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# Introduction

In this contribution, we provide overview of evaluation results provided in contributions submitted for Rel.17 NR Positioning Enhancements WI [1]-[20]. In addition, we try to formulate tentative conclusions and proposals for discussions based on provided results as well as collect comments from companies.

Please refer to Section 2 if you are interested to check the overview of the contributions. The summary of the discussed aspects and tentative proposals for discussion are provided in Section 3.

# Review of Submitted Contributions

In this contribution, we provide overview of evaluation results provided in contributions submitted for Rel.17 NR Positioning Enhancements WI [1]-[20]. In addition, we try to formulate tentative conclusions and proposals for discussions based on provided results.

## Source #1

In [[1], Huawei], the evaluations of multiple positioning techniques (DL-TDOA, DL-TDOA+DL-AOD, UL-TDOA, UL+TDOA+UL-AOA, Multi-RTT) is presented for baseline scenarios with and without UE/gNB calibration errors. In addition, InF-DH scenario with variable UE/gNB antenna height was analysed. The super-resolution measurement algorithms without LOS/NLOS detection is applied.

**Accuracy analysis**

The following observations are made based on presented results for baseline scenarios:

* Hybrid positioning can help to improve the positioning accuracy
* Positioning accuracy of the center area UEs is generally higher than the edge area UEs
* For InF-SH,
	+ Accuracy of less than 0.2m@90% can be achieved with DL-TDOA+DL-AOD and UL-TDOA+UL-AOA in FR2
	+ Accuracy of less than 0.5m@90% can be achieved with UL-TDOA+UL-AOA in FR1 and Multi-RTT in FR2

The following observations are made based on presented results for modified InF-DH with clutter parameters {40%, 3m, 5m} with variable and fixed UE/gNB antenna height for UL+TDOA+UL-AOA and Multi-RTT in FR1 and FR2:

* For modified InF-DH,
	+ Accuracy of less than 0.5m@90% cannot be achieved without NLOS/LOS detection

For evaluation of the DL-TDOA, UL-TDOA, UL+TDOA+UL-AOA and Multi-RTT in FR1, with calibration errors (gNB Rx/Tx time error T1=1.4ns; UE Rx/Tx time error T1=5.6ns) the following observations are made under above assumptions:

* Positioning accuracy of R16 Multi-RTT deteriorated greatly than other positioning methods with UE/gNB calibration error.
* Positioning accuracy of less than 0.5m@90% can be achieved with UL-TDOA+UL-AOA.

**UE power consumption analysis**

The UE power consumption for the following cases involving PRS measurement and SRS transmission are provided (power model is based on TR 38.840):

* PRS with no CDRX / PRS with CDRX and PRS always in or outside on-duration
* SRS with no CDRX / SRS with CDRX and SRS always in on-duration

The following observations are made:

* PRS measurement takes 7% power consumption without C-DRX and ~18% power consumption with C-DRX
* SRS transmission takes 1% power consumption without C-DRX and 2.7% power consumption with C-DRX

## Source #2

In [[2], vivo], the DL-TDOA, UL-TDOA, UL-AOA and Multi-RTT positioning accuracy analysis is provided for InF-SH and InF-DH scenarios for convex and all UEs.

**Horizontal accuracy analysis**

The following observations are made for different positioning techniques:

* DL-TDOA positioning，
	+ performance target [0.2m 90%]
		- can be achieved in InF-SH and InF-DH with the baseline assumptions for convex UEs
		- can be achieved in InF-SH for FR2 for all UEs
		- **cannot be achieved** in InF-SH for FR1 and InF-DH for FR1 and FR2 for all UEs
* For UL-TDOA positioning,
	+ performance target [0.2m 90%]
		- can be achieved in InF-SH and InF-DH with the baseline assumptions for convex UEs
		- can be achieved in InF-SH for FR2 for all UEs,
		- **cannot be achieved** in InF-SH for FR1 and InF-DH for FR1 and FR2 for all UEs
* For UL-AOA positioning,
	+ performance target [0.2m 90%]
		- **cannot be achieved** in InF-SH and InF-DH scenarios.
* For RTT positioning,
	+ performance target [0.2m 90%]
		- can be achieved in InF-SH for FR2 for all UEs,
		- **cannot be achieved** in InF-SH for FR1 and InF-DH for FR1 and FR2 for all UEs.

Based on provided results it is concluded that:

* Performance target [0.2m 90%] can be achieved in InF-SH and InF-DH with baseline assumptions for all the Rel-16 timing-based positioning techniques.

**Vertical accuracy analysis**

Paper additionally provides vertical positioning evaluations with DL-TDOA and AOA/ZOA for InF-SH and InF-DH scenarios for FR1. The following observations are drawn:

* For DL-TDOA positioning，
	+ performance target [1m 90%]
		- can be achieved In InF-SH and InF-DH scenarios for FR1 with baseline assumptions.
* The uniformly distributed UE height and BS height have no benefit for vertical positioning
* For vertical evaluation with AOA/ZOA technique,
	+ performance target [1m 90%]
		- can be achieved In InF-SH scenario
		- cannot be achieved InF-DH scenario for FR1 with baseline assumptions

**Latency Analysis**

Two options of e2e latency are analyzed: UE-to-UE and LCS-to-UE. It is also noted that the process of the UE-based and UE-assisted positioning is different in terms of latency.

Contribution provides analysis of

* e2e latency and higher layer latency
	+ 100ms e2e latency cannot be reached with Rel-16 DL positioning
	+ Concluded: Physical layer latency is the major part of total positioning latency
* Physical layer latency for DL positioning solutions
	+ $T\_{PRS}$ is the periodicity of PRS
	+ $ T\_{Process time} $is up to UE ability and the signal that needs to measure, as usually
	+ $T\_{ measGap}$ is the periodicity of the measurement gap
	+ $T\_{gap,request}$ is the time to request the gap
	+ $T\_{gap,configuration}$ is the time required by UE to configure gaps; RRC reconfiguration delay
	+ $T\_{pusch reporting time}$ is the time to report
	+ Concluded: Physical layer latency needs to be reduced in R17
* Latency analysis for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs
	+ Additional latency of 40~200ms will be introduced if the UE switches to connected state from idle state for positioning measurement and report

## Source #3

In [[3], ZTE], evaluation results for DL-TDOA with and w/o network synchronization error are provided using MUSIC super-resolution algorithm for FR1 and FR2. The following major conclusions are drawn:

* For InF-SH scenario,
	+ horizontal location error is larger than 40 m for most of cases with 50 ns synchronization error at the percentile of 90% UEs
	+ assuming ideal synchronization and all UEs are inside convex hull, the horizontal positioning accuracy of 90% UEs is less than 0.450 m in FR1, while the value is 0.044 m in FR2
* For InF-DH scenario,
	+ following cases with clutter settings {40%, 2m, 2m} can meet sub-meter level requirement,
		- at the percentile of 50% UEs when all UEs are inside convex hull in FR1
		- at the percentile of 47% UEs when all UEs are uniformly distributed in FR1
		- at the percentile of 67% UEs when all UEs are inside convex hull in FR2
		- at the percentile of 50% UEs when all UEs are uniformly distributed in FR2

It was also observed that vertical accuracy requirement (i.e. 1 m for 90% of UEs) can be met in selected cases based on current assumptions and Rel-16 positioning method under perfect synchronization condition.

## Source #4

In [[4],Sony], the evaluation of positioning accuracy and latency is provided for DL-TDoA and DL-TDoA+ AoD technique with and without LOS detection.

The following observations are made based on provided results:

* In InF-SH scenario,
	+ the target of horizontal positioning accuracy in FR2 is nearly achieved by using positioning technique enhancements, i.e. incorporating legacy DL-TDOA and AoD with NLOS detection.
* In InF-DH scenario,
	+ the target of horizontal positioning accuracy cannot be met by using positioning technique enhancements, i.e. incorporating legacy DL-TDOA and AoD with NLOS detection.
* In InH-OO scenario,
	+ the target of horizontal positioning accuracy can be met by using positioning technique enhancements, i.e. incorporating legacy DL-TDOA and AoD with NLOS detection.

Based on latency analysis the following is recommended:

* RAN1 to study the operation of aperiodic PRS and fast positioning measurement report in order to meet positioning latency requirements.

## Source #5

The work in [[5], CATT] provides initial simulation data for NR positioning performance in InF scenarios. The following positioning techniques were analyzed: DL-TDOA, UL-TDOA, UL-TDOA+UL AoA, Multi-RTT. The MUSIC algorithm was used for estimation of signal location parameters together with 2D or 3D positioning using Chan’s algorithm.

* For DL-TDOA positioning and UEs within convex hull,
	+ range of horizontal accuracy is from 0.04m (InF-SH-2D/FR2) to 1.50m(InF-DH-3D/FR2) at 90% CDF point
	+ range of vertical accuracy is from 0.63(InF-SH-3D/FR2)m to 3.06(InF-DH-3D/FR2)m at 90% CDF point
	+ horizontal accuracy obtained from the UEs within Convex Hull performs better than that of all UEs (0.20 m vs 0.42 m at CDF 90% point)
	+ vertical accuracy obtained from the UEs within Convex Hull and that of all UEs are nearly the same
* For UL-TDOA positioning method and UEs within convex hull,
	+ range of horizontal accuracy is from 0.05m (InF-SH-2D/FR2) to 1.94m (InF-DH-3D/FR2) at 90% CDF point
	+ range of vertical accuracy is from 0.83m (InF-SH-3D/FR2) to 3.13(InF-DH-3D/FR2) at 90% CDF point
	+ horizontal accuracy obtained from UEs within Convex Hull performs better than that of all UEs (0.26 m vs 0.52 m at 90% CDF point)
	+ vertical accuracy obtained from UEs within Convex Hull and that of all UEs are nearly the same
* For UL-TDOA+UL-AOA positioning,
	+ range of horizontal accuracy is from 0.15m to 0.27m at 90% CDF point
	+ range of vertical accuracy is from 0.63m to 2.26m at 90% CDF point
* For Multi-RTT positioning,
	+ range of horizontal accuracy is from 0.07m to 0.56m at 90% CDF point
	+ range of vertical accuracy is from 2.18m to 2.82m at 90% CDF point

## Source #6

In [[6], Intel], performance of DL-TDOA, UL-TDOA, and Multi-RTT techniques has been evaluated for InF-SH baseline, InF-DH baseline, and InF-DH optional scenarios in FR1 and FR2 bands. It has been shown that LOS/NLOS links classification provides a significant performance gain, especially in the InF-DH scenario, where the probability of LOS is smaller. The analysis was done assuming perfect synchronization and no quantization errors for UE measurement reporting.

The following conclusions are made:

* Performance of the Rel.16 positioning techniques highly depends on the measurement data set used in the estimation
* Usage of the LOS links only provides better performance compared to the case when both LOS and NLOS links are utilized
* The required performance can be achieved, if the sufficient amount of the LOS links can be detected and the NLOS links can be discarded based on the LOS/NLOS links classification
* The best performance can be achieved with Multi-RTT measurement technique

Combination of Multi-RTT estimations with the vertical AoA measurements was evaluated with a conclusion that Multi-RTT + vertical AoA measurements further improves positioning performance in the InF scenarios.

The analysis of Multi-RTT was also made assuming practical algorithm for LOS/NLOS classification. The usage of the practical LOS/NLOS classification algorithms was shown to provide significant improvement in the positioning accuracy and should be considered as an enhancement for Rel.17 positioning techniques.

Finally, initial latency analysis was provided. The presented analysis for average latency and resource utilization required for DL/UL positioning procedure shows the benefit of on demand resource allocation for transmission of positioning reference signals.

## Source #7

The following performance results were provided in [OPPO, [7]] for DL-TDOA in InF scenarios:

* In InF-SH scenario, < 1m accuracy for 90% of UEs is achievable
* In InF-DH scenarios, < 1m accuracy for 90% of UEs is not achievable
	+ D = 20m can achieve 2.47m accuracy for 90% of UEs
	+ D = 50m can achieve 13.19m accuracy for 90% of UEs

In the evaluation, positioning method was based on Chan algorithm with equally weighted TOA covariance. The maximum-likelihood detection to obtain 1/4Ts resolution and good quality of TOA measurement was applied.

## Source #8

The following results were provided in [BUPT, [8]]. The following assumptions were used for analysis:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | InF-SH/FR1 | InF-DH/FR1 | InF-SH/FR2 | InF-DH/FR2 |
| CDF percentile | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| CDF value | 0.617m | 0.293m | 0.179m | 0.116m |

The results were obtained using phase tracking algorithm for measurement and under the following evaluation assumptions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **[Source 4, InF-DH, FR2]** |
| Channel model (baseline, otherwise state any modifications) | Baseline |
| Reference Signal Physical Structure and Resource Allocation (RE pattern) | TS38.211 R16 PRS comb-12 pattern |
| Reference signal (type of sequence, number of ports, …)  | TS38.211 R16 PRS |
| Number of symbols used per slot per positioning estimate | 12 symbols |
| Number of slots per positioning estimate | 8000 slots |
| Power-boosting level | 1 |
| interference modelling (ideal muting, or other) | ideal muting |
| Description of Measurement Algorithm (e.g. super resolution, interference cancellation, ….) | Phase tracking |
| Description of positioning technique / applied positioning algorithm (e.g. Least square, taylor series, etc) | Chan |
| Network synchronization assumptions | Perfect Synchronization |
| Beam-related assumption (beam sweeping / alignment assumptions at the tx and rx sides) | Ideal alignment |
| Precoding assumptions (codebook, nrof antenna elements used, etc) | nrof antenna elements used |
| Additional notes, if any |   |

## Source #9

The following proposals and observations are made in [[9], Samsung]:

* With increased NLOS probability, positioning accuracy degrades significantly
* Performance of DL-TDOA in InF scenario is as follows:
	+ For InF-SH scenario,
		- the target of less that 1m positioning accuracy with 90% availability can be achievable;
	+ For InF-DH scenario,
		- the positioning accuracy with 90% availability is quite large due to NLOS and the errors in TOA estimation
* The target requirements for NR positioning enhancement should be
	+ horizontal positioning accuracy < 1m
	+ latency < 1s
* In addition, power consumption can also be considered which can be reflected as aspects such as signaling overhead.

## Source #10

The analysis of DL-TDoA and DL-AoD for InF-SH and InF-SL scenarios was provided in [[10], Mediatek]. The IFFT and super-resolution algorithms were applied in the study.

* For DL-TDOA in InF-SH (inter-site distance (ISD) 50m):
	+ positioning error <1m for 80% UEs (super resolution algorithm for TOA estimation)
	+ positioning performance for super resolution algorithm with best 10 TRPs is better than for IFFT based algorithm with best 16 TRPs
* For DL-TDOA in InF-SL: (ISD 20m):
	+ DL-TDOA positioning error <1m for 80% UEs if UE applies super resolution algorithm for TOA estimation and all links have LOS channel assumption
	+ For realistic channel model, super resolution algorithm doesn’t lead to better positioning accuracy. In this scenario, DL-TDOA can achieve positioning error < 2m for 80% UEs with UE applying IFFT based algorithm for TOA estimation
* For DL-AoD in InF-SH:
	+ Even assuming all LOS channel, DL-AoD technique cannot achieve error <1m for 80% UEs
	+ For realistic channel. We see that DL-AoD can only achieve error < 2.4m for 80% UEs
* For DL-AoD in InF-SL:
	+ DL-AoD error <70cm for 80% UEs assuming all links are LOS
	+ For realistic channel model, DL-AoD can only achieve error < 1.5m for 80% UEs
	+ Performance in InF-SH is worse than that in InF-SL. This is because ISD in InF-SH is larger than that in InF-SL. Note that under the same AoD estimation error, large ISD would lead to larger positioning error

## Source #11

The contribution in [[11], CMCC] focused on latency analysis. It has the following key observations and proposals:

Observations:

* The current higher layer procedure is long and complicated, and the latency can be further reduced, e.g., by enabling enhanced higher layer architecture and signalling procedure.
* To achieve a physical layer procedure of less than 10ms, the configuration of the DL PRS periodicity is limited and the DL PRS overhead would be heavy.

Proposals:

* In Rel-17 target positioning requirements for commercial use cases:
	+ End-to-end latency for position estimation of UE (< 100 ms)
	+ Physical layer latency for position estimation of UE (< 50 ms)
* In Rel-17 target positioning requirements for IIoT use cases:
	+ End-to-end latency for position estimation of UE (<10ms)
	+ Physical layer latency for position estimation of UE (<10ms)

## Source #12

In [[12], InterDigital], the latency analysis has been completed. From the physical layer perspective, the latency is divided into four delay components, including the following:

* T1 – time duration for positioning initialization
* T2 - Time duration for RS reception/transmission and processing
* T3 - Time duration for measurement reporting and processing
* T4 - Time duration for data forwarding/routing and processing in network

At UE, T1, T2 and T3 contain physical layer delay components for PRS processing while T1 and T2 contain delay components related to transmission of SRS.

It is proposed:

* For latency analysis at UE for Rel. 17 enhanced techniques, analyse delay at T1, T2 and T3, separately

## Source #13

The work in [[13], Lenovo, Motorola Mobility] mainly discusses latency aspects for NR Positioning study in Rel.17. The following main views are presented on various discussion aspects:

**On scenarios and latency analysis**

* For NR positioning enhancements in Rel-17, deprioritize the end-to-end latency impact and analysis for commercial use cases and if time permits, this evaluation can be also included as part of study in a best effort manner.
* For NR positioning enhancements in Rel-17, at least only reasonable values below 100ms, e.g. 20ms of end-to-end latency performance requirement for UE position estimation in IIoT use cases should be considered for further down-selection.

**On UE state transition and latency analysis**

* For NR positioning enhancements in Rel-17, the latency due to any state transition delays and existing RACH procedures should be ignored for the positioning latency evaluation.
* For NR positioning enhancements in Rel-17, the latency evaluations should be carried out with the assumption that the UE is already in RRC\_CONNECTED state.

**On guidance on latency analysis from other WGs**

* Consider the input and guidance from SA2 and RAN3 WGs regarding the detailed positioning latency evaluations from CN and NG-RAN.
* Consider the input and guidance from the RAN2 WG regarding the detailed latency evaluations of the LPP procedures.

**On E2E latency evaluation**

* The end-to-end positioning latency can be collectively evaluated in terms of the CN, LMF, NG-RAN, LPP and physical layer procedures.

## Source #14

The paper in [[14], LGE] mainly discuss latency related aspects. Based on discussions the following observations and proposal are drawn:

**On latency of higher layers**

* In perspective of end-to-end latency, there are 3 types of location service procedure such as NI-LR / MT-LR / MO-LR and more than one scenarios are included in each type.
* LPP(a) message and the signalling which is exchanged between UE and/or gNB and/or server and/or functions(application/network) can be different depending on the scenario.

**Physical layer latency analysis for DL based positioning**

* In perspective of physical layer, minimum latency for grant based positioning measurement exceeds the target delay [10] ms according the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Procedure** | **Latency** |
| Measurement gap request | 1ms |
| Measurement gap configuration | 10ms  |
| PRS reception | 3ms for FR1 / 1.5ms for FR2 |
| Scheduling request | 0.68ms |
| UL grant | 2.68ms |
| Reporting measurement result | 1.21ms |
| Total minimum elapsed time | 18.57ms for FR1 / 17.07 for FR2 |

* Rel-17 NR positioning SI needs to study PRS measurement latency and PRS reporting latency at least for the physical layer latency enhancement.

## Source #15

The initial evaluation results as well as consideration on latency analysis are provided in [[15], Nokia]. In terms of performance accuracy, the following data are reported

Table 1. CDF Summary of Initial Results for DL TDOA for Horizontal Error

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scenario, Fc, BW** | **50%** | **67%** | **80%** | **90%** |
| InF-SH, 3.5 GHz, 100 MHz | 0.98 m | 1.47 m  | 2.13 m  | 4.35 m  |
| InF-DH, 3.5 GHz, 100 MHz | 1.71 m | 3.15 m  | 4.39 m | 7.16 m |
| IOO, 3.5 GHz, 100 MHz | 1.17 m | 1.92 m  | 3.24 m | 6.50 m |
| UMi, 3.5 GHz, 100 MHz | 5.29 m | 9.59 m | 14.92 m | 23.81 m |

and the following observations are made:

* Performance of DL-TDOA is significantly worse in InF-DH compared with InF-SH. Meeting the strictest accuracy requirements for InF-DH may be challenging.
* Performance of DL-TDOA is better in the InF-SH scenario compared with IOO.
* Performance of DL-TDOA is limited by the granularity of RSTD measurements.

**On latency**

It is proposed that RAN1 assumes some baseline values for different higher layer signalling delays (e.g., each LPP signalling step takes X ms where X is FFS) and send LS to RAN2/3 with baseline values for confirmation/feedback.

## Source #16

Contribution [[16], Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI] focuses on the ToA performance in InF scenarios and complement it by an analysis on the achievable positioning accuracy. In addition, the impacts of Absolute Time-of-Arrival model (AToA) and K-Factor are analyzed. The following observations are made based on provided analysis:

* For InF-LOS channels, simple ToA-Estimators method provide high accuracy
* The ToA estimation error for LOS is significantly smaller (median value 0.5ns @ SNR= 0dB) compared to the ToA-Error for NLOS generated by AToA model (median value 31ns)
* With the given AToA model, a reliable LOS/NLOS detector is essential to achieve high positioning accuracy with probability of LOS according to the statistics of the deployment
* Technologies allowing a reliable LOS/NLOS detection and/or a ToA quality indicator shall be studied with high priority
* The Absolute ToA model does not differentiate between the different InF NLOS scenarios. The statistical properties may be dependent on deployment scenarios and environment characteristics.
* Characterize the positioning technologies versus channel parameters. At least the following complementary analysis shall be derived from the simulations:
	+ ToA estimator accuracy relative to the delay introduced by the AToA model
	+ ToA estimator accuracy versus K-factor

## Source #17

The paper [[17], CeWIT] provides the initial evaluation results for Rel.17 use cases. The following performance results were reported for DL-TDoA for ideal synchronization.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Baseline InF-SH | Baseline InF-DH |
| Bandwidth | 50% | 67% | 80% | 90% | 95% | 50% | 67% | 80% | 90% | 95% |
| 20MHz | 2.31m | 3.52m | 4.9m | 8.95m | - | 2.47m | 3.3m | 5.2m | 9.5m | - |
| 50Mhz | 1.23m | 1.62m | 2.32m | 3.73m | 6.13m | 1.03m | 1.63m | 2.14m | 3.2m | 8.9m |
| 100MHz | 0.6m | 0.85m | 1.41m | 1.78m | 4.18m | 0.61m | 0.96m | 1.4m | 1.9m | 3.2m |
| 200MHz | 0.3m | 0.52m | 0.95m | 2.70m | 4.18m | 0.35m | 0.55m | 0.84m | 1.37m | 2.0m |

* Bandwidth of PRS is a critical parameter to define the accuracy of positioning in both the IIoT scenarios. Similarly, determining the LOS path will improve the accuracy of position at least in case of InF-DH scenario.

It is also observed that network synchronization error is critical factor in Rel.17 positioning enhancement as it degrades the positioning accuracy significantly. Tight synchronisation close to ideal is necessary for Rel.17 scenarios.

Finally, the following proposals are made:

* LOS path detection and hybrid positioning techniques should be studied in positioning enhancement study.
* Network synchronization error techniques should be studied in Rel.17 to achieve required accuracy.

## Source #18

The evaluation results in [[18], Qualcomm] are provided for multiple scenarios. Contribution also briefly outlines TOA estimation as well pruning and outlier rejection algorithms.

**Horizontal Accuracy Analysis**

The following observations are made based on analysis of InF scenarios:

* IIOT requirement (<20cm accuracy) can be met at 90%, 50%,20%, 7% when T1 = 0, 0.5, 1, 2 ns at both Tx and Rx side in InF-SH FR2 scenario.
* IIOT requirement (<20cm accuracy) can be met at 68%, 27%, 11%, 4% when T1 = 0, 0.5, 1, 2 ns at both Tx and Rx side in InF-DH FR2 scenario.
* For InF-SH scenarios, the 0.5ns resolution limit for UE-assisted TDOA and RTT is not enough to meet the 20 cm requirements.

The UMi/UMa scenarios are analyzed with the Tx/Rx timing error and/or network sync error according to truncated Gaussian Distribution [-2\*T1,2\*T1] nsec, as agreed in previous 3GPP RAN1 meetings. Both TDOA and M-RTT results are shown. In addition, the likelihood fusion algorithm is considered in evaluations. The following observations are made based on analysis of UMi/UMa scenarios:

* For UMiFR1 scenarios,
	+ Tx/Rx calibration with T1 = 5 nsec or above shows a noticeable degradation to performance of RTT Positioning when using either a baseline, or an advanced positioning engine algorithm.
	+ RTT performance with realistic Tx/Rx calibration errors achieves better performance than TDOA with realistic network sync and Tx/Rx calibration errors.
* For UMi FR2 scenarios,
	+ With gNB sync errors T1 larger than 10ns, TDOA cannot meet the commercial requirement (1m at 80%).
	+ TDOA can meet with commercial requirement with calibration errors T1 smaller or equal to 1ns. RTT can meet the same requirement with calibration errors between T1 = 0.5~1ns(or say smaller or equal to 0.5ns) in comb2.
	+ TDOA can meet with commercial requirement with calibration errors T1 smaller than 2ns (or say smaller or equal to 1ns). RTT can meet the same requirement with calibration error smaller than 0.5ns in comb6.

The following observations are made for InH scenario:

* For InH FR2 scenarios
	+ With gNB sync errors T1 larger than 10ns, OTDOA cannot meet the commercial requirement (1m at 80%).
	+ RTT has inferior performance compared with OTDOA with calibration errors only in the worst-case model assumptions. (4 independent calibration errors are added per TRP in RTT, compared with 2 independent calibration errors in the RSTD with OTDOA).
	+ OTDOA can meet commercial requirement with calibration errors T1 smaller than 2ns (or say smaller or equal to 1ns). RTT can meet the same requirement with calibration errors between T1 = 0.5~1ns (or say smaller or equal to 0.5ns).

**Latency Analysis**

The detailed E2E latency study is presented including analysis of physical layer latency and higher layer latency.

In terms of physical layer latency, the following observation was made:

* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the succesfull decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [57-823] msec depending at least in the following factors (the list may not exhaustive):
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data transmission (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ PRS processing capabilities
	+ PRS periodicity
	+ Measurement gap periodicity
	+ gNB processing assumptions with regards to PUSCH decoding, RRC processing time
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
* With regards to PHY-layer latency analysis, the following components seem to be the most time-consuming:
	+ Measurement gap Configuration & Triggering of Location-Request
	+ PRS availability & Alignment (e.g. Periodic PRS with long periodicity)
	+ Number/length of PRS instance(s) required to be measured
	+ UE PRS processing time

## Source #19

In [[19], Ericsson], simulation results are presented for positioning accuracies in UMa, UMi, IOO, and baseline InF scenarios. All DL-TDOA simulations are done for Rel. 16 12 symbol, comb-12 DL-PRS. For UL-TDOA simulations, 2 symbol, comb-2 SRS is considered.

**UMa**

* A significant performance gap exists between the achievable and Rel. 17 target accuracies in UMa scenario. It is proposed to exclude UMa scenario from Rel. 17 evaluations.

**UMi**

* Target accuracy of <1 m for general commercial use cases can be achieved in UMi (FR1) scenario with potential enhancements. Early results also show that Rel. 17 target accuracies can be met in UMi (FR2). It is proposed to include UMi scenario in Rel.17 evaluations.
* The UMi NLOS excess delay is far from negligible when targeting 1m accuracy and needs to be modelled. It is proposed to use the same lognormal parameters for the NLOS excess delay in UMi as the ones defined for the InF model in 38.901, i.e. log10(NLOS excess delay/1s) is normally distributed with mean mu=-7.5 and standard deviation sigma=0.4.

**InH(OO)**

* Target accuracy of <1 m for general commercial use cases can be achieved in IOO (FR1) scenario with potential enhancements. Early results show that Rel. 17 target accuracies can be met in IOO (FR2). It is proposed to consider IOO scenario in Rel. 17 evaluations.
* The IOO NLOS excess delay is far from negligible when targeting 1m accuracy and needs to be modelled. Use the same lognormal parameters for the NLOS excess delay in IOO as the ones defined for the InF model in 38.901, i.e. log10(NLOS excess delay/1s) is normally distributed with mean mu=-7.5 and standard deviation sigma=0.4.

**InF**

* Simulation results suggest that Rel. 17 target accuracies can be met in InF-SH (FR1).
* A significant performance gap exists between the achievable and Rel. 17 target accuracies in InF-DH (FR1).
* Rel. 17 target accuracies are met in FR2 in InF SH scenario if there are no RX/TX timing errors but not with 8ns RX/TX timing errors.
* Rel. 17 target accuracies are not met in FR2 in InF DH scenario.
* RX/Tx error affects achievable positioning accuracy.
* Consider Rx/Tx error for Rel. 17 evaluations.

# Summary of Discussion Aspects

The following aspects were discussed/mentioned in submitted contributions:

## Analysis of physical layer latency for NR positioning

### Description and Initial Proposal

The latency aspect was discussed and evaluated in multiple contributions. In general latency may need to be studied separately for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE based and UE-assisted approaches. The most complete analysis of physical layer latency for positioning was provided in [2], [18]. Based on review of contribution the following proposal can be formulated

**Tentative Proposal #1**

* RAN1 to separately study physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches
* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors (the list may not exhaustive):
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data transmission (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ PRS processing capabilities
	+ PRS periodicity
	+ Measurement gap periodicity
	+ gNB processing assumptions with regards to PUSCH decoding, RRC processing time
	+ RRC processing time at the UE

Based on presented analysis so far, the following proposal seems can be concluded.

**Tentative Proposal #2**

* The physical layer latency for NR positioning needs to be enhanced to meet most stringent requirement of I-IOT use cases of 10ms

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on tentative proposals #1 and #2 above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | In general, we agree with proposal#1 and #2. But there are some modification for proposal #1 considering the **RRC processing time (ie,10ms) well over the PUSCH process time (ie, 4.25OS)** We propose the sub-bullet # 1 #2 #9 are modified as below* + UE PUSCH preparation time, alignment time and duration time (sub-bullet # 1)
	+ UE PDSCH processing time (sub-bullet # 2)
	+ gNB processing time for PUSCH decoding (sub-bullet # 9)
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB (sub-bullet # 9)

Furthermore, we think it is necessary to interpret the related RRC signaling for the ‘RRC processing time’, such as RRC processing time for MG request and configuration. |
| Nokia/NSB | On FL proposal 1: * In the second bullet we aim at a definition of physical layer latency for positioning but this seems to assume UE assisted mode and DL based, correct? If the first bullet is agreeable then we suggest to have a second bullet which defines the physical layer latency for the various cases that we plan to investigate (for example in UL based there is no PUSCH sent containing a report) or we provide a definition that is agnotsitc to the specific case. Then in a third bullet we may list the factors that contribute.
* On the proposed [X,Y] range. Is the intention to define both a maximum and minimum latency for a single shot positioning fix (i.e, only one PRS occasion) or is this also somehow tied to the latency required to meet a given accuracy? Defining/analyzing a maximum value Y may be a bit tricky in our view.

On FL proposal 2: * Suggest to say requires enhancements in place of needs to be enhancemed.
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For proposal #1, there is a proposal from FL also for physical layer latency definition in email thread of 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Eval-Addl-Scenarios where we tend to think is a right place to discuss the physical layer latency. Also, the definition of physical layer latency should be applicable to UE measurement (when applicable) and gNB measurement (when applicable) for DL-only positioning, UL-only positioning, multi-RTT positioning and NR E-CID positioning.For proposal 2, the enhancement should be discussed in the email thread of 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Pot-Pos-Enh. |
| CATT | For Proposal #1, For the first bullet, since UE-based and UE-assisted approaches can be DL only, UL only and DL+UL, suggest making the following changes:* RAN1 to separately study physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches

For Proposal #2, given this AI focuses on the evalution, the proposal may be:* The physical layer latency for NR positioning needs to be evaluated to see if most stringent requirement of I-IOT use cases of 10ms can be met.
 |
| Futurewei | Only second bullet of Proposal 1 should be agreed as Observation. The first bullet of Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 should be part of the discussion in the Enhancements AI. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the first bullet of P#1, in that the positioning latency evaluation should be well structured and appropriately differentiated based on the different positioning methods mentioned in tentative P#1. The second bullet of P#1 comprises of the various positioning delay components depending on a certain scenario and may not require an agreement as such since the list itself is not exhaustive as indicated by the FL.We are also supportive of P#2, since enhancements may be required to fulfill the target physical layer latency requirements for IIoT positioning. |
| Qualcomm | We are generally supportive of Proposal 1. By looking the comments above, a suggestion in order to avoid splitting in the proposal the DL-only, UL-only, DL/UL, UE-B or UE-A we can just say: “when applicable” , so indeed not all components are applicable in all cases.For proposal 2, is the understanding that the 10 msec correspond to End-To-End Latency? Based on the SI description, there is a desired to target that for some scenarios, so we believe it needs to be clarified. * ***The physical layer latency for NR positioning needs to be enhanced to meet most stringent requirement of I-IOT use cases of 10ms End-To-End latency***
 |
| ZTE | For Proposal #1:* Agree with QC’s suggestion. Every component should be noted which method (i.e. DL-only, UL-only, DL/UL, UE-B or UE-A) may need this component.

For Proposal #2:* It’s better to be discussed in 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Pot-Pos-Enh.
 |
| MTK | We think both proposals can be discussed in 8.5.3 |
| Intel | Agree with the first proposal. For the second proposal, we agree with modifications proposed by Nokia and Qualcomm. This aspect should be discussed in this AI since it is an outcome of the evaluation. |
| Fraunhofer | Support Proposal 2.The first bullet in Proposal 1 is fine, however the details in the second bullet are applicable for the DL-only in UE assisted. It can be more helpful is to list the main latency factors identified by multiple sources. |
| LG | First of all, we think that this issue is dealt with in both AI 8.5.1 and 8.5.2. So, we prefer to avoid the dulplicated discussion.For proposal #1: since measugmenet gap configuration includes lenghth, timing advance, offset as well as periodicity, we suggest that the sub bullet #8 (measuremet gap periodicity) needs to be changed into measurement gap configuration. In addition, L2L1 processing delay for UL grant at gNB also needs to be considered for SR-based.For proposal #2: we agree with it and it should be discussed in the email thread of 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Pot-Pos-Enh. |
| CEWiT | We are okay with proposal 1 first bullet. It will be useful if we enlist the physical layer parameters separately for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions. Further purpose of range [X,Y] is not clear here as main question is, how are we going to use this values for subsequent evaluations?  Proposal 2 is more like conclusion based on submitted evaluations.  |
| SONY | We support both proposalsOn Proposal #2: It is unclear whether 10 ms is the end-to-end latency or the physical layer latency. |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

**Proposal #1 – Revision#1**

* RAN1 to separately study physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches
* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (e.g. for DL only UE assisted solution starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data transmission (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ PRS processing capabilities
	+ PRS periodicity
	+ Measurement gap periodicity
	+ gNB processing assumptions with regards to PUSCH decoding, RRC processing time
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
* Notes:
	+ The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution
	+ The values X and Y are TBD assuming a single shot measurement and positioning fix

**Proposal #2 – Revision#1**

* **The physical layer latency for NR positioning requires enhancements to meet most stringent requirement of I-IOT use cases of 10ms End-To-End latency**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposals in Section 3.1.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| vivo | Support P1 in principle，but we can‘t understand why UE process time is divided into three sub-bullet（UL,DL and RRC processing time），while only one sub-bullet for gNB process time（ie，gNB processing assumptions with regards to PUSCH decoding, RRC processing time）.For P2, We suggest discussing after the requirement of **10ms End-To-End latency has been agreed.** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are afraid we cannot accept either of the proposal.For P1#R1, our concerns are* The term “the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB” is not clear. Does it mean the LPP message “RequestLocationInformation”?
* We do not need to enumerate all long components that are applicable to DL measurement only.
* We do not need to restrict the measurement to be single shot, and should be left to each company.

Our motivation is to define a proper time span belonging to the physical layer latency, and leave the components up to each individual company to evaluate. So here is our suggestion.**Proposal #1 – Revision from Huawei/HiSilicon*** RAN1 to separately study physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches
* The PHY-layer latency for TTFF (time to first fix) in NR Rel-16 Positioning is defined as
	+ For UE measurement for positioning and DL E-CID
		- Starting from the transmission by the gNB MAC entity of the PDSCH conveying the LPP message containing RequestLocationInformation
		- Ending with the successful reception by the gNB MAC entity of the PUSCH containing conveying the LPP message containing ProvideLocationInformation.
	+ For NG-RAN measurement for positioning
		- Starting from the reception by the TRP of the NRPPa message MEASUREMENT REQUEST
		- Ending with the transmission by the TRP of the NRPPa message MEASUREMENT RESPONSE
	+ For UL E-CID
		- Starting from the reception by the serving gNB of the NRPPa message E-CID MEASUREMENT INITIATION REQUEST
		- Ending with the transmission by the serving gNB of the NRPPa message E-CID MEASUREMENT INITIATION RESPONSE

For P2#R1, our concerns are* 10ms latency is said to be desired from some IIoT use case in SID, but we have not agreed that 10ms E2E is the target requirement for Rel-17 enhancement, nor did we agree that 10ms E2E latency should be the TTFF latency.
* We should not say that it needs enhancement for now, as it is not the last meeting. Suggest to go with observation of facts.
* In our understanding, the physical layer latency for UL-only positioning and E-CID positioning can be less than 10ms.

**Proposal #2 – Revision from Huawei/HiSilicon**Evaluation of the physical layer latency for NR positioning shows that Rel-16 positioning methods based on UE reception of DL-PRS without enhancement cannot achieve the 10ms End-To-End TTFF latency. |
| SONY | Do not support. We think (at least at this stage) RAN1 cannot decide the end-to-end latency, especially with this challenging number (10ms). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| SS | OK for proposal 1 but for proposal 2 E2E latency is out of RAN1 scope. |
| LG | For sub-bullet 7 and 8 proposal #1: we are OK to consider PRS periodicity but the actual PRS transmission time duration (actual PRS measurement time length) is not equal to the PRS periodicity, so we suggest that RAN1 need to consider not only periodicity of PRS/measurement gap but also actual measurement time length. |
| Ericsson | On proposal 2, the target latency requirement of 10ms is not agreed yet. So it is better to put the 10ms under brackets for now.  |
| Intel | Support |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

Majority of companies seems in favour of proposal #1 with minor modification addressed in Revision#2. One company goes one step further and tries to come up with definition for different types of NR Prositioning solutions. Based on majority the original proposal with slight modifications is proposed as a Revision#2.

**Proposal #1 – Revision#2**

* ~~RAN1 to separately study~~ Physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions as well as for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches is separately studied
* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (e.g. for DL only UE assisted solution starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data transmission (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ DL PRS processing capabilities
	+ DL PRS periodicity
	+ Measurement gap periodicity and length
	+ gNB processing assumptions for UL reception with regards to PUSCH decoding, RRC processing time
	+ gNB processing assumptions for DL transmission with regards to PDSCH preaparation time, RRC processing time
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
* Notes:
	+ The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution
	+ The values X and Y are TBD assuming a single shot measurement for positioning estimate

Regarding proposal#2, it can be discussed next meeting once analysis of latency is completed and latency requirements are agreed.

As a result of RAN1 discussion during the GTW session, the following agreement was reached:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches are separately studied |

### Revision#3 of Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to comment on the following proposal.

**Proposal #1 – Revision#3**

* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (e.g. for DL only UE assisted solution starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data reception ~~transmission~~ (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ DL PRS processing capabilities
	+ DL PRS periodicity
	+ UL SRS for positioning periodicity and transmission duration
	+ UL SRS for positioning processing time
	+ Measurement gap periodicity and length
	+ gNB processing assumptions for UL reception with regards to PUSCH decoding
	+ gNB processing assumptions for DL transmission with regards to PDSCH preparation
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB
* Notes:
	+ The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution
	+ The values X and Y are TBD assuming a single shot measurement for positioning estimate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| CATT | From the man bullets, it seems the proposals covers the PHY-layer latency for all NR Rel-16 Positioning methods, where DL only UE assisted solution is used as an example. But, the lists of the sub-bullets do not include the physical layer delays required for UL positioning, e.g., the configuration, transmission and reception of the SRS.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay. |
| ZTE | OK. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | The entire list is discussing evaluation methodology rather than evaluation itself, and as CATT comment, the long list only concerns DL part.If definition of physical layer latency is covered by email #1, we do not think it needs to be discussed/agreed here. |
| Intel | Support. On CATT and Huawei comments regarding lack of UL parts, it does not seem to be completely correct and it would be more constructive if companies propose specific UL components to be captured in the list.* + UL SRS for positioning periodicity and transmission duration
	+ UL SRS for positioning processing time
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB

We have added the following sub-bullets to the list above.Regarding, additional comments that it is more relevant for evaluation methodology, we disagree. In order to do evaluations RAN1 needs first to identify components contributing to physical layer latency and then add values to components. We think discussion is useful to achieve the goal at the subsequent meetings for physical layer latency analysis.  |

### Revision#4 of Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to comment on the following proposal with modifications provided by Intel.

**Proposal #1 – Revision#4**

Capture the following in TR

* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning (e.g. for DL only UE assisted solution starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data reception ~~transmission~~ (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ DL PRS processing capabilities
	+ DL PRS periodicity
	+ UL SRS for positioning periodicity and transmission duration
	+ UL SRS for positioning processing time
	+ Measurement gap periodicity and length
	+ gNB processing assumptions for UL reception with regards to PUSCH decoding
	+ gNB processing assumptions for DL transmission with regards to PDSCH preparation
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB
* Notes:
	+ The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution
	+ The values X and Y are TBD assuming a single shot measurement for positioning estimate

### Collection of Views for Revision#4 Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.1.7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Reply to IntelFirst we need to agree the time spam for physical layer latency for different positioning methods. Let me copy-paste what we proposed* The PHY-layer latency for TTFF (time to first fix) in NR Rel-16 Positioning is defined as
	+ For UE measurement for positioning and DL E-CID
		- Starting from the transmission by the gNB MAC entity of the PDSCH conveying the LPP message containing RequestLocationInformation
		- Ending with the successful reception by the gNB MAC entity of the PUSCH conveying the LPP message containing ProvideLocationInformation.
	+ For NG-RAN measurement for positioning
		- Starting from the reception by the TRP of the NRPPa message MEASUREMENT REQUEST
		- Ending with the transmission by the TRP of the NRPPa message MEASUREMENT RESPONSE
	+ For UL E-CID
		- Starting from the reception by the serving gNB of the NRPPa message E-CID MEASUREMENT INITIATION REQUEST
		- Ending with the transmission by the serving gNB of the NRPPa message E-CID MEASUREMENT INITIATION RESPONSE

If everyone is fine with this, we suggest to define the following components* The PHY-layer latency in NR Rel-16 Positioning depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data reception ~~transmission~~ (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ DL PRS processing capabilities
	+ DL PRS periodicity
	+ DL Rx beam sweeping at UE
	+ UL SRS for positioning periodicity and transmission duration
	+ UL Tx beam sweeping/beam selection at UE
	+ UL Rx beam sweeping at gNB
	+ Use of AP-SRS
	+ UL SRS for positioning processing time
	+ Measurement gap periodicity and length
	+ gNB processing assumptions for UL reception with regards to PUSCH decoding
	+ gNB processing assumptions for DL transmission with regards to PDSCH preparation
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB
	+ Availability of UE RRM measurement at gNB
	+ SMTC configuration
	+ Periodicity of SSB/CSI-RS for mobility
	+ UE RRM reporting characteristics
* Notes:
	+ The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution
	+ Whether to assume a single shot measurement for positioning estimate is up to each company.
 |
| vivo | Firstly, it is too early to capture above proposal into the TR on initial evaluation results when not all evaluation models/parameters are settled.Secondly, in online meeting, the below agreement has been achievedAgreement:Physical layer latency for DL only, UL only, DL+UL positioning solutions for UE-based and UE-assisted approaches are separately studiedSo we prefer to discuss separately. And we can agree the Physical layer latency of DL UE-assisted as the staring point. Therefore, we prefer to modify like below~~Capture the following in TR~~* The PHY-layer latency for DL only UE assisted solution in NR Rel-16 Positioning (~~e.g. for DL only UE assisted solution~~ starting from the transmission of the location request from the serving gNB, up to the successful decoding of the PUSCH containing the Positioning report from the serving gNB) ranges in the interval [X, Y] ms where X and Y are TBD and depends at least on the following factors when it is applicable to specific solution:
	+ UE timeline of UL data transmission (UE PUSCH preparation time)
	+ UE timeline of DL data reception ~~transmission~~ (UE PDSCH processing time)
	+ SR-based or grant-free UL configuration
	+ Numerology of PUSCH, PDSCH
	+ FDD or TDD and frame structure configuration
	+ DL PRS processing capabilities
	+ DL PRS periodicity
	+ ~~UL SRS for positioning periodicity and transmission duration~~
	+ ~~UL SRS for positioning processing time~~
	+ Measurement gap periodicity and length
	+ gNB processing assumptions for UL reception with regards to PUSCH decoding
	+ gNB processing assumptions for DL transmission with regards to PDSCH preparation
	+ RRC processing time at the UE
	+ RRC processing time at the gNB
* Notes:
	+ ~~The list may not be exhaustive and only subset of factors can be applicable to any specific positioning solution~~
	+ The values X and Y are TBD assuming a single shot measurement for positioning estimate
 |
| LG | We are OK to the proposal including TX/RX beam sweeping. We have some clarification questions for the Huawei’s suggestion. Could you explain the meaning of the additional components such as availability of UE RRM measurement at gNB, SMTC configuration, and UE RRM reporting characteristics, in terms of latency? |
| ZTE | - Agree with Huawei to add more components, it’s more reasonable that PHY latency should include both network and UE side latency. Some components may need more explanation as listed by LG.- Single shot estimate is easier to define PHY latency and compare results from different companies. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To vivo: we do not think “separately study” will lead to listing components separately for this discussion, nor do we consider DL should be prioritized in the second to the last meeting.We fully agree with and sympathize Intel’s effort in helping companies to identify the components that may contribute to the overall physical layer latency, which is why we are also being constructive by enumerating all potential components that may affect UL-only positioning, multi-RTT, and even E-CID positioning.However we should define the span of physical layer latency first, before selecting the components.To Intel:Regarding the comments from Intel:Regarding consideration on TTFF, it is an open question and up to companies to decide. My understanding/preference is to find out the minimum time for single shot NR positioning iteration/transactions that includes trigger to do this transaction, transmission of reference signals, measurements and report of measurement if it is applicable.Our understanding is that TTFF may require some logistic procedure, including measurement gap request/configuration for DL, SRS resource request for UL, RRM configuration for UL E-CID, which may or may not be included in the phy latency depending on the definition.Can you also clarify why do you think “whether to assume a single shot measurement for positioning estimate is up to each company”? How to compare latency analysis then?I guess the periodicity is up to each company, correct? For example, for multi-RTT, we can assume SRS periodicity is 20ms, and PRS is 160ms, and we do not need to limit single shot measurement for SRS right? And for PRS, UE can only process single positioning frequency layer at a time, but UE may transmit SRS for positioning cross CCs at the same time. For FR2, considering beam sweeping, how can we ensure single shot measuremrent?Honestly speaking, without aligning the parameters, we do not expect that comparing results will be possible. To LGE:Those parameters are related to E-CID positioning, which we think is important for low latency and very helpful for the following DL/UL positioning procedure if any. The accuracy of E-CID can be enhanced at least to meet the commercial requirement and potentially IIoT requirement. |
| CATT | Prefer Huawei’s revision that seems capture the list of the impacting factors more complete.  |
| Ericsson | The list proposed by huawei seems more realistic of the actual phy-related items contributing to latency, so we also prefer to capture Huawei’s revision. Some items may only contribute in some cases. For example, beam sweeping is not always necessary for every measurement, so we could exclude it from the latency budget if we were looking for a best case scenario.  |
|  |  |

### Revision#5 of Initial Proposal

It seems companies continue to express comments bringing more aspects to discussion. Given that RAN1 is agreed to continue analysis on the L1 latency for various positioning techniques, it seems the current exercise can serve as a good initial basis for future discussion. Therefore, instead of listing components for all positioning techniques, it is proposed to agree on parameters and table to facilitate analysis of physical layer latency.

**Proposal #1 – Revision#5**

* At least the following information is provided for positioning physical layer latency analysis:
	+ Source of positioning request (UE, Network)
	+ Destination of positioning measurements or data (UE, Network)
	+ Start and end triggers/events for physical layer latency evaluation
	+ Initial and final RRC State of positioned UE (RRC IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED)
	+ Positioning technique (DL-TDOA, Multi-RTT, etc.), type (DL, UL, DL+UL), mode (UE-based, UE-assisted)
	+ Latency component w/ value range and description, including information on any parallel (simultaneous) components
	+ Total latency value
* Latency components are ordered consequently in time starting from the earliest one

|  |
| --- |
| **Source [UE, NW]/Destination [UE, NW]****Positioning technique [DL-TDOA, E-CID, …], type [DL, UL, DL+UL], mode [UE-A, UE-B],** **Initial RRC State [IDLE, INACTVE, CONNECTED]** |
| **Latency Component** | **Value Range** | **Description of Latency Component** |
| Start trigger |  |  |
| Name of component 1 |  |  |
| Name of component 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Name of last component |  |  |
| End trigger |  |  |
| Total values  |  |  |

### Collection of Views for Revision #5 Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay.  |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Not OK.1. Unclear why the source of positioning request is concerned. Suggest to remove it.2. Not sure why we need to consider the initial/final RRC state for physical layer latency, as the discussion on starting event of L1 latency assumes UE is RRC CONNECTED for DL measurement at least. Suggest to remove it.3. We suggest to enumerate all considered positioning methods (DL-TDOA, Multi-RTT, UL-TDOA,NR E-CID or the combinations thereof).4. We have question for such evaluation methodology. Clearly the delay could be rather random, depending on scheduling availabilities. Therefore, we suggest to remove the Table, and let companies to do the math. |
| ZTE | Prefer to list some potential components as suggested by Huawei in previous revision.  |
| LG | Support the revised proposal, but we can agree with the second point from Huawei. Actually, RAN1 has not discussed the details of positioning measurement in RRC Idle/inactive state. We also suggest to remove it.To Huawei: We have a question for the first bullet. We think that there is 3 types of location services such as MO-LR, MT-LR and NI-LR, and, from our side, it is unclear whether these types affect to physical layer latency at the moment. If the physical layer latency is the same regardless of the types, we are OK to remove “source of positioning request”. However, if not, RAN1 needs to consider it.Regarding the fourth bullet, we agree with that the delay could not be a fixed value of each component, but the delay value within a certain range. Could you more elaborate on the meaning of random ?, and we also have a question on the meaning of 'math' in your proposal. Do you prefer to express the latency as a equation considering various components ? |
| CEWiT | OK |
| FL comment | Response to Huawei:Regarding 1), L1 latency may depends on which entity originates the request and which entity is recipient of measurements/locationRegarding 2), we do not need to do it for Rel.16, however it may be a part of Rel.17 enhancements.Regarding 3), it is OK except combinations which may be too largeRegarding 4), we suggest taking table as a recommendation.To ZTE:We do not have enough time to debate and converge on components and values. You can use this document and use identified components when prepare contribution. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon2 | To Intel:LGE also mentioned MO-LR and MT-LR (For NI-LR, I guess it is more like regulatory, not commercial use case). In our understanding MO-LR is UE sending NAS to AMF, while MT-LR is external client sending request to GMLC and then forward to AMF. Then AMF selects the LMF. We currently do not see any impact from the LCS request type. In summary, we suggest to remove it.If we define e.g. Phy-latency analysis for DL only positioning starts from gNB transmitting LPP measurement request to UE, and ends with gNB receiving LPP measurement response from the UE, I assume both message needs UE to be in CONNECTED state. At least from our side, latency pertaining RRC state transit is classified as higher layer latency, which is why we suggest to remove it.We would prefer to list UL-TDOA and NR E-CID. The bullet in Revision #6 is OK for us.If it is recommendation, we suggest to explicitly say it the template. The bullet in Revision #6 is OK for us. |
| FL response | To Huawei:Regarding 1) I guess for the study the general case can be considered and each of the following options may be valid and can be discussed further

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Request is coming from  | Target of location information |
| NW | NW | UE |
| UE | UE | NW |

I have not used upper layer terminology (MO-LR, MT-LR, NI-LR) in order not to mix discussion and avoid misleading points.Regarding 2) my understanding this aspect is still up to discussion. It would be good to converge on this aspect during RAN1#102e, however these aspects seems agreed to be investigated in AI 8.5.3. You are welcome to clarify your position in contributions submitted for the next meeting.Regarding 3), thanks for supportRegarding 4), yes the intention is to update template once agreement is reached. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To IntelIn we understand it correctly, the “Source of positioning request” refers the “Source of positioning **measurement** request”? In Rel-16, we assume that it can only be LMF, but I guess some enhancement is discussing possibility of gNB/NG-RAN. If that is correct, we can live with it being clarified as “Source of positioning **measurement** request”. Without any doubt, I think we are touching more or less higher layer signaling regardless of RRC/NAS/LPP, and you cannot dismiss the ambiguity in the higher layers domain when you use “Source of positioning request”.Then we think the bullet should be revised toRRC State of positioned UE (RRC IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED) at the start and end time for the physical layer latency evaluation |
| SS | OK in principle. But one clarification question. Should we agree on a common table for each component or it is up to each company to decide?  |

## Analysis of e2e/higher layer latency for NR positioning

### Description and Initial Proposal

Companies also discuss the other E2E / higher layer latency components. It seems there is no common understanding in terms of which WG should analyse the E2E / higher layer latency. It is typically a scope of RAN2 WG. It is important to align on common understanding among all RAN WGs and therefore it is suggested to discuss the following proposal:

**Tentative Proposal #3**

* Send LS to RAN WG2 and WG3 and ask to provide list of latency components with corresponding range of values for existing and enhanced NR positioning solutions

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above regarding e2e / higher layer latency analysis.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We are okay to have a common understanding of the higher latency. For RAN1, we prefer to focus on the physical layer latency. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. It might be good after converging on proposals 1-2 to send a list of scenarios for range values to RAN2/3. For example we may ask RAN2/3 to approximate minimum latency that can be achieved for DL positioning in UE assisted, UL positioning in UE assisted, etc.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We see the intention of sending the LS is to have an end-to-end latency evaluations. However, we doubt the LS is helpful because this latency analysis may involve core network also which may be outside RAN2 or RAN3 expertise.  |
| CATT | Support. Although we may not obtain all of the answer of higher-layer latency from RAN2/3 as pointed out, we can at least get some inputs from them,which would help the evaluation of the e2e latency. |
| Futurewei | For the study phase now, such an LS can wait until more details or understanding arises with RAN1 the physical layer components of the latency.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with tentative P#3, but also wondering if SA2 can also provide additional input with respect to LCS request and response core network procedures, which may be included in the e2e latency analysis. Given the limited time of SI, it would be perhaps better if we trigger the other WGs for their respective inputs. |
| Qualcomm | RAN1 should inform RAN2/RA3 for a potential budget of Phy-layer latency, and ask RAN2/RAN3 to take these budget into account in their dicsussions. In other words:**Alternative Proposal*** **Send LS to RAN WG2 and WG3: RAN1 is discussing the issue of latency for NR Rel-17 Positioning. RAN1 asks RAN2/3 to provide list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and potential enhanced NR positioning solutions, taking into account that an End-To-End latency of 10 msec may be desired in some IoT scenarios, and that the Phy-layer component of the End-to-End latency may be [6] msec.**

We can discuss the brackets further onlineTo Huawei/HiSilicon: If it is outside the scope of RAN2, RAN3, they can reply back accordingly saying that they cannot propose numbers because it is out of scope.  |
| ZTE | Support. The LS should at least includes,* The latency requirement in Rel-17.
* RAN1’s understanding on physical layer latency.
* As suggested by QC “ask RAN2/RAN3 to provide list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and potential enhanced NR positioning solution”.
 |
| MTK | Sending LS is okay. QC’s version can be as the baseline for further re-shaping |
| Intel | Support the FL proposal, the content of the LS can be discussed further. Having common understanding of high layer latency, it would be easier to estimate the overall e2e positioning latency. |
| Fraunhofer | Same view as MTK. |
| LG | In our understanding, the LS seems that RAN1 asks RAN2/RAN3 to define the higher layer latency, so we are supportive of this proposal.Also, we are fine with the alternarive proposal from QC. However, since the exact value of end-to-end latency has not been agreed as a specific value of “10ms” in QC’s view that “**taking into account that an End-To-End latency of 10 msec may be desired in some IoT scenarios”,** So we suggest to add square bracket such as [10] ms.  |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| CEWiT | We are fine with LS. Input form RAN2/3 will be helpful to proceed with RAN 1 study |
| SONY | Support. Sending an LS would be beneficial for our study. Furthermore, Latency analysis may also involve core network. The LS should also be sent to SA2.  |
| SS | Support |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

Based on received responses, it seems majority agree to send LS to RAN2/RAN3 WGs with a request to study latency components imposed by higher layer of NR Positioning and corresponding ranges.

**Proposal #3 - Revision#1**

* **Send LS to RAN WG2 and WG3 for analysis of latency of NR positiongn protocols defined in Rel.16 and potential enhancements**
* **Text proposal for LS:**
	+ **RAN1 evaluates physical layer latency and its potential reduction for NR Rel-17 positioning solutions. In order to evaluate End-To-End latency of NR positioning solutions the input from RAN2/3 is needed on latency components of NR higher layer positioning protocols. RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2/3 to provide list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and potential enhanced NR positioning solutions, taking into account that an End-To-End latency of 10 msec may be desired in some I-IoT scenarios**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.2.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. We also suggest including the latest agreements on latency requirements (if proposal in AI 8.5.1 ends up being agreed).  |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | Support. Agree with Nokia. |
| vivo | Not support the Text proposal, we don’t think ‘ **its potential reduction for NR Rel-17 positioning solutions’** can be easily agreed in this meeting. And we wonder the **End-To-End latency of 10 msec** has been agreed. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We have concern on liasing RAN3 as they are not involved in the SID.We do not need to repeat the text in the SID in the LS.In addition, we have some text changes on the LS.Suggested proposal is as follows**Proposal #3 - Revision from Huawei*** **Send LS to RAN WG2 for analysis of latency of NR positioning protocols defined in Rel.16 and potential enhancements**
* **Text proposal for LS:**

**RAN1 evaluates physical layer latency and its potential reduction for NR Rel-17 positioning solutions. In order to evaluate End-To-End latency of NR positioning solutions the input from RAN2 is needed on latency components of NR/NG-RAN/5GC higher layer positionng protocols. RAN1 respectfully asks if RAN2 can provide a list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and potential enhanced NR positioning solutions** |
| SONY | We still believe that we need to send the LS to SA2 (i.e. UE positioning requires core network operation, such as signaling /procedure involving AMF, LS).  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support, but we could also CC: SA2 for relevant inputs on e2e latency. |
| SS | Support |
| LG | We are generally OK but we still have a concern on mentioning the specific value of “10 ms” since the exact value of end-to-end latency has not been agreed. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. based on higher layer latency values obtained from the reply LS and the total latency budget value from requirements, the physical layer latency target can be derived.Also, the end-to-end latency of 10ms is not agreed yet. So please place 10ms under brackets for now. We can remove the brackets once there is a corresponding agreement in AI 8.5.1. |
| Intel | Support |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to comment on the following proposal.

**Proposal #3 - Revision#2**

* **Send LS to RAN WG2 and CC SA WG2 for analysis of latency of NR positioning protocols defined in Rel.16 and potential enhancements**
* **Text proposal for LS:**
* **RAN1 evaluates physical layer latency ~~and its potential reduction~~ for NR Rel-17 positioning solutions. In order to evaluate End-To-End latency of NR positioning solutions the input from RAN2 is needed on latency components of NR/NG-RAN/5GC higher layer positionng protocols. RAN1 respectfully asks if RAN2 can provide a list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and potential enhanced NR positioning solutions**

### RAN1 Outcome

During RAN1 GTW session, the following agreement was reached based on discussion of the Proposal#3 - Revision#2:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Text proposal for LS to RAN WG2 and CC SA WG2 and RAN WG3 for analysis of latency of NR positioning protocols defined in Rel.16:* RAN1 evaluates physical layer latency and its potential reduction for NR Rel-17 positioning solutions. In order to evaluate End-To-End latency of NR positioning solutions the input from RAN2 is needed on latency components of NR/NG-RAN/5GC higher layer positioning protocols. RAN1 respectfully asks if RAN2 can provide a list of latency components with corresponding range of values for the existing and any potential enhanced NR positioning solutions, keeping in mind the End-To-End latency described as desired in the study item description (RP-200928)
 |

## Target horizontal/vertical positioning accuracy requirements

### Description and Initial Proposal

Given that positioning error target requirements were not finalized at the previous meeting many companies tend to use evaluation results and either suggest target requirements based on results or make a conclusion whether certain positioning technique can meet requirement aligned with company view. In order to address this problem, it is suggested to agree on target requirements in agenda item for evaluation methodology.

The following data can be considered as an input to the discussion in evaluation methodology agenda item for I-IoT scenarios:

* CDF percentile – 90%
* Horizontal error – select among the following alternatives
	+ Alt.1 < 0.2m
	+ Alt.2 < 0.5m
* Vertical error < 1m

**Tentative Proposal #4**

* Discuss and agree on target positioning accuracy requirements in AI 8.5.1 to avoid duplication

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree with P4 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Agree |
| CATT | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Supportive of P#4 |
| ZTE | Agree. |
| MTK | Agree  |
| Intel | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | Agree. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| SONY | Support |
| SS | Support |
| LG | Agree. |

### Conclusion

Based on received responses the following is concluded:

* **Further discussion on target positioning accuracy requirements is to continue under AI 8.5.1**
* **Under AI 8.5.2. discussion on positioning accuracy requirements is closed and only evaluation results are to be discussed.**

## Target latency requirements

### Description and Initial Proposal

Given that latency target requirements were not finalized and require further discussion on latency components, it is suggested to agree on target e2e latency requirements in agenda item for evaluation methodology.

The e2e latency of 10ms can be considered as an input to the discussion in evaluation methodology agenda item for I-IoT scenarios.

**Tentative Proposal #5**

* Discuss and agree on target latency requirements in AI 8.5.1 to avoid duplication

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree with P5 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Agree. |
| CATT | Support |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Supportive of P#5 |
| ZTE | Support. |
| MTK | agree |
| Intel | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| LG | Agree |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| CEWiT | Support |
| SONY | Support |
| SS | Support |

### Conclusion

Based on received responses the following is concluded:

* **Further discussion on target latency requirements is to continue under AI 8.5.1.**
* **Under AI 8.5.2. discussion on latency requirements is closed and only evaluation results are to be discussed**

## Performance analysis of horizontal/vertical positioning

### Description and Initial Proposal

Companies have conducted initial evaluation of Rel.16 positioning solutions and checked performance of either horizontal or both horizontal and vertical solutions. In general, it is expected that final conclusions on evaluations will be made at the next meeting since currently performance target are not fixed.

So far, the following initial conclusions and observations can be made:

**Tentative Proposal #6**

* Baseline InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links for positioning. For baseline InF-SH scenario, under perfect synchronization and UE/gNB Tx/Rx calibration,
	+ It is feasible to achieve X = 0.2m accuracy of horizontal positioning at 90% using Rel.16 positioning techniques.
* Probability of LOS links for baseline InF-DH scenario is much lower comparing to InF-SH. For baseline InF-DH scenario, under perfect synchronization and UE/gNB Tx/Rx calibration,
	+ Further analysis is needed to check whether X = 0.2m accuracy of horizontal positioning at 90% using Rel.16 positioning techniques can be met.

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above and whether it is necessary to capture initial observations based on provided performance data so far or more time is needed for evaluation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | In general, we agree with proposal#6. It is noted that the target X = 0.2m can be satisfied in our Tdoc for DH. And we also found CATT and Intel( in the LOS case) can reach the target. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the 2nd bullet but for the first bullet (specifically the sub-bullet) we think it is still too early to declare we can achieve this accuracy. Some companies seem to observe different accuracy levels. At this stage we prefer to avoid this type of conclusion. One question is also that if we can meet InF-SH performance of 20 cm for 90% of UEs, does this mean we will not pursue accuracy enhancements in this Rel?  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To us, it is too early to conclude the feasibility of achieving 0.2m accuracy, as our results only show 0.299m@90% for the concerned case. Also, the results vary significantly between different positioning methods and the frequency ranges.  |
| CATT | We are fine to conclude it is feasible to achieve X = 0.2m accuracy of horizontal positioning as long as we made it clear that the conclusion is made under the perfect conditions (no synch error, no Tx/Rx group delays).To Nokia: Our understanding is that the conclusion does not mean we will not pursue accuracy enhancements in this Rel-17, simply because the conclusion is made under ‘perfect’ conditions. It does not mean we are able to meet the requirements in a real InF-SH environment with Rel-16 techniques.  |
| Qualcomm | We are not confident to conclude that 20cm for 90% is feasible at this stage. If we want to say that “some companies” and under “perfect conditions” provided results that meet the 20cm in 90% of the UEs, it may be closer to the current situation. However, we are not sure that it would help to make this decision at this meeting, so we prefer not to spend too much time into it and leave it for the next meeting.  |
| ZTE | Next meeting will be the last meeting for positioning SI. It’s too early to have conclusions, since some evaluation assumptions are still under discussion (e.g. UE/gNB Tx/Rx errors). |
| MTK | Let’s conclude this in next meeting |
| Intel | We prefer to postpone discussion on performance conclusions to the next meeting |
| Fraunhofer | Agree with the conclusion in the first bullet. Our preference is not to have the second bullet especially if we agree on Proposal 7 and conclude the evaluations on the agreed optional InF-DH configurations. |
| CEWiT | Agree that it will be too early to conclude the feasibility in InF-SHFine with second bullet.  |
| SONY | We think the conclusions as in Proposal#6 is still premature. We can wait and make the conclusions in the next meeting (RAN1#103e). |
| SS | We think we should agree with accuracy requirements before we jump into the conclusion. |

### Conclusion

Based on received responses it seems more time is needed for evaluation analysis to conclude on positioning accuracy and feasibility to meet requirements. The following is concluded:

* **Outcome of evaluation results and conclusions are to be discussed at the next meeting**

## LOS/NLOS detection/classification

### Description and Initial Proposal

One of the major challenges for accurate positioning in InF-DH scenario, is low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links which causes significant degradation of Rel.16 solutions if no enhancements are considered. The LOS/NLOS classification is considered as a useful approach to improve performance of Rel.16 solutions.

**Tentative Proposal #7**

* Rel.17 NR positioning enhancements support mechanisms for LOS/NLOS classification/detection which is shown to be essential to improve performance of Rel.16 positioning solutions
	+ FFS details

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above as a potential solution for Rel.17 enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Maybe it should be discussed in the enhancement. If we discussed in the evaluation, the simulation algorithm and condition maybe need to clarify. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with vivo that maybe enhancements AI is a better place to discuss this proposal. That said from company contributions it is clear that LoS/NLoS classification has an impact on the performance. Perhaps an observation along those lines could be agreeable without mentioning enhancments.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Our understanding is that in this AI, we should only conclude something likeMechanisms for LOS/NLOS classification/detection is shown to be essential to improve performance of Rel.16 positioning solutions. As an enhancement, LOS/NLOS identification can be discussed in another email thread of 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Pot-Pos-Enh.  |
| CATT | We suggest making the conclusion in AI 8.5.2 on the importance of LOS/NLOS classification/detection based on the evaluation results. The enhancements could be handled in AI 8.5.3. |
| Futurewei | I think approving the main bullet as a Conclusion or Observation is all that is needed here. The proposals for enhancements are contained in another AI.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Supportive of P#7, given that NLOS links especially degrade positioning performance in cluttered IIoT scenarios. The corresponding details regarding the LOS/NLOS classification techniques can be discussed in the parallel positioning enhancements email thread (AI 8.5.3). |
| Qualcomm | We think this should be discussed in the enhancement. In this ED, we think the proposal should be more about what it was observed.***Proposed Conclusion:******Low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause significant performance degradation*** |
| ZTE | It’s more like an observation rather than enhancement.  |
| MTK | The mechanism to support LOS/NLOS detection may belong to the enhancement part |
| Intel | In this AI we can make an observation, that LOS detection can improve positioning performance in some I-IoT scenarios. The decision on whenever the LOS/NLOS detection should be used in NR Positioning Rel-17 shouls be made in Enhancements AI. |
| Fraunhofer | We prefer the formulation provided by Huawei. On QC conclusion: the NLOS links may still cause performance degradation even if enough LOS links are valid. |
| LG  | We understand the necessity of this proposal, but we suggest that the details of enhancement could be discussed in AI 8.5.3. |
| CEWiT | Agree with most of the companies view that here we can conclude on the necessity of LOS/NLOS detection for positioning enhancement and related agreement can be taken into AI 8.5.3 |
| SONY | We also observed that LOS/NLOS classification/detection is beneficial in improving positioning accuracy. We think we should make it as conclusions (instead of proposal). The details (if agreed) should be discussed in 8.5.3. |
| SS | This seems to be an observation/conclusion.  |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

According to feature lead understanding that proposed NR positiong enhancements related to positioning accuracy improvement are to be evaluated under AI 8.5.2. From this perspective it is reasonable to draw some observations and conclusions to be captured in the TR based on presented results. This time many companies have looked into the benefits provided from LOS/NLOS classification/detection. Therefore it seems valid to discuss some observations and capture those in TR.

**Proposal #7 – Revision#1**

**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaliuations:**

* **Performance analysis of baseline I-IoT InF scenarios shows that InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links. In InF-DH the probability of LOS links is reduced substantially while probability of NLOS links is increased accordingly.**
* **Evaluations show that low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause significant performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
* **Evaluations have also shown that the use of LOS/NLOS classification techniques is beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.6.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support but suggest to change last bullet as follows: * **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumption (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx error) the use of LOS/NLOS classification techniques may be beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**
 |
| Qualcomm | We think the problem is more general than LOS/NLOS classification. This expression seems to suggest to some “explicit” signaling that a path is LOS/NLOS and points to a specific solution. However, there can be methods that are more implicit, e.g. outlier rejection of some TRPs, algorithms that are positioning-domain methods, rather than measurement-domain methods, soft probality reporting of TOAs, PDP profile reporting, etc.If we really want to add a statement on this, we believe a more general statement is needed to capture the observation from RAN1 perspective. Also, I think the word “significant” can be removed. * **Evaluations show that low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause ~~significant~~ performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
* **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx error) a variety of ~~the use of LOS/NLOS classification~~ techniques may be beneficial to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset.**
 |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal in general but think the third bullet should be more on results observed rather than on the techniques. Support the proposed revisions from Nokia.  |
| Fraunhofer | Support the FL proposal. The relation of the ideal assumptions with the LOS/NLOS identification in modified proposals is not clear. Even with other error sources are present, the ATOA offset from NLOS will degrade the performance. |
| ZTE | Support. The third bullet should be more general without mentioning specific technique. |
| vivo | For the third sub-bullet, it is too vague for us, it seems any **LOS/NLOS** classification techniques are beneficial for NR positioning. |
| OPPO | Support the revisions from Qualcomm |
| SONY | Support the revised version made by Qualcomm |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Revision but also open to covering implicit mechanisms in the proposal. |
| SS | Support QC’s version. |
| LG | Support the QC’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia’s change above. For the sake of completeness, we suggest to use “LOS/NLOS classification/**detection”** to describe potential solutions. It is also important to note that these observations are made under ideal conditions (e.g., no Rx/Tx error). |
| Intel | Support, from our understanding it seems a direct conclusion from submitted contributions. |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

**Proposal #7 – Revision#2**

**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaluations:**

* **Performance analysis of baseline I-IoT InF scenarios shows that InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links. In InF-DH the probability of LOS links is reduced substantially while probability of NLOS links is increased accordingly.**
* **Evaluations show that low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause ~~significant~~ performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
* **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx error) the use of LOS/NLOS classification/detection techniques is beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**
	+ **FFS impact on specification, performance of explicit or implicit solutions of LOS/NLOS classification/detection to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset**

### Collection of Views for Revision#2

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.6.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | As we proposed above, and seems found support from a few companies, we don’t think that the word “LOS/NLOS classification detection” encompasses all the different methods. For example, can we argue that basic/well-known/many-years-tested TRP outlier rejection is really LOS/NLOS classification/detection? There can be many reasons for which a link is bad, and only a subset of companies have shown that LOS/NLOS classification/detection in the strict sense of definition indeed can be feasible/beneficial. We encourage the companies that want to focus on LOS/NLOS classification/detection (in the stict sense of its meaning) to provide in the next meeting results where baseline TRP outlier rejections/rejection/determination (e.g. RANSAC, or RAIM as shown in vivo Tdoc), or any other implementation based solution (i.e., no explicit air interface or enhanced signaling may be needed) are used as baseline for comparison. It would be very instructive to set our baseline straight before jumping into specific approaches on solving well-known problems in positioning. Having said the above, we cannot accept this conclusion above and suggest to update it in a way we shown above.* **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx error) a variety of ~~the use of LOS/NLOS classification~~ techniques may be beneficial to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset.**
	+ **FFS impact on specification, performance of explicit or implicit solutions of LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection ~~to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset~~**
 |
| CATT | we are fine with the QC’s modification, although we believe **outlier determination/rejection** methods, which are commonly used in receivers for positioning measurements, may not have much impact on the 3GPP specification. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL proposal. In QC’s revision we just say that “a variety of techniques may be beneficial”. This is very broad and doesn’t give much of an indication of what are those techniques. Not sure that we could agree that to broad of a statement. In our understanding many companies show the improvement in LOS/NLOS classification and we are not sure why we are now adding outlier determination/rejection into this proposal. That could be a separate proposal in our view.  |
| vivo | We don’t support such proposal saying “**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaluations”.**How can we capture observations/conclusions into the TR on initial evaluation results when not even all evaluation models/parameters are settled? What about new results submitted to the next meeting? What if some different observations on new results? Is the intention to conclude on evaluations at this meeting and no more evaluation for next meeting? If not, I don’t think it’s a good approach to capture observations/conclusions into the TR based on initial results. |
| ZTE | - We prefer QC’s version, it’s more general.- In FFS part, we don’t have to mention “ impact on specification”, it should be done in another agenda.* + FFS impact on the performance of explicit or implicit solutions of LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset.
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support the FL’s proposal and agree with comments from Nokia. Also this thread intends to conclude on some observations based on the simulation results for progress although some optional evaluation models have not been settled yet. LOS benefiting high positioning accuracy seems quite like common-sense to us. Therefore, the generic enough description of the proposal should still hold although new results can come to the next meeting. Granted it is not the case, the new observations can be supplemented based on the new results.  |
| Intel | Support FL proposal.We agree with comments from Nokia and Huawei. To vivo: companies submitted contribution to provide status of work and observations they have based on performance study that was conducted at the previous and current meetings. There is nothing wrong to capture the status we have so far and update if it is needed at the subsequent meetings.To Qualcomm: we assume that outlier rejection is covered by the term of LOS/NLOS classification. If Qualcomm’s understanding is different, we are OK to add outlier rejection to the proposal itself although how it is done is likely to be out of specification scope. |

### Revision#3 of Initial Proposal

It seems compromise proposal is needed to accommodate comments from several companies. In order to address is the following revision is proposed

**Proposal #7 – Revision#3**

**Capture the following in TR:**

* **Performance analysis of baseline I-IoT InF scenarios shows that InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links. In InF-DH the probability of LOS links is reduced substantially while probability of NLOS links is increased accordingly.**
* **Evaluations show that low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause ~~significant~~ performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
* **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx calibration error) the LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection techniques are beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**
	+ **FFS impact on specification of explicit or implicit solutions of LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection techniques to alleviate the performance degradation that arises from a low probability of LOS links and the propagation delay offset**

### Collection of Views for Revision#3

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.6.7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Firstly, as we said before, we don’t support such proposal saying “**Capture the following in TR”.**Furthermore, for the third sub-bullet, it is still too vague for us, it seems any **LOS/NLOS** classification techniques are beneficial for NR positioning. At least, we propose to modify as below* **Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx calibration error) the effective LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection techniques are beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**
 |
| LG | In this agenda, we do not need to mention “impact on specification” in FFS. We support three main bullets except for the sub-bullet which is FFS. |
| ZTE | OK in principle.But the FFS is not necessary to list here, enhancement and spec impact should be discussed in another agenda. |
| CATT | Support in principle. It is also fine to us to remove the FFS |
| Qualcomm | **Additional changes shown in this color. We also have preference to remove the “Capture the following in TR” . We think the FFS needs to be kept.** * **Initial Evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx calibration error), a variety of techniques, such as an effective LOS/NLOS classification/detection, or outlier determination/rejection, may be beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with ZTE’s comments. Don’t think the FFS is necessary.  |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. Fine to capture the results in the TR. |
|  |  |

### Revision#4 of Initial Proposal

The following changes have been made based on feedback from companies: FFS is removed, proposed changes without concerns from other companies are accepted

**Proposal #7 – Revision#4**

**Capture the following in TR:**

* **Performance analysis of baseline I-IoT InF scenarios shows that InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links. In InF-DH the probability of LOS links is reduced substantially while probability of NLOS links is increased accordingly.**
* **Evaluations show that low probability of LOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
* **Initial evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx calibration error) the effective LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection techniques may be beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**

### Collection of Views for Revision#4

Companies are invited to comment on revised proposal in Section 3.6.9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | We have a question with respect to the logic of capturing observations/conclusion based on some initial evaluation results toward some enhancement methods. There’re more companies submitted baseline evaluation results in this meeting. However, in section 3.5, it is concluded that observations/conclusions are to be discussed in the next meeting when more results are available.Then there’re less initial evaluation results submitted to this meeting on these enhancement methods to begin with. This proposal still went through multiple rounds of email discussions trying to capture a possible performance benefits (in comparison to the baseline) where we even don’t know what the baseline performance is.We propose to take a consistent approaching in terms of capturing observations/conclusions based initial evaluation results in this meeting. It is preferred to capture observation/conclusions toward enhancement based on more final evaluation results into TR in the next meeting after the baseline performance is known and agreed upon. |
| CATT | Ok with the proposal. No strong view, but the sentence may read better to say:* **Evaluations show that high probability of NLOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
 |
| Futurewei | Support.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| ZTE | OK. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LG | OK and CATT’s proposal looks slightly better. |
| CEWiT | OK |
| SS | OK |

## UE/gNB Tx/Rx calibration errors

### Description and Initial Proposal

The impact of UE/gNB Tx/Rx calibration errors was evaluated and shown to be an important factor that can limit performance of timing-based solutions.

In general, the proper model of UE/gNB Tx/Rx time error is needed. The calibration aspects fit more RAN4 WG scope and thus it needs to be decided how to proceed with evaluations towards next meeting.

**Tentative Proposal #8**

* Alt.1: Calibration errors for UE/gNB Tx/Rx timings are used in future analysis. Select one of the options based on submitted contributions.
	+ Option 1: gNB Rx/Tx Time error T1=1.4ns UE Rx/Tx time error T1=5.6ns
	+ Option 2: Check value of Tx/Rx error suitable to meet X = 0.2m of horizontal positioning accuracy requirement
	+ Option 3: RAN1 sends LS to RAN4 to consult on calibration model for UE/gNB Tx/Rx time error

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | The question seems to be also discussed in the AI 8.5.1. For us, it is not clear about the definition of Tx/Rx timings, some company say it can be calibrated before positioning, some companies think only part of it can be calibrated, some companies think it includes the antenna panel switching and timing jitter. We prefer to unify the understanding of Tx/Rx timings.As our understating, the UE/gNB RX and TX timing error is the delay caused by the processing form the baseband to the antennas, or the delay caused by different antenna lengths. If the above understanding is reasonable, we can not understand why the UE Rx/Tx time error is longer than gNB Rx/Tx Time error in option 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | This should be discussed in 8.5.1 in our view as it is already included in the FL summary there.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | It seems to be covered by AI 8.5.1.  |
| CATT | We suggest making the conclusion in AI 8.5.2 on the importance of properly handling Tx/Rx group delays based on the evaluation results. The enhancements could be handled in AI 8.5.3. |
| Qualcomm | We think this should be discussed in the enhancement. In this ED, we think the proposal should be more about what it was observed.***Proposed Conclusion:******Calibration Errors for UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may cause performance degradation in the timing-based methods of Rel-16 Positioning solutions.***  |
| ZTE | It has been discussed in AI 8.5.1. |
| Intel | It should be discussed in AI 8.5.1 |
| LG | It has been already discussed in AI 8.5.1 but we also prefer option 3 because defining exact value is out of scope for RAN1. |
| SONY | Considering this is the agenda item where the simulation results were presented. We should make a conclusion related to the calibration error. For example, we can provide this conclusion: “The impact of UE/gNB Tx/Rx calibration errors was evaluated in some contributions and shown to be an important factor that can limit performance of timing-based solutions”We also think it should be discussed in AI 8.5.1 |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

Based on received responses it seems the following is concluded:

* **Discussion on model of calibration errors for UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing is to contimue under AI 8.5.1**

At the same time it is fair to capture observations on impact of calibration errors for UE/gNB Tx/Rx timings based on results that were already presented.

**Proposal #8 – Revision#1**

**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaluations:**

* **It is observed that calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing based methods of Rel.16 positionining solutions when precise UE positiongn is targeted and thus should be considered in evaluations**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.7.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay.  |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see why the “thus should be considered in evaluations” is really needed as a conclusion. We think the statmenet is enough:**It is observed that calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing based methods of Rel.16 positionining solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted** |
| Futurewei | Ok, and the proposal should end without “and thus…” |
| Fraunhofer | Support the modified proposal from QC |
| vivo | Based on the agreement in the last meeting, it is an optional scenario, and up to the company to provide the evaluation result. So also propose without “and thus…”Agreement:Optional: The UE/gNB RX and TX timing error, in FR1/FR2, can be modeled as a truncated Gaussian distribution with zero mean and standard deviation of T1 ns, with truncation of the distribution to the [-T2, T2] range, and with T2=2\*T1:* T1:  [X] ns for gNB and [Y] ns for UE
* FFS: X, Y
* Note: RX and TX timing errors are generated per panel independently
* FFS: how the Rx and Tx timing errors are applied
 |
| OPPO | Support the modified proposal from QC |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK. |
| SONY | OK |
| SS | OK |
| LG | We also agree with proposal from QC |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Intel | Agree with the first part of thew revised proposal. Share views of Qualcomm and vivo, saying that the evaluation of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing errors should be optional |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

**Proposal #8 – Revision#2**

**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaluations:**

* **It is observed that** **calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing-based methods of Rel.16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted ~~and thus should be considered in evaluations~~**

### Collection of Views for Revision#2

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.7.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| CATT | OK.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay.  |
| vivo | We don’t support such proposal saying “**Capture the following observations/conclusions in TR based on initial evaluations”.**How can we capture observations/conclusions into the TR on initial evaluation results when not even all evaluation models/parameters are settled? What about new results submitted to the next meeting? What if some different observations on new results? Is the intention to conclude on evaluations at this meeting and no more evaluation for next meeting? If not, I don’t think it’s a good approach to capture observations/conclusions into the TR based on initial results.Particular to the calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing. We raised questions on this in AI 8.5.1 where even the model for this Tx/Rx timing is not settled. How can we draw such observations/conclusions?  |
| ZTE | Ok in principle. To address vivo’s concern, one suggestion from our side is,*Interested companies may need more evaluation results to investigate the performance gap when calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing exist.* |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. Normally the TR captures new agreement on a per-meeting basis. As far we understand, calibration error at gNB/UE is the major thread to higher accuracy positioning for the commercial gNB/UE. |
| Intel | Agree with FL proposal. |

### Revision#3 of Initial Proposal

In order to address concern from one company regarding initial observations the main bullet is modified.

**Proposal #8 – Revision#3**

**Capture the following in TR:**

* **It is observed that calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing-based methods of Rel.16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted ~~and thus should be considered in evaluations~~**

### Collection of Views for Revision#3

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.7.7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| vivo | Firstly, as we said before, we don’t support such proposal saying “**Capture the following in TR”.**Secondly, we prefer to capture the quantitive values in TR for the negatively impact performance other than ‘may negatively impact performance’. |
| LG | OK  |
| ZTE | OK. |
| CATT | OK |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Ericsson | Fine with FL’s proposal. Ok to capture the observation in the TR as multiple companies have simulated and shown similar observation. |
|  |  |

### Revision#4 of Initial Proposal

One company seems against of the intention to capture observation in the TR and prefers “capture the quantitive values in TR”. From feature lead perspective the quantitive values are expected to be added at the next meeting based on evaluation methodology which is being developed in parallel.

 Based on feedback from all other companies it is OK to simply agree on proposal. Therefore, proposal of reiterated once again.

**Proposal #8 – Revision#4:**

**Capture the following in TR:**

* **It is observed that calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing-based methods of Rel.16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted**

### Collection of Views for Revision#4

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.7.9. If company disagree with proposal it is welcome to provide revision that is deemed to be acceptable to other companies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay.  |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | We do not support this proposal #8.As we commented in section 3.6, we have a concern with respect to the logic of capturing observations/conclusion based on some initial evaluation results toward one aspect which is related to an optional modeling discussion. There’re more companies submitted baseline evaluation results in this meeting. However, in section 3.5, it is concluded that observations/conclusions are to be discussed in the next meeting when more results are available.Then there’re less initial evaluation results submitted to this meeting on these UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing calibration error to begin with. The details of this optional modeling itself was agreed yesterday in GTW session after we compromised for the sake of progress, the parameters X and Y are not decided but leave to each company. How is it proper to agree on the observations based some initial results when the modeling itself just agreed in this meeting?We propose to take a consistent approaching in terms of capturing observations/conclusions based initial evaluation results in this meeting. It is preferred to capture observation/conclusions based on more final evaluation results with aligned modeling into TR in the next meeting after the baseline performance is known and agreed upon. |
| CATT | OK |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| ZTE | OK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LG | OK |
| CEWiT | OK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Feature Lead Response | To vivo:“As we commented in section 3.6, we have a concern with respect to the logic of capturing observations/conclusion based on some initial evaluation results toward one aspect which is related to an optional modeling discussion.”[It is an important practical aspect that was acknowledged by majority of companies. Regarding the logic to capture intermediate results there is nothing wrong to update TR on a per meeting basis, moreover it is obviously beneficial for systematic analysis. Finally, we do not see anything wrong in proposed wording]“There’re more companies submitted baseline evaluation results in this meeting. However, in section 3.5, it is concluded that observations/conclusions are to be discussed in the next meeting when more results are available.Then there’re less initial evaluation results submitted to this meeting on these UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing calibration error to begin with.”[It is because multiple companies raised concern on collection of results this meeting. Only one company has concern to capture initial outcome which is consistent with observation made by many companies]“The details of this optional modeling itself was agreed yesterday in GTW session after we compromised for the sake of progress, the parameters X and Y are not decided but leave to each company. How is it proper to agree on the observations based some initial results when the modeling itself just agreed in this meeting?”[Agreement was made. Companies have presented analysis. It is much better situation comparing to the case when agreement is done but analysis is not provided. It seems very natural to make initial observations.]“We propose to take a consistent approaching in terms of capturing observations/conclusions based initial evaluation results in this meeting. It is preferred to capture observation/conclusions based on more final evaluation results with aligned modeling into TR in the next meeting after the baseline performance is known and agreed upon.”[Feature lead and majority of companies seems do not see any inconsistency, as explained above] |
| SS | OK |

## Network synchronization error estimation

### Description and Initial Proposal

Network synchronization error was shown to be critical for TDOA based timing solutions. Several companies mentioned possibility to estimate network synchronization error by UEs/gNBs.

**Tentative Proposal #9**

* RAN1 to further study feasibility of network synchronization error estimation as a part of Rel.17 positioning enhancement solutions

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above aiming to discuss further efforts on network synchronization error estimation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | I don‘t understand why we discussed the network synchronization in AI 8.5.2. In the last meeting, the 50ns sync error has been agreed as an optional scenario, it is up to companies to provide the evaluation result with the sync error. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with vivo that this shouldn’t be discussed in this AI. There are proposals in AI 8.5.3 which may be a better place to discuss this issue.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | I guess the intention of this proposal is to stuy the feasibliblity of any enhancement for estimating the NW sync error to be discussed in AI 8.5.3, from this sense, we are ok with the proposal.  |
| CATT | We suggest making the conclusion in AI 8.5.2 on the importance of properly handling network synchronization error. The enhancements could be handled in AI 8.5.3. |
| Futurewei | This should be discussed in the Enhancements AI, not here. |
| Qualcomm | We think this should be discussed in the enhancement. In this ED, we think the proposal should be more about what it was observed.***Proposed Conclusion:******Network synchronization may cause performance degradation in the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 Positioning solutions.*** |
| ZTE | It’s more like an observation rather than enhancement.  |
| MTK | According to the LTE experience, the sync error is >= 130ns from US network. And this is why DL-TDOA performs poorly and therefore RAT independent approach (GNSS) is preferred for outdoors.Instead of the estimation of sync error, we can consider some mechanism to cancel the sync error, such as applying multiple-RTT, or applying DL-TDOA+UL-TDOA  |
| Intel | In this AI we can do only observation on evaluation results with synchronization error. The discussion on Network synchronization compensation should be done in Enhancement AI |
| LG | Agree with CATT’s view that making the conclusion of this proposal in AI 8.5.2, and the enhancements should be dealt in AI 8.5.3. |
| CEWiT | If it is conclusive remark to help the agreement in AI 8.5.3 then we support this proposal. |
| Sony | Do not support Proposal #9 (same view as VIVO). |
| SS | Agree with vivo |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

Based on received responses the following revision of the proposal is suggested for further discussion

**Proposal #9 – Revision#1:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Network synchronization error cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions and needs to be properly handled for precise positioning**
	+ **FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation and its impact on NR positioning**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.8.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay in principle but wasn’t this already observed in Rel-16? Should be obvious. FFS point is okay for us.  |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Futurewei | Revised the first sub-bullet by removing the phrase “and needs…”* + **Network synchronization error cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions ~~and needs to be properly handled for precise positioning~~**
 |
| Fraunhofer | Support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| vivo | Same view with Futherwei. Remove the phrase “and needs…” |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK. |
| SONY | OK |
| SS | OK with the first bullet |
| LG | We also prefer to remove”and needs….” In addition, this issue was already discussed in Rel-16. If I correctly know, the time synchronization information between TRPs/Cells can be provided to the UE by 37.355. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to add another FFS.FFS: whether network synchronization error estimation/compensation needs any specification enhancements.If this can be left to network implementation, we don’t need to specify these. Regarding the TR capturing the statement, we assume on ly the first subbullet is to be captured. The FFS is aimed at the work done in 8.5.3? |
| Intel | Support |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

**Proposal #9 – Revision#2:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Network synchronization error cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions ~~and needs to be properly handled for precise positioning~~**
* **FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation and its impact on NR positioning**
* **FFS: whether network synchronization error estimation/compensation needs any specification enhancements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#2

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.8.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| CATT | For “FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation and its impact on NR positioning”, I assume the discussion of the feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation is not related to the general network synchronization techniques (e.g., GNSS based), but more specifically the synchronization techniques based on NR signals/measurements. If this is the common understanding, we may narrow down the scope to:“FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation based on NR reference signals and measurements” |
| Nokia/NSB | Don’t support the FFS points as those should be/are being discussed in AI 8.5.3. Should say “may cause” in our view as there could be implementation solutions that address this.  |
| vivo | OKSupport in general except capturing it in TR |
| ZTE | We don’t need second part here, enhancement should be discussed in another agenda. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| Intel | Agree with FL proposal |

### Revision#3 of Initial Proposal

The following proposed wording proposal “based on NR reference signals and measurements” is additionally reflected. FL understanding that companies would like to evaluate it and thus it is fair to capture it under evaluation agenda.

**Proposal #9 – Revision#3:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Network synchronization error cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions ~~and needs to be properly handled for precise positioning~~**
* **FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation / compensation** based on NR reference signals and measurements **and its impact on NR positioning**
* **FFS: whether network synchronization error estimation/compensation needs any specification enhancements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#3

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.8.7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | We don’t support FFS points. In our view, the FFS points need to be discussed in the enhancement agenda. |
| ZTE | OKay. We still have one reservation, this email thread is to draft some observations and conclusions based on submitted evaluation results, so we don’t need to touch enhancement part. |
| CATT | Support. Prefer to keep ‘FFS’. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Don’t support the FFS points as those should be/are being discussed in AI 8.5.3. Should say “may cause” in our view as there could be implementation solutions that address this.  |
| Ericsson | Ok. Similar to CATT, we prefer to keep the ‘FFS’. |
| vivo | We can accept the first bullet which is already known from Rel-16 study. We also do not support capture FFS bullets. They do not belong to observations/conclusion based on evaluation results. These aspects should be discussed in the other AI 8.5.3. |
|  |  |

### Revision#4 of Initial Proposal

Companies made conflicting comments. Some companies are against to keep FFS points assuming that those should be discussed in enhancements AI, while other companies prefer to keep FFS. Other companies prefer to remove observation based on “submitted evaluation results”. From feature lead perspective, current proposal reflects technical facts, therefore feature lead asks companies to provide constructive comments in the next round of discussion and avoid going in circle. If current wording is not acceptable, companies are invited to provide their wording.

**Proposal #9 – Revision#4:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Network synchronization error cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions**
* **FFS feasibility of network synchronization error estimation/compensation based on NR reference signals and measurements and its impact on NR positioning**
* **FFS whether network synchronization error estimation/compensation needs any specification enhancements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#4

Companies are invited to provide views and alternative wording (if is needed) on proposal in Section 3.8.9 that can be acceptable to all companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We suggest a small change as follows to main bullet but otherwise okay:* + **Network synchronization errors may cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions**
 |
| Qualcomm | OK with the update from Nokia |
| Vivo | We support the wording update from Nokia to the 1st bullet.On the 2nd and 3rd bullets of FFS, we’re not clear why listed here in AI 8.5.2. Our understanding is that those FFS bullets are covered already in agenda 8.5.3 related to study of methods to handle network synchronization error issue in general.  |
| CATT | OK with the update from Nokia. Also fine with vivo’s suggestion to remove FFS. |
| Futurewei | Ok but need to keep the observation in the same form as other observations that are proposed:* **Evaluations show that network synchronization errors may cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions**
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with Nokia or Futurewei’s suggestion. |
| ZTE | OK. Agree with Futurewei. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LG | OK with Futurewei’s proposal. |
| CEWiT | Okay with TR text but FFS points are being discussed in sub-AI 8.5.3. No need to have agreement in this sub agenda. |
| SS | OK with Futurewei’s rewording |

## Granularity of timing report

### Description and Initial Proposal

A few companies have mentioned that granularity of timing measurement reports is a potential limiting factor for timing-based positioning solutions.

**Tentative Proposal #10**

* RAN1 to further study whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough aiming to conclude at the next RAN1 meeting

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above regarding enhancement of granularity of timing reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | It is up to companies to provide the evaluation result with different granularity. The comparison of the performance with different granularity can be provided by interested companies. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think a general observation on the impat of granularity could be reached in this AI so the proposal is okay in principle for us.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK. |
| CATT | OK. |
| Qualcomm | This is applicable for UE-A only, UE-B does not have this problem. Also can be considered in the enhnacements discussion. Suggest to update the proposal to be more about what we observe:***Proposed Conclusion**** ***For UE-Assisted Positioning, Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports may cause performance degradation in the timing-based Rel-16 Positioning solutions.***
 |
| ZTE | It’s more like an observation rather than enhancement.  |
| MTK | Discuss this at enhancement part |
| Intel | Support proposal |
| Fraunhofer | Ok with the proposal. |
| LG | We are OK. |
| SONY | Do not support P#10. We can discuss this as part of positioning enhancement techniques (AI 8.5.3) |
| SS | Agree with Sony |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

Based on provided resonses it seems the following revision may be agreeable to the group.

**Proposal #10 – Revision#1**

* **For UL-TDOA, DL-TDOA, and Multi-RTT UE-assisted positioning techniques, the Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports may cause performance degradation of the timing-based Rel-16 positioning solutions**
	+ **FFS till the next RAN1 meeting whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough to avoid degradation in I-IoT scenarios and meet positioning requirements**

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.9.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | We suggest to just agree on the FFS bullet at this point as we may then have to revert the main bullet if the granularity is found to be acceptable.  |
| QC | Generally supportive, but wondering if we should the: “**when precise UE positioning is targeted**” That is: * **For UL-TDOA, DL-TDOA, and Multi-RTT UE-assisted positioning techniques, the Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports may cause performance degradation when precise UE positioning is targeted ~~of the timing-based Rel-16 positioning solutions~~**
 |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| ZTE | FFS is enough. Interested companies can bring their results in next meeting. |
| Vivo | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with QC’s revision. |
| SONY | Support the revised version made by QC |
| SS | FFS is OK |
| LG | We also support only FFS point. In the next meeting, we can make conclusion such as main bullet based on the analysis provided by interested companies. |
| Ericsson | Same view as Nokia/NSB. We prefer to only agree on the FFS part. |
| Intel | Support |

### Revision#2 of Initial Proposal

**Proposal #10 – Revision#2**

* **For UL-TDOA, DL-TDOA, and Multi-RTT ~~UE-assisted positioning techniques~~, the Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports may cause performance degradation of the timing-based Rel-16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted**
	+ **FFS till the next RAN1 meeting whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough to avoid degradation in I-IoT scenarios and meet positioning requirements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#2

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.9.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see why we need to put a deadline on the Rel-16 granularity. It can be a simple enhancement during WI. Remove the: “**till the next RAN1 meeting**” |
| CATT | Support in principle. |
| Nokia/NSB | Still only support the FFS bullet as this position had some support from at least 5 companies above.  |
| Vivo | We’re not sure how much value by having this proposal given the main bullet says “may cause”. If the intention is just listing a FFS, we can accept the FFS sub-bullet without the main bullet. |
| ZTE | OK |
| Intel | Agree with FL proposal. Our understanding is that the potential agreement will be captured in the TR and FFS is expected to be resolved during SI or WI phase.We are O.K. with change from Qualcomm. |

### Revision#3 of Initial Proposal

In this revision, the comment to remove wording “**till the next RAN1 meeting**” is reflected together with suggestion to capture main bullet in TR. It seems no additional change is requested and hopefully revision#3 can be acceptable to all.

**Proposal #10 – Revision#3**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **For UL-TDOA, DL-TDOA, and Multi-RTT ~~UE-assisted positioning techniques~~, the Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports may cause performance degradation of the timing-based Rel-16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted**
* **FFS ~~till the next RAN1 meeting~~ whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough to avoid degradation in I-IoT scenarios and meet positioning requirements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#3

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.9.7

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We’re not sure how much value by having this proposal given the main bullet says “may cause”. If the intention is just listing a FFS, we can accept the FFS sub-bullet without the main bullet. |
| LG | We only support FFS. Before capture the proposal in TR, in our view, it is appropriate to discuss this proposal, after we analyze and/or evaluate how much performance degradation is expected. |
| ZTE | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| Qualcomm  | Why the “UE-A positioning technques” was removed. UE-B does not have timing measurements reported nor any granularity problems.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Sorry to repeat from above but still only support the FFS bullet as this position had some support from at least 5 companies above. |
| Ericsson | We have similar view as VIVO and LG. We only support keeping the FFS. |
|  |  |

### Revision#4 of Initial Proposal

Considering that majority of companies prefer to keep FFS part only, the original proposal was modified.

**Proposal #10 – Revision#4**

* **FFS whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough to avoid degradation in I-IoT scenarios and meet positioning requirements**

### Collection of Views for Revision#4

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal in Section 3.9.9

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay.  |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| Futurewei | OK |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK |
| ZTE | OK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LG | OK |
| CEWiT | OK |
| SS | OK |

## UE power consumption

### Description and Initial Proposal

One company provided UE power consumption analysis for the cases involving PRS measurement and SRS transmission. UE power consumption is certainly important consideration. In order to conduct such studies, RAN1 needs to decide on UE power consumption model.

**Tentative Proposal #11**

* RAN1 to further discuss details and necessity of UE power consumption evaluations for NR Positioning in Rel.17

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above including specific details of UE power consumption model.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We agree with P11.Device efficiency(ie, UE power consumption) is an objective, same with accuracy and latency. And it has the evaluation model or method for accuracy and latency, while the UE power consumption doesn’t have a common evaluation model, it is difficult to evaluate the performance of enhancement.We believe that a quantitative evaluation of power consumption for positioning is necessary. and it will help choosing a suitable positioning solution with efficient power consumption. So we prefer to further discuss the evaluation model of UE power model. |
| Nokia/NSB | As commented in the other AI the prior agreement from RAN1#101-e seems very clear: Agreement:* UE power consumption for NR positioning can be optionally evaluated in the SI.
* Note: It is up to each company on how to evaluate the power consumption for positioning. The UE power consumption models developed in TR38.840 can be considered as the starting point for defining the UE power consumption model for the evaluation for NR positioning

Based on the note we don’t see the need for this proposal.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We view power consumption as an important KPI to provide another perspective to look into positioning performance. Also, the power consumption model seems to being discussed in the email thread of 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Eval-Addl-Scenarios.  |
| CATT | It seems to us the previous agreement is good enough. Each company can bring their evaluation results. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Supportive of UE power consumption evaluations and corresponding feasibility for Rel-17 positioning. As some companies already mentioned, the previous agreement already covers P#11.  |
| ZTE | Discuss it in 102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Eval-Addl-Scenarios. |
| Intel | Agree with Nokia that agreement from previous meeting totally covers details for evaluation and analysis of UE power consumption. Do not agree with proposal |
| Fraunhofer | We don’t see the need for the proposal. |
| LG | In the previous meeting, the issue related with power consumption was already agreed. So, this proposal doesn’t need to be discussed in this meeting. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| SONY | From the UE point of view, power consumption is important particularly Rel-17 is dealing with low latency and high accuracy positioning (which may potentially require high power consumption. Instead of providing proposals, we can make a conclusion or note suggesting the power consumption model should be discussed as part of AI 8.5.1 (102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Eval-Addl-Scenarios) |
| SS | No need |

### Conclusion

Based in received responses the following is concluded:

* **Further discussion on UE Power Consumption model is to continue under AI 8.5.1.**
* **Under AI 8.5.2. UE Power Consumption model is closed and only evaluation results can be discussed if provided**

## Unified Template for Collection of Evaluation Results

### Description and Initial Proposal

In order to simplify the work at the upcoming meeting, it is desirable to develop unified across companies (compliant with 3GPP TR styles) template for collection of evaluation results. This template is expected to support evaluation of multiple techniques and simplify analysis of the results. Each company can be requested to provide answers on whether and which performance technique can reach the target performance requirement to draw final observations.

**Tentative Proposal #12**

* RAN1 to design template (during RAN1#102e) for collection of evaluation results at the upcoming meetings aiming to simplify analysis of provided data, preparation of summary/conclusions based on provided evaluation studies and integration of the provided data to 3GPP TR

Companies are invited to provide views on proposal above including desirable features/attributes of the template. If it is agreed, the next step is to design and endorse template.

### Collection of Views on Initial Proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | We think we can reuse the template in TR 38.855, and companies may provide the evaluation results with the assumptions. |
| Nokia/NSB | From last meeting: Agreement:For TR 38.857, the template used in TR 38.855 for the inclusion of simulation results is reused. In addition, the following parameters should be provided for each scenario together with the simulation results.(table omit for space)We are okay to adapt the template from TR 38.855 if necessary but this seems to already be agreed as the baseline. Perhaps we need some template for accuracy results?  |
| CATT | It seems we can follow the agreement to reuse the template used in TR 38.855. |
| Intel | For collecting result we propose to use table agreed on previous meeting with minor modification (two new rows are added: Measurements used for positioning, Enhancements applied on top of Rel-16 functionaloty):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **[Case 1, scenario, FRx]** | **[Case 2, scenario, FRx]** |
| Channel model (baseline, otherwise state any modifications) |  |  |
| Reference Signal Physical Structure and Resource Allocation (RE pattern) |  |  |
| Reference signal (type of sequence, number of ports, …)  |  |  |
| Number of sites |  |  |
| Number of symbols used per slot per positioning estimate |  |  |
| Number of slots per positioning estimate |  |  |
| Power-boosting level |  |  |
| Uplink power control (applied/not applied) |  |  |
| interference modelling (ideal muting, or other) |  |  |
| Measurements used for positioning (DL-TDOA, UL-TDOA. Multi-RTT, UL-TDOA + UL AoA, Multi-RTT + UL-AoA, etc.) |  |  |
| Enhancements applied on top of Rel-16 functionaloty, if any |  |  |
| Description of Measurement Algorithm (e.g. super resolution, interference cancellation, ….) |  |  |
| Description of positioning technique / applied positioning algorithm (e.g. Least square, taylor series, etc) |  |  |
| Network synchronization assumptions |  |  |
| Beam-related assumption (beam sweeping / alignment assumptions at the tx and rx sides) |  |  |
| Precoding assumptions (codebook, nrof antenna elements used, etc) |  |  |
| Additional notes, if any(gNB antenna height, UE antenna height, UE antenna configuration, UE mobility, UE/gNB RX and TX timing error etc.) |  |  |

The performance for each evaluation case should be captured in following table, where points of CDF curve were ageeed on previous meeting:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 50% | 67% | 80% | 90% | 95% |
| **Case 1** | Horizontal Error, convex UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Optional) Horizontal Error, all UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Altitude Error, convex UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Optional) Altitude Error, all UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Case 2** | Horizontal Error, convex UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Optional) Horizontal Error, all UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Altitude Error, convex UEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Optional) Altitude Error, all UEs |  |  |  |  |  |

The performance observation for each evaluation case should be captured in following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Observations |
| **Case 1** | Observarion based on positioning perfromance for Case 1 |
| **Case 2** | Observarion based on positioning perfromance for Case 2 |

Optionally, CDF curves are presented in xml spreadsheet in forms of the of X axis value corresponding to the set of probability from 0% to 100% with granularity of 1%. |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the proposal. Specifically the simulation results in section8-TR38.855 can be better alligned in 38.857 for the baseline, optional and design specific parameters. |
| SONY | We can re-use the template in TR 38.855, particularly for the horizontal/vertical accuracy. |
| SS | We have agreed that template in 38.855 can be reused. |

### Revision of Initial Proposal

Assuming there is no concerns, it is probably better to discuss directly based on template example. Considering limited time for preparation of the template it is suggested to discuss this aspect later during the meeting week when initial version of revised template is prepared and shared.

### Collection of Views for Revised Proposal

TBD

# Proposal on Initial Outcome

Based on responses provided by companies, it is suggested to agree on the following list of proposals:

**Proposal #1 – Revision#7**

* **At least the following information is provided for positioning physical layer latency analysis:**
	+ **Source initiating request for positioning measurements/location for a given UE (UE, Network)**
	+ **Destination awaiting for positioning measurements/location for a given UE (UE, Network)**
	+ **Start and end triggers/events for physical layer latency evaluation**
		- **For Rel.16 solutions, it is based on specification for each solution**
	+ **Initial and final RRC State of positioned UE (RRC IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED) at the start and end time for the physical layer latency evaluation**
		- **For Rel.16 UE-assisted solutions, it is applicable for UEs in RRC CONNECTED state only**
	+ **Positioning**
		- **technique (enumeration): (1) DL-TDOA, (2) DL AoD, (3) UL-TDoA, (4) UL-AoA, (5) Multi-RTT, (6) E-CID**
		- **type: DL, UL, DL+UL**
		- **mode: UE-based, UE-assisted**
	+ **Latency component w/ value range and description, including information on any parallel (simultaneous) components**
	+ **Total latency value**
* **Latency components are recommended to be captured in table and ordered consequently in time starting from the earliest one:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Source [UE, NW]/Destination [UE, NW]****Positioning technique [DL-TDOA, E-CID, …], type [DL, UL, DL+UL], mode [UE-A, UE-B],** **Initial RRC State [IDLE, INACTVE, CONNECTED]** |
| **Latency Component** | **Value Range** | **Description of Latency Component** |
| Start trigger |  |  |
| Name of component 1 |  |  |
| Name of component 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Name of last component |  |  |
| End trigger |  |  |
| Total values  |  |  |

**Proposal #7 – Revision#5**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Performance analysis of baseline I-IoT InF scenarios shows that InF-SH scenario is characterized by high probability of LOS links. In InF-DH the probability of LOS links is reduced substantially while probability of NLOS links is increased accordingly.**
	+ **Evaluations show that high probability of NLOS links and propagation delay offset imposed by NLOS links may cause performance degradation of positioning accuracy, that was especially observed in InF-DH scenario**
	+ **Initial evaluations have also shown that under certain ideal assumptions (e.g., synchronization error, Rx/Tx calibration error) the effective LOS/NLOS classification/detection, outlier determination/rejection techniques may be beneficial to improve NR positioning accuracy**

**Proposal #8 – Revision#5:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **It is observed that calibration errors of UE/gNB Tx/Rx timing may negatively impact performance of timing-based methods of Rel.16 positioning solutions when precise UE positioning is targeted**

**Proposal #9 – Revision#5:**

* **Capture the following in TR:**
	+ **Evaluations show that network synchronization errors may cause performance degradation of the DL-TDOA or UL-TDOA Rel-16 positioning solutions**

**Proposal #10 – Revision#5**

* **FFS whether Rel.16 granularity of timing measurement reports is enough to avoid degradation in I-IoT scenarios and meet positioning requirements**

Companies are invited to provide comments. If some of proposals are not acceptable, please provide specific correction for each proposal that is deemed to be acceptable by all companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Fraunhofer | Agree on the proposals in Section4. Proposal#10 doesn’t say much still we are fine with the current version. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Comments copied here* P1:
	+ “Source of positioning request” should be changed to “Source of positioning measurement request”
	+ Initial and final RRC State of positioned UE (RRC IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED) should be changed to “RRC State of positioned UE (RRC IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED) at the start and end time for the physical layer latency evaluation”
 |
| LG | In the Proposal#1, for physical layer latency, we understand that overall Rel-16 positioning techniques can be considered for the UE-based mode, even though they are not currently supported now. We would like to check our understanding is aligned with this proposal. (From our side, we are fine with excluding ECID technique for UE-based positioning)Regarding Proposal#7,#8, and #9, we are generally OK. However, we think that we do not need to spend a lot of time to discuss these proposal. In our understanding, even if these proposals are not agreed, in TR document, we think that the research/simulation results containing these proposals from each company would be captured unless we discuss which results need to be excluded.For Proposal#10, OK. |
|  |  |

# Summary

This contribution provides intermediate summary of RAN1 WG discussion [102-e-NR-Pos-Enh-Eval-Acc-Lat]. It is proposed to discuss the latest revisions of proposals during RAN1 GTW sessions if time permits.
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