the configuration of TRS for synchronization before the SRS transmission.*** |
| Quectel [3] | ***Proposal 1:***   * The procedure of low power positioning should consider the impact of Paging Early Indication for UE in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE mode   ***Proposal 2:***   * For power saving and latency reduction for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs, positioning with PRACH preamble should be studied from the perspectives of TA granularity, PRACH SCS and length and DL synchronization accuracy.   ***Proposal 3:***   * The power consumption of SRS transmission and higher accuracy DL positioning method should be evaluated. |
| vivo [5] | ***Proposal 1:***   * ***Power saving enhancements should be supported for LPHAP to meet the power consumption requirement.***   ***Proposal 3:***   * ***In idle/inactive state, the issues/solutions for LPHAP with eDRX mechanism should be considered to maximize the battery life, including*** * ***Potential UE behavior when eDRX is configured*** * ***Positioning related issues for eDRX cycle beyond 10.24s in inactive state*** * ***eDRX/positioning related coordination between positioning nodes***   ***Proposal 4:***   * ***The following solutions related to inactive DRX can be considered for LPHAP, including*** * ***LMF requesting inactive DRX configurations (e.g. DRX cycle, etc.) from the cells including UE serving cell and neighboring cells that may be reselected can be considered for LPHAP*** * ***PRS measurement/SRS transmission in the vicinity of paging monitoring***   ***Proposal 5:***   * ***Mobility for SRS transmission inactive state can be considered for LPHAP, including*** * ***Pre-configured SRS*** * ***UE initiated SRS configuration update request*** * ***SRS beam sweeping enabling***   ***Proposal 6:***   * ***Introduce longer candidate values for SRS periodicity, e.g., 15360, 20480, 30720ms.***   ***Proposal 7:***   * ***Support the following enhancements related to idle state positioning*** * ***DL-PRS measurement in idle state*** * ***Reporting of DL-PRS measurement and/or location estimate performed in idle state when the UE is in inactive/connected state.*** |
| Nokia/NSB [6] | **Proposal 3:** RAN1 should consider overall enhancement including positioning measurement behavior, positioning measurement reporting, procedure for RS configuration/reconfiguration.  **Proposal 4**: RAN1 to study allowing UE to skip some measurement reports (e.g., when measurement results are similar).  **Proposal 5:** For purpose of the power consumption reduction, RAN1 investigates the impact of the partial measurement reporting functionality and identifies the necessary physical layer procedure.  **Proposal 6:** RAN1 to study partial updates of PRS AD for UEs in RRC\_INACTIVE mode to reduce overhead and power consumption.  **Proposal 7**: RAN1 to study methods to reduce frequent configuration or update of UL SRS for positioning, e.g., by configuring common UL SRS for positioning within a positioning area.  **Proposal 8**: RAN1 to study how to avoid frequent BWP switching to transmit SRS resource outside of UL BWP.  **Proposal 9**: RAN1 to study how to reduce UE positioning activities (e.g., PRS reception in DL positioning, or SRS-pos transmission in UL positioning) on demand. |
| OPPO [7] | ***Proposal 4: Study whether or not to introduce more candidate values for the reporting interval for the UE power saving.*** |
| CATT [8] | **Proposal 1: For DL positioning, enhancement to support measurement reporting in RRC\_IDLE state should be considered for LPHAP in Rel-18.**  **Proposal 2: For UL positioning, the mechansim of SRS-Pos configuration for UE in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE state should be enhanced especially for the case when UE moves out of the original gNB in Rel-18.**  **Proposal 3: The following SRS-Pos configuration method for UL positioning should be considered:**   * **Introducing a new RACH procedure for UE to obtain the SRS-Pos configuration information.**   **Proposal 4: UE could stop monitoring the Paging Occasions (POs) during the deferred MT-LR period.** |
| Intel [9] | **Proposal 2: RAN1 recommends to support eDRX values of 20.48s and 30.72s in RRC INACTIVE state.**  **Proposal 3: Investigate UL positioning enhancement mechanisms such as how SRS configuration can be updated without entering RRC connected mode in new cell.**  **Proposal 4: RAN1 conducts feasibility study on whether DL positioning measurement reporting and UL SRS transmission can be supported from physical layer perspective**   * **Consider at least pre-configured UL resource for UL transmissions in Idle mode.** |
| Sony [10] | Proposal 1 – Consider aligning the DRX on duration and DL assisted PRS procedure. Further discuss the details (e.g., by RAN2).  Proposal 2 – RAN1 to consider other/additional power saving mechanisms to reduce the total power consumption of LPHAP devices. |
| ZTE [11] | ***Proposal 1: eDRX cycle with > 10.24s should not be discussed in positioning agenda.***  ***Proposal 3: To reduce transition times, UE should either receive both PO and PRS or receive nothing.***  ***Proposal 4: Support the following enhancement for PRS configuration:***   * + - ***Support 1-symble PRS/SRS***     - ***Support the comb size {24, 48}***   ***Proposal 5: Rel-18 should further enhance the UE mobility in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE to reduce the power consumption for UL positioning, e.g. reduce SRS reconfiguration.***  ***Proposal 6: Support MT-LR for positioning via MT-SDT in RRC\_INACTIVE in Rel-18.*** |
| xiaomi [12] | ***Proposal 1: Support to define Ultra-deep sleep state for LPHAP device.***  ***Proposal 2: eDRX cycle with 20.48s and 30.72s can be configured to archive the target battery life for LPHAP device.***  ***Proposal 3: Study SRS transmission or PRS measurement in PO indicated not necessary to wake up by DCI format 2\_7.***  ***Proposal 4: The positioning SRS con be configured per cell group for UE power consumption reduction.***  ***Proposal 5: Study SRS configuration request by random access.*** |
| CMCC [13] | **Proposal 4: Enhancements on power saving solutions should be studied for low power and high accuracy positionings.**  **Proposal 5: From RAN1 perspective, support of DL measurement for UEs in RRC\_IDLE state.**  **Proposal 6: The following DRX related enhancements should be considered:**   * **Introduction of the eDRX mode in LPHAP** * **Reduce the number of PDCCH monitoring occasions in RRC\_INACTIVE/IDLE state for LPHAP** * **Align the DRX pattern and the DL PRS / UL SRS occasions**   **Proposal 7: The following enhancement of SRS transmission in RRC\_INACTIVE state should be considered:**   * **SRS resources are (pre-)configured within an area in RRC\_INACTIVE state.** * **FFS: How to define this area.** |
| Lenovo [14] | ***Proposal 1: RAN1 to support positioning measurements in RRC\_IDLE state, which may be considered beneficial for LPHAP devices.***  ***Proposal 2: The serving gNB may provide/share the applicable UE’s DRX configuration with the LMF for adaptation of the PRS measurement configuration.***  ***Proposal 3: RAN1 to further study they type of DRX configuration to be shared with the LMF, e.g., C-DRX, I-DRX. RAN3 coordination may be required.*** |
| InterDigital [15] | **Proposal 1: Study achievable accuracy of IDLE mode positioning**  **Proposal 2: Study feasibility of IDLE mode positioning methods using PRACH and/or SRS for positioning** |
| Samsung [16] | **Proposal 1: RAN1 shall wait for RAN2’s clarification on the scope of the study. Especially, one of the following options shall be clarified:**   * **Option 1: The study investigates potential enhancement to positioning in RRC\_INATIVE state to support LPHAP.** * **Option 2: The study investigates supporting of positioning in RRC\_IDLE state and potential enhancement to support LPHAP.** * **Option 3: Option 1 + Option 2.**   **Proposal 3: To improve the battery life in low SNR scenario, it’s beneficial to study and support paging or PEI triggered positioning.** |
| Sharp [17] | **Proposal:** For LPHAP, the DL positioning in RRC\_IDLE state should be studied.  **Observation:** When studying PRACH-based UL positioning in RRC\_IDLE state, the difference of power consumption between the positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE state and the positioning in RRC\_IDLE should be the metric. |
| LGE [18] | ***Proposal #1:***   * Enhancements for power saving in RRC inactive state should be studied.   ***Observation #3:***   * For LPHAP, following issues should be considered from a time domain perspective:   + For higher accuracy, configuring the shorter periodicity and/or the larger repetition on PRS/SRS resources could be used, but it costs of UL/DL resources and UE power.   + The time domain window is not supported for inactive state UE in Rel-17.   ***Observation #4:***   * For LPHAP, following issues should be considered from a frequency domain perspective   + When separated BWP for positioning SRS is configured for UE in RRC inactive state, power consumption due to the BWP switching should be considered.   ***Observation #5:***   * If the SRS for positioning always has lower priority than other UL channels, not only performance in terms of accuracy cannot be guaranteed, but also the latency can be increased because of the drop and/or delaying of SRS transmission due to lower priority. |
| NTT DOCOMO [19] | **Proposal 1:**   * **To achieve the requirements of Rel-18 LPHAP (i.e., use case 6 defined in TS 22.104), high reception priority of DL-PRS in RRC\_INACTIVE state may be needed.** * **One possible solution is to reuse PPW for high priority reception of DL-PRS. In addition, RAN1 may need to discuss additional specification impacts.**   **Proposal 2:**   * **To achieve the requirements of Rel-18 LPHAP (i.e., use case 6 defined in TS 22.104), high transmission priority of SRS for positioning in RRC\_INACTIVE state may be needed.** * **One possible solution is to introduce transmission priority indicator between SRS for positioning and other DL/UL signals.**   **Proposal 3:**   * **RAN1 should study to align DRX configuration and paging occasion with PRS measurement or SRS transmission occasion.** * **Priority rules between DRX and PRS/SRS configuration may be needed if the alignment isn’t possible.** |
| Qualcomm [20] | ***Proposal 1: Support Positioning measurements in RRC Idle state.***  ***Proposal 2: For the purpose of reduced power consumption in RRC Inactive, the following can be beneficial:***   * ***Study ways of optimizing the SRS configuration/activation/request procedure(s) included in the UL/DL+UL RRC inactive positioning (e.g. SRS pre-configuration, RACH-based SRS request from the UE, paging-based SRS activation).*** * ***Study ways for SRS transmission continuation after cell change in RRC Inactive (e.g., continuity of the configured SRS across cell change).*** * ***Study PRS/SRS configuration restrictions & corresponding new UE capabilities for enabling reduced power consumption for RTT positioning.*** |

**Appendix B: Agreements in previous RAN1 meetings**

B.1 RAN1#109-e meeting

**Agreement**

Confirm that use case 6 defined in TS 22.104 is the single representative use case for the study of LPHAP.

**Agreement**

At least the relative power unit is adopted as the performance metric to evaluate the power consumption of the Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning and potential enhancements.

**Agreement**

A reference device (e.g., a mobile phone) with reference traffic type, reference battery capability, and reference battery life is defined for the purpose of identification of the performance gap that achieved by the Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning baseline and the target battery life of LPHAP use case 6.

**Agreement**

* Adopt the following parameters as the common evaluation parameters for the LPHAP evaluation:
  + Frequency range: FR1 (baseline); FR2 (optional)
  + SCS: 30kHz for FR1 (baseline); 120kHz for FR2 (optional)
  + BW of the DL PRS and UL SRS pos: 100MHz;
  + Single-sample measurement per position fix (baseline); 4-sample measurement per position fix (optional)
  + UE mobility: up to 3km/h
* Note: It is up to each company to provide detailed power model and evaluation results on power consumption in FR2.

**Agreement**

In the LPHAP evaluation, the power consumption of 5GC data traffic is not modelled. Only the power consumption of the traffic type related to LPHAP positioning (e.g., obtaining/updating SRS configurations, DL PRS measurement reporting, etc.) is considered.

* Note: This does not preclude the power consumption of paging monitoring in the baseline evaluation, but rather assumes that no power consumption of 5GC data traffic is considered during a power cycle.

**Agreement**

Adopt the following power consumption model common for the baseline evaluation of Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative power** |
| PDCCH-only (PPDCCH) | 50Note |
| PDCCH + PDSCH (PPDCCH+PDSCH) | 120 |
| SSB proc. (PSSB) | 50 |
| UL | 250 (0 dBm)  700 (23 dBm) |
| (Optional) PRACH | [210] |
| (Optional) BWP switching | [50] |
| (Optional) Intra-frequency RRM measurement (Pintra) | [60] (synchronous case, N=8, measurement only; Pintra, meas-only)  [80] (combined search and measurement; Pintra, search+meas) |
| (Optional) Inter-frequency RRM measurement (Pinter) | [60] (measurement only per freq. layer; Pinter, meas-only)  [150] (neighbor cell search power per freq. layer; Pinter, search-only)  Micro sleep power assumed for switch in/out a freq. layer |
| Note: Power scaling to 20MHz reception bandwidth follows the rule in Section 8.1.3 of TR 38.840, i.e., max{reference power \* 0.4, 50}. | |

**Agreement**

Adopt the following power consumption model for UL SRS for positioning transmission.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative power** |
| SRS | 210 (baseline);  700 (optional) |

**Agreement**

* In Rel-18 low power and high accuracy positioning, adopt the following requirement:
  + Horizontal positioning accuracy < 1 m for 90% of UEs
  + Positioning interval / duty cycle of 15-30 s
  + UE battery life of 6 months – 1 year
* Note: Setting an exact value each from the set of positioning interval / duty cycle and UE battery life in the evaluation and identification of performance gap will be discussed separately when necessary.

**Conclusion**

* At least when the positioning accuracy is evaluated without jointly evaluating the associated power consumption, the target horizontal positioning accuracy requirement on LPHAP of <1m can be achieved by Rel-16/17 positioning techniques with a positioning bandwidth of at least 100MHz.
* The main aspect of RAN1 evaluation is on power consumption.
* Note: This does not preclude the case that the positioning accuracy can be revisited, if found necessary at later stage.

**Agreement**

* Study further at least the following models and parameter values of conversion between the relative power unit and the battery life to identify the performance gap:
  + Alt. 1: battery life is used as the metric to identify the gap
    - Example:
  + Alt. 2: relative power unit is adopted as the metric to identify the gap
    - Example:

in which

* C1 is the battery capacity of the reference device;
* T1 is the battery life of the reference device;
* P1 is the relative power unit obtained based on the reference traffic type;
* X is the percentage of the power consumed by the reference traffic type;
* C2 is the battery capacity of the LPHAP device;
* P2 is the evaluated relative power unit of the LPHAP device;
* P2\_req is the target relative power unit of the LPHAP device;
* T2\_req is the target battery life of the LPHAP device
* Examples of these parameters are provided as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C1** | **T1** | **X** | **reference traffic type** | **C2** | **T2req** |
| [4500] mAh | [10] hours | [20] % | [FTP (model 3)] | [800] mAh | [12] months |

**Agreement**

Adopt the following periodicity of DL PRS / UL SRS for positioning in the baseline evaluation of Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE positioning:

* 1 DL PRS / UL SRS for positioning occasion per N I-DRX cycle(s);
  + Candidate values of N to evaluate is 1 and 8 for I-DRX cycle of 1.28s;
    - Note: Individual company may consider either one or both in the evaluation.
  + Candidate value of N to evaluate is 1 for I-DRX cycle of 10.24s.

**Agreement**

* The I-DRX configuration is included in the baseline evaluation of Rel-17 RRC\_INACTVIE positioning.
  + Note: This does not preclude the case where no I-DRX cycle nor paging is considered in the evaluation of potential solutions to maximize the battery life.
* Adopt the following I-DRX cycle to evaluate:
  + 1.28s (baseline); 10.24s (optional).

**Agreement**

* Adopt the power consumption model, additional transition energy and total transition time of the three sleep types (deep sleep, light sleep, and micro sleep) in TR38.840 as the evaluation baseline:
* FFS: whether/how an additional new ultra-deep sleep mode can be considered in the evaluation of potential solutions to maximize the battery life, including the determination of the relative power, additional transition energy and total transition time, if necessary.

**Agreement**

* Adopt the following reference configuration and assumption for DL PRS to define the power consumption model for DL PRS measurement:
  + 1 Number of PFL;
  + 8 DL PRS resources per slot are measured;
  + DL PRS instance of smaller than or equal to 1 slot duration;
* Adopt the following table as the power consumption model for DL PRS measurement (derived from Table 22 in TR38.840):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N: Number of TRPs for DL PRS measurement | Synchronous case (baseline) | | Asynchronous case (optional) | |
| FR1 (baseline) | FR2  (optional) | FR1 | FR2 |
| N=4 (baseline) | 120 | 195 | 140 | 255 |
| N=8 (optional) | 150 | 225 | 170 | 285 |

**Agreement**

* For DL positioning, at least the following power components and parameter values are considered for the baseline evaluation of Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE positioning:
  + For the UE-assisted DL positioning,
* SSB proc. with 2 ms duration and the periodicity of I-DRX cycle;
* Paging with 2 ms duration, the periodicity of I-DRX cycle, and group paging rate of 10%;
* DL PRS measurement with 0.5 ms duration;
* CG-SDT with 1ms duration and the periodicity of positioning interval;
  + - * RRCRelsease after the CG-SDT can be optionally included with [1] ms duration;
* (Optional) BWP switching with [1] ms duration;
* (Optional) Intra-/inter-frequency RRM measurement in low SINR condition with [1] ms duration;
* (Optional) RA-SDT (e.g., including CORSET0 + SIB1, PRACH, RAR, Msg 3/4/5) in case of CG-SDT is unavailable;
  + For the UE-based DL positioning,
    - SSB proc. with 2 ms duration and the periodicity of I-DRX cycle;
    - Paging with 2 ms duration, the periodicity of I-DRX cycle, and group paging rate of 10%;
    - DL PRS measurement with 0.5 ms duration;
    - (Optional) BWP switching with [1] ms duration;
    - (Optional) Intra-/inter-frequency RRM measurement in low SINR condition with [1] ms duration;
* Note: The power component and parameter values for UE-assisted DL positioning is also applicable to the DL part of UE-assisted DL+UL positioning method.
* Note: Individual company may consider additional power components and different parameter values in bracket in the evaluation.
* Note: Companies are encouraged to provide the assumption on the timeline between different power consumption events in the evaluation of potential enhancements to reduce the transition times between different power states and to extend the sleeping time as much as possible.

**Agreement**

* For UL positioning, at least the following power components and parameter values are considered for the baseline evaluation of Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE positioning:
  + SSB proc. with 2 ms duration and the periodicity of I-DRX cycle;
  + Paging with 2 ms duration, the periodicity of I-DRX cycle, and group paging rate of 10%;
  + UL SRS for positioning transmission with 0.5 ms duration;
  + (Optional) BWP switching with [1] ms duration;
  + (Optional) Intra-/inter-frequency RRM measurement in low SINR condition with [1] ms duration;
* Note: The power component and parameter values for UL positioning is also applicable to the UL part of UE-assisted DL+UL positioning method.
* Note: Individual company may consider additional power components and different parameter values in bracket in the evaluation.
* Note: Companies are encouraged to provide the assumption on the timeline between different power consumption events in the evaluation of potential enhancements to reduce the transition times between different power states and to extend the sleeping time as much as possible.

B.2 RAN1#110 meeting

Agreement

In the LPHAP evaluation, adopt the following model to convert the relative power unit to the battery life:

* Alt. 1: battery life is used as the metric to identify the gap



* + K is an implementation factor, K = 1 (baseline); K = 0.5, 2, 4 (optional)
* Note: The definition of the notations will be captured in the updates of TR.
* Note: The voltage is assumed to be the same for the reference device and the LPHAP device.

Agreement

* In the LPHAP evaluation, adopt the following example parameter values in the conversion model to evaluate the battery life:
  + For the reference device in the conversion model:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C1 (mAh)** | **T1 (hour)** | **X** | **reference traffic type** |
| 4500 | 12 | 20% | FTP (model 3) |

* + For the LPHAP device, consider 2 typesin the conversion model:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LPHAP device** | **C2 (mAh)** | **T2req (month)** |
| Type A (baseline) | 800 | 6~12 |
| Type B (optional) | 4500 | 6~12 |

* Note: As the reference device and LPHAP device characteristics, and therefore the parameter values of the model for determining battery life, is dependent on implementation factors, manufacturer, design options and cost options, it is up to individual company to evaluate the optional K values, and report the corresponding parameter values.

Agreement

In the LPHAP evaluation, adopt the example value of relative power unit of the reference device P1 = 50 to further align the battery life among companies.

Agreement

For the purpose of LPHAP evaluation, an ultra-deep sleep state is considered. The following options of the power consumption model of the ultra-deep sleep state can be further discussed:

* Option 1:
  + The relative power unit: 0.015
  + Additional transition energy: 2000
  + Total transition time: 400ms
* Option 2:
  + The relative power unit: 0.01
  + Additional transition energy: 450;
  + Total transition time: 25ms
  + FFS: restrictions in processing associated with option 2 after the UE comes out of ultra-deep sleep state
* Notes: the values above can be further discussed

Agreement

For option 1 in the agreement above, the value of additional transition energy is changed to “a value between 2000 and 20000”. FFS which value.

Agreement

* For the purpose of LPHAP evaluation, the following assumptions on eDRX configuration and/or paging reception can be optionally considered:
  + The eDRX cycle to evaluate: 20.48s; 30.72s;
  + For paging reception:
    - 1 paging occasion is included in one eDRX cycle
    - 10% paging rate
  + No paging reception can be optionally evaluated;
  + 1 DL PRS and/or UL SRS for positioning occasion per 1 eDRX cycle
    - Minimizing the gap between PRS measurement, SRS transmission and/or measurement reporting with paging monitoring in time domain can be evaluated.

Agreement

The tables to collect evaluation results from each source in section 3.3.2 of [R1-2207993](file:///C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Local\Temp\360zip$Temp\Docs\R1-2207993.zip) are endorsed.

Agreement

Capture the following in TR as an observation:

* Evaluations of baseline Rel-17 RRC\_INACTIVE state positioning with the evaluation assumptions agreed for the study show that the power consumption on deep sleep state accounts for the highest proportion in the total power.

**Appendix C: Contact information**

The contact information of delegates in charge of LPHAP AI is summarized in the following table for your information.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| CMCC | Jingwen Zhang | zhangjingwen@chinamobile.com |
| vivo | Yuanyuan Wang | yuanyuan.wang.txyj@vivo.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jinhuan Xia | Jinhuan.xia@huawei.com |
| CATT | Ren Da | renda@catt.cn |
| Qualcomm | Alex Manolakos | amanolak@qti.qualcomm.com |
| OPPO | Zhihua Shi | szh@oppo.com |
| Xiaomi | Mingju Li | limingju@xiaomi.com |
| Samsung | Hongbo Si | hongbo.si@samsung.com |
| Lenovo | Alexander Golitschek | aelbwart@lenovo.com |
| Ericsson | Florent Munier | Florent.munier@ericsson.com |
| NTT DOCOMO | Masaya Okamura | masaya.okamura.ea@nttdocomo.com |
| Spreadtrum | Zhenzhu lei | reven.lei@unisoc.com |
| ZTE | Chuangxin Jiang | jiang.chuangxin1@zte.com.cn |
| InterDigital | Fumihiro Hasegawa | Fumihiro.hasegawa@InterDigital.com |