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1. Introduction

This FL summary documents the proposals and discussions for agenda item 8.5.3, based on the following chairman decision:

[104-e-NR-ePos-03] Email discussion/approval on accuracy improvements for DL-AoD positioning solutions with checkpoints for agreements on Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05 – Florent (Ericsson)

The FL proposals are based on submission to AI 8.5.3 [1-21], but also including [16] and [21] which where submitted to AI 8.5.2 but contained proposals relevant to 8.5.3.

The proposals in the contributions centered on the following aspects:

Enhancements to UE reporting (LPP)

* Aspect #1 reporting of first path RSRP
* Aspect #2 support of NLOS identification
* Aspect #3 Adjacent beam reporting
* Aspect #4 Rx Beam reporting enhancements
* Aspect #5 CIR reporting for AoD
* Aspect #6 extension of number of reported RSRP measurements
* Aspect #7 Signalling to assist reference UE calibration

Enhancements to gnodeB signalling (NRPPa)

* Aspect #8 beam orientation error handling
* Aspect #9 gNodeB beam Shape information signalling
* Aspect #10 gnodeB based calculation of AOD
* Aspects #11 TRP antenna Array configuration signalling
1. Aspects for discussion

## UE Reporting aspects:

### Aspect #1 reporting of first path RSRP

#### Summary and FL proposal

Most companies support introducing an RSRP measurement of the earliest received path RSRP for a PRS resource configured for DL AoD, with some companies going further and support reporting more than one path, or the time difference between the first path received at each TRP [1][2][3] [7] [10][11][12][13][14][15][16][18][19][20]. The following proposals were submitted:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1] | Proposal 3: The UE uses the LOS path of one DL PRS resource to measure the RSRP measurement report for DL-AoD. Proposal 4: In DL-AoD measurement report, besides the RSRP measurement of DL PRS resources for each TRP, the UE also reports the relative time-of-arrival of those reported DL PRS resources of each TRP. |
| [2] | ***Proposal 2: Support path specific power reporting for DL-AoD positioning.*** |
| [3] | ***Proposal 1:*** *In addition to RSRP measurement, Rel-17 UE should have capability to support timing measurement for DL-AOD positioning method and report the timing information for network based positioning.* |
| [6] | ***Proposal 4***: Additional measurement with angle information relative to the first detected path should be further studied including its feasibility to improve AoD based positioning methods. |
| [7] | **Proposal 2**: Support timing based measurement and report for improving positioning accuracy of DL-AoD.  |
| [10] | **Proposal 1: Introduce first path coefficient (Hfp) (i.e the amplitude of the first path in the received signal's power delay profile) in DL-AoD measurement report from UE to LS.** |
| [11] | **Proposal 1: Support the enhancement of reporting PRS-RSRP associated with ToA of the first arrival path.** |
| [12] | *Proposal 1: Report DL TDoA together with DL PRS-RSRP for DL AoD.* *Proposal 2: To indicate the first arrival path by reporting the arrival time of each beam in beam measurement report.* |
| [13] | **Proposal 2: To improve the DL-AoD accuracy in UE-assisted mode, support enhanced UE measurements and reporting by considering the following:** * **Reporting additional correlation information (ex. CIR reporting)**
* **Reporting of the estimated first arriving path, multipath and noise power**
* **Reporting of timing measurements on the DL-PRS resources along with the RSRP report.**
 |
| [14] | **Proposal 2-3**: The RSRP measurement may support the single path RSRP measurement. Therefore, new RSRP measurement definition could be needed |
| [15] | ***Proposal 1: For DL-AoD positioning method, UE can report the RSRP measurement for first arrival path together with a LOS/NLOS indicator.***  |
| [16] | **Proposal 1:** Support in Rel-17 that DL-PRS-RSRP calculation for each beam is associated to a time window in which the RSRP measurement is performed.  |
| [18]. | ***Proposal 2: Support UE reporting of RSRP side information and additional measurements to improve the accuracy of the DL-AoD estimate, especially in NLOS scenarios. FFS details such as type of side information and timing measurements, aperiodic/periodic measurement windows, etc.*** |
| [19]  | **Observation 1:** * **Rel-17 can consider using other information (e.g. arrival path timings) in addition to RSRP for UE assisted DL-AoD positioning.**
 |
| [20] | **Proposal 1 Define a DL PRS peak-RSRP measurement for the power of a specific peak in the channel impulse response of a received DL-PRS resource.****Proposal 2 Include the DL PRS peak-RSRP in the NR DL-AoD Location Information alongside the existing DL PRS RSRP measurement.****Proposal 4 Include the DL PRS peak-RSRP in the NR DL-TDOA and multi RTT Location Information alongside the existing DL PRS RSTD measurement.****Proposal 5 The UE shall report the DL PRS Peak-RSRP and the corresponding DL PRS resource ID for each additional path in the RSTD and UE Rx-Tx time difference measurements.****Proposal 6 The UE shall report the strongest detected paths as additional paths (i.e. in addition to the first path).** |

Based on the set of proposals, it is proposed to have an initial agreement to support first-path RSRP measurement and reporting, while keeping open the additional details.

Support the DL-AOD enhancement of measuring and reporting PRS-RSRP based on first arriving path

* + FFS: Indication of the path arrival time
	+ FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
	+ FFS: Measurement definition
	+ FFS: other method to support PRS-RSRP per path among OTDOA, UL TDOA

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Support. We think that, Rel-16 AoD is to define multiple RSRP measurements to determine the direction between a TRP and a UE, and multiple directions are used to determine the UE location. Rel-17 AoD enhancement may still follow this method. We also understand that there are new proposals for AOD, such as using bluetooth’s solution. But we think it should be studied further, especially under NLOS. So we tend to focus on enhancing RSRP measurement methods in Rel-17 |
| vivo | In general, we are open to introduce the first path-RSRP, however, from our evaluation, the first path-RSRP cannot improve the performance significantly. We support it after the performance benefit and the use case is clear. So, we propose **Evaluate the performance benefit for DL-AOD enhancement with reporting PRS-RSRP based on the first arriving path first, if the benefit is clear, support it.** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support in general, but to our understanding, the power of the path should no longer be called RSRP. |
| CMCC | Support |
| ZTE | Suggest revising the proposal to be more general. Meanwhile, remove last FFS since this AI only discusses DL-AOD.1. Support the DL-AOD enhancement of measuring and reporting ~~PRS-RSRP based on~~ the information of first arriving path,
	* FFS: power/amplitude based on the first arriving path
	* FFS: Indication of the path arrival time
	* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
	* FFS: Measurement definition
	* ~~FFS: other method to support PRS-RSRP per path among OTDOA, UL TDOA~~
 |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally okay with the updated proposal from ZTE. We are supportive of including time measurements (i.e., configuring RSTD between DL PRS of same TRP) along with the current DL-AoD measurement procedure. In that way we think this could be viewed as a bit separate proposal than “first path”.  |
| CATT | We have some concerns on this proposal. If the first arriving path is not the LOS path, the RSRP related to the first arriving path is still not the accurate RSRP for DL-AoD calculation. |
| Intel  | Support.  |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  | Open to Support, although we also share CATT’s concern on the main bullet regarding the RSRP accuracy if the first detected path is NLOS. |
| Qualcomm | It is the first meeting of the WI, and in some sense, since there may need to be an update of the WID, it is a soft continuation of the SI on the topic of Angle measurements. Therefore, we need to consider this in a more holistic approach. What we are trying to enable is the UE measuring and deriving measurements related to the first arrival path. This should be true for both UE-B and UE-A DL-AoD methods, and focusing only on reporting enhancements would not be enough. The necessary enhancements need to be in place so that the measurements are useful and the reporting is relevant (reporting enhancements just for the sake of reporting enhancements should be avoided). Having said the above, we prefer ZTE’s approach to keep the discussion more general and use the word “information”, since it can be, power, amplitude, angle measurements that a UE can report. We make the following adjustments on top of ZTE’s version: For DL-AoD, support enhancements, for both UE-based and UE-assisted, enabling measuring and, for UE-assisted, reporting ~~PRS-RSRP based on~~ ~~the~~ information related to the ~~of~~ first arriving path, FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancementsFFS: power/amplitude/angle based on the first arriving pathFFS: Indication of the path arrival timeFFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.FFS: Measurement definition  |
| Apple | Support the intention |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. Regarding Qualcomm and ZTE’s proposal, we prefer keeping the proposal focused on defining a new measurement for received power per path. There are many companies supporting to introduce this type of measurement, while few support measuring/reporting complex-valued channel measurement.  |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| OPPO | We can support the intention. But we do not see the use case for reporting additional path to the first path. Suggest to delete the 2nd FFS. Support the DL-AOD enhancement of measuring and reporting PRS-RSRP based on first arriving path * + FFS: Indication of the path arrival time
	+ ~~FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.~~
	+ FFS: Measurement definition
	+ FFS: other method to support PRS-RSRP per path among OTDOA, UL TDOA
 |
| LG | We are OK with QC’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support and we are fine with the updated proposal from QC. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal.  |
| vivo2 | We think it is too early to support this enhancement before proving this enhancement has sufficient benefits. At least, from our evaluation results, we didn’t see a significant improvement as the following figure. We analyze the reason is even the optimal AoD performance with ideal beam selection is far from meeting the positioning accuracy requirement. So, I doubt we can directly support it without enough research and evaluation from companies. |
| Samsung  | Fine with the proposals. |
| Fraunhofer | Prefer QC’s proposal |
| CATT-2 | We have one question on this proposal: How to judge the first path? Our understanding should be the first arrival path that exceeds a certain power threshold. This is more like an implementation problem. It is difficult to specify a specific power threshold in the standard. Our suggestion is to report the information of multiple paths, and how to choose these paths is an implementation problem, which can be the first path whose power exceeds a certain power threshold or the strongest path whose arrival time to arrive before a certain time. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The first round of comments can be summarized as follow:

* Supporting the FL proposal: Mediatek, Huawei, CMCC, Samsung, China Telecom, Xiaomi, Intel, Interdigital, Apple, Ericsson, DOCOMO, Oppo (without multipath FFS), Lenovo
* Proposed revised proposal to also include power/amplitude/ angle measurement: ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia, LG, Sony, Fraunhofer
* Do not support/concerns: CATT (need clarification on LOS indication), vivo (Support evaluating first),

Given that a large amount of companies support the proposal which focuses on first-path power measurement, it feels difficult to change it toward what is proposed by the alternative proposal, which proposes to consider power, amplitude and angles as candidates. It is therefore propose to agree on per-path power measurement as a first step, but keep open the possibility to expand toward measurement different quantities, such as amplitude or angle.

Regarding removal of some FFSs: The FFS on other methods is removed as proposed in the alternate proposal by ZTE et al. Additionally, since only one company wants to remove the FFS on additional path, I have kept it for now. As this is an FFS, additional path are not to be agreed yet anyway.

~~Proposal 1a: Support the DL-AOD enhancement of measuring and reporting PRS-RSRP based on first arriving path~~

* + ~~FFS: Indication of the path arrival time~~
	+ ~~FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.~~
	+ ~~FFS: Measurement definition~~
	+ ~~FFS: measurement of angle or amplitude of the first path.~~

Update: based on the GTW call, the latest proposal for this issue is:

Proposal 1b: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path

* Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* Option 4: Information corresponds to the path arrival time
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | For the record, Moderator’s unrevised proposals to this problem given the current status of the WI and the received comments, is rather unfortunate. The Moderator proposed a proposal, that has support of a 13 of companies, while there are 8 (!) companies that want some modifications. We are at the start of the WI, and we don’t have Options/Alternative written down in a previous meeting, so we are in hurry to downselect to finish the specification. We are early in a new Release, and further technical discussions/analysis/simulatios are needed, and the moderator should promote such technical discussions, nor impede them. We need to write down a proposal that has Options clearly written, so that companies can do their due diligence, their back-office work and come back in next RAN1 meeting. I am trying to show one such example below, by being “inclusive” of the received technical comments. From QC side, and for the technical discussion, we are a bit confused whether “PRS-RSRP” and “Amplitude” really corresponds to a separate topic, and we would like some clarification. For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* FFS: Indication of the path arrival time
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
 |
| vivo | We hope it to be agreed after the gain is clear. And thanks for Huawei to further explain the solution of AoD after online session. We will further evaluate whether there is a significant gain in using Huawei’s solution.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK with QC’s version. We would also like to clarify that the “first path” should correspond to a path with the same delay across all PRS resources in a PRS resource set. |
| ZTE | The following proposal in Chairman’s note can be a starting point for further discussion.Proposal:For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* Option 4: Information corresponds to the path arrival time
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements

In current specification, we haven’t defined amplitude based reporting, so we propose to remove the second option since it’s equivalent to option 1. In addition, we would like to add another FFS.* FFS: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.

For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* ~~Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path~~
* Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the path arrival time
* FFS: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
 |
| CATT | We share the same view with ZTE, that the Option 2(Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path) has some overlap with Option1(Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path). We prefer to put Option1 into the FFS.For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* ~~Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path~~
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* Option 4: Information corresponds to the path arrival time
* FFS: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
 |
| LG | Our understanding is that the ‘path arrival time’ in fourth bullet is intended for first arriving path. If it is right, we would like to suggest to describe ‘arrival time of first path’ of the first bullet.  |
| Qualcomm | OK to not add Amplitude as a separate, or maybe, if some companies want to keep it just do PRS-RSRP/Amplitude in Option 1 so that it is clarified in future meetings.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like some clarification (similar to our comment in thread 8.5.2) on how the first arriving path will be defined. Is the intention that similar to how RSTD was defined in Rel-16 that it is up to UE implementation how to determine the first arriving path (and any additional paths)? Or is the intention something different here? To Huawei, we are confused by your comment that this path should be the same across a PRS resource set. Does that mean that if a UE doesn’t detect a path (which could be LOS path) for one DL PRS resource, e.g., due to blockage, that the UE should then not report that path for the other DL PRS resources?  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To Nokia, our understanding is that the first path should be the global first path across all resources in a PRS resource set, which in some resources, may not be present or observed with low power due to beamforming. The logic here is that the path selected should be the same path observed in different beams, and UE should not reselect first path across different beam. Hopefully that clarifies. |
| OPPO | We do not think Option 2 and 3 are reasonable. Amplitude information can be covered by the RSRP. So option 2 is not needed. Option 3: what is the “angle“? Considering UE rotation, there is no meaningful angle for UE side. Another question, since we lists “options“ here. Is the intention is to downselect fom them? If so, better to clarify it in the main bulletProposal 1b: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path, down-select from * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* ~~Option 2: Information corresponds to Amplitude of the first arriving path~~
* ~~Option 3: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path~~
* Option 4: Information corresponds to the path arrival time
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
 |
| Xiaomi | First we want to clarify that the listed options are used to be selected as additional report to PRS-RSRP for UE-A DL AoD in Rel-16, or to replace the PRS-RSRP for UE-A DL AoD in Rel-16. Second we share same views as ZTE that to add a FFS with supporting multiple options above are not precluded. And we also think Option 2 has some overlap with Option 1 and can be removed.  |
| China Telecom | We share the similar views as ZTE that Option 2 should be removed. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal suggested by ZTE. We think Opt.1 can cover Opt.2. |
| Ericsson | Support options 1 and 4.We agree option 2 could be removed as it can be derived from the power measurement. Regarding option 3, is it the phase or the angle of arrival?Regarding the comments by Huawei on the first path across al resources, we agree in principle, but shouldn’t the UE be allowed to evaluate the „first path“ of each resource individually? The LMF can then assess the measurement and decide the most reliable first path. |
| Intel | Support Option 1. But, without phase information the report looks incomplete.Therefore, we ask FL to add option with report of both RSRP and phase for the first arrival path. |
| Qualcomm | To OPPO: The angle is the AOD of the gNB, not the UE. The orientation of the UE would not matter. Please see section 4 of R1-2101470 as an example. As a toy example, we can consider this photo was comes from a AoD bluetooth example: The UE measures the phase differents of 2 ports, and knows how to transform this into an AoD. |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

The second round of comments can be summarized as follow:

* Vivo commented that we should wait for evaluation before considering the options.
* The proposal from the second GTW session was updated based on comments to remove option 2. ZTE adds an FFS regarding multiple options, and CATT adds an FFS regarding option 2. Qualcomm and Docomo mention that option 2 could be included in option 1.
* LG proposed a clarification of option 4 (“arrival time of the first path”, instead of “path arrival time”)
* Proposed clarification/notes: “first path” should correspond to a path with the same delay across all PRS resources in a PRS resource set (Huawei).
* Xiaomi asked to clarify whether the listed options are used to be selected as additional report to PRS-RSRP for UE-A DL AoD in Rel-16, or to replace the PRS-RSRP for UE-A DL AoD in Rel-16. In the FL view, the wording of the proposal doesn’t preclude either, since the details of the report are FFS.
* Intel proposed to extend to another option, inclueing RSRP and phase for the first arrival path.

Based on the comments, it is proposed to update the proposal by removing option 2, adding the proposed FFS by CATT as well as the note proposed by Huawei. Regarding the FFS from ZTE, it seems that it reads better as a note, so it is added as such in the modified proposal. Moreover, we can discuss whether to add the option 2 (reporting amplitude) in option 1 (as proposed by qualcomm) instead of an FFS during the GTW call.

Proposal 1c: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path

* Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path
* Option 4: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP and phase of the first arriving path
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
* Note 1: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.
* Note 2: “first path” should correspond to a path with the same delay across all PRS resources in a PRS resource set

#### third round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the revised proposal 1c, although the angle information of revised Option 2 may cause confusion w.r.t AoA and therefore it would be helpful to indicate that the angle in question is the DL-AoD of the first arriving path, e.g. “Option 2: Information corresponds to the DL-AoD ~~angle~~ of the first arriving path” |
| Fraunhofer | Fine with the proposal. Propose a minor modification on option 4 as the PRS RSRP is captured already in Option1 (see also Note1)Option 4: Information corresponds to ~~PRS-RSRP and~~ phase of the first arriving path |
| vivo | The proposal is unclear for us, there seems multiple solutions in here. One is enhancing PRS-RSRP to path RSRP, another is combing other methods (such as ToA, Departure Angle). We think it’s a bit weird to list unrelated (or non-contrasting) solutions in this proposal. Besides, we also have some concerns for option 2 and option 4:For option 2, at least, replace “angle” to “departure angle ” is more clear for us based on the QC explanation. For option 4, “phase of the first arriving path” is unclear to us, as our understanding, the phase will be different across subcarriers. Or what option 4 wants to express here is the amplitude and phase of the CIR corresponding to first path? |
| Nokia/NSB | We can’t support the proposal in the current form as we think it is quite confusing and there are many options which companies clearly have different views on what they mean. As this is the first meeting of the WI we think it is too early to already say support in the main bullet given the status of discussions. Suggest to only study or investigate the options. Specifically we have the following comments:* Option 2 is unclear what Angle we mean. If we mean DL-AoD then how does the UE have this information? Is this only for UE-B? Or are we introducing a new measurement?
* Option 4 we have similar questions as vivo and would like to better understand what would be specified? Is this the phase difference measurement proposed in QC’s TDoc or something different?
* Note 2 is very unclear to us. I understood Huawei’s response to mean the first path should be the global first path (this make sense). But as written the note reads as if the reported path needs to be detected in every resource and must be the same value. That makes no sense.
 |
| CATT | In our understanding, the angle in Option 2 should means the DL-AoD measured by UE, then it had better to clarify in order to avoid confusion. For Option 4, we failed to see its applicaiton scenarios and benefits. Since Option 1 had mentioned PRS-RSRP, we prefer to remove Option 4 as follows:Proposal 1c: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of departure of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path
* ~~Option 4: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP and phase of the first arriving path~~
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
* Note 1: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.
* Note 2: “first path” should correspond to a path with the same delay across all PRS resources in a PRS resource set
 |
| OPPO | Do not support Option 2 and Option 4:Re Option 2: The departure angle of each path at the gNB side can not be measured at the UE side. @QC, the example does not work for UE because the PRS only has one port. What UE receives from one TRP is signal transmitted from all the antennas.Re Option 4: we share the similar understanding as CATT.Proposal 1c: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD support enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path * Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* ~~Option 2: Information corresponds to the angle of the first arriving path~~
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path
* ~~Option 4: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP and phase of the first arriving path~~

  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To our understanding, we think phase reporting may also help, so if Option 4 is removed, we would suggest to add “other options are not precluded”.For Option 2, if I understand it correctly based on QC’s explanation, should it be based on multi-port PRS or CSI-RS? We are fine to include the Option for the time being.For Note 2, if there is strong concern from Nokia, we suggest to change Note 2 to “FFS: How the “first path” is selected across multiple PRS resources within a PRS resource set.” Hopefully it can be acceptable for Nokia. |
| Sony | We are okay with this proposal and also the updated Note 2 (proposed by HW/HiSi), considering we are still in the first meeting. In the next meeting, the proponent of each option can provide more information to improve clarity and minimize the confusion (as we observed here in the email discussion). |
| Qualcomm | To **HW and OPPO**: For Option 2, we dont think multi-PRS is really needed: The spec already has multiple single-Port PRS resources in a set. E.g., a TRP with X/2 cross-poled antenna elements in a ULA fashion would just map each antenna element to a PRS resource (e.g. similar to bluetooth example where the case is just 2 antenna elements). Yes CSIRS can also work, no doubt there, but not sure how much appetite there is from the group to add the legacy CSIRS resources as DL RSs for positioning purposes. To OPPO: As we described, yes the departure angle can be measured. We have multiple PRS resources in the spec already. We just need a mapping of those resources to a codebook (similar to the CSIRS ports of a resource being mapped to the Type-1 codebooks). There is no requirement in the spec that a PRS resource is transmitted from all the antennas. It is surely one of the options and a very likely option in FR2 (due to analog BFing), and maybe in some beamformed FR1 cases, but in several InH/InF scearios in FR1, few number of antennas at the nodes (e.g. see WiFi examples), we could just have X PRS resources (each one single port) to be transmitted on the same OFDM symbol with comb-X (these are already supported) and just map a PRS resource to a physical antenna port (similar to the concept of unprecoded CSIRS). The spec will not say precoded/unprecoded, and there is NO need of a spec change in 38.211. Just some procedure clarification & assistance data enhancement to index the PRS resources correctly when teh UE is searching for the phase difference between the single-port PRS resources. It will be up to each network deployment whether to do this (or any other mapping) of PRS ports to physical antennas. UEs already do coherent PRS measurements for timing-purpose, and already Option 1 (RSRP of the first path) requires the UE to receive multiple PRS resources, go in the time-domain, identify the main path, and measure the energy in that path vs the RSRP of the whole PRS resource. In other words, if we plan to move away from the low-complexity RSRP-only approach (wherein simple frequency-domain / RE-averaging is used), we should technically compare all options and identify which options are best case for NR Positioning. Overall we are supportive to keep all 4 options.  |

#### Summary of 3rd round of comments and updated proposal

Based on the received feedback, the following changes have been made:

* Rewording on option 2 to say “AoD ” instead of “angle” based on lenovo’s feedback
* Update to option 4 to remove RSRP as suggested by Fraunhofer (option 1 and 4 can be combined)
* Reworded option 4 to clarify tha the phase correspond to the argument of the complex-valued channel first path, based on vivo’s comment.
* Reworded “support” to ”study”. Hopefully it is more clear that these are candidate that should be evaluated prior to a possible agreed solution.
* Changed note2 to an FFS based on Huawei’s comment.

Proposal 1d: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD study the following enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path

* Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* Option 2: Information corresponds to the DL-AoD of the first arriving path
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path
* Option 4: Information corresponds to phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
* FFS: how the “first path” is selected among PRS resources in a PRS resource set
* Note 1: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.

#### Fourth round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | We support the proposal for further study. We agree with FL that “study ” is better than “ support ” in current phase. |
| OPPO | We do not support Option 2 and Opton 4. Suggest to delete them from the proposalRe Option 2: the latest wording in Option 2 is DL-AoD of first path. That means the same thing as Option 1. The DL AoD information of PRS resource is equivalent to reporting the RSRP of one or a few selected PRS resource. TO QC: mapping PRS resource to codebook precoder vector in FR1 and Tx beam in FR2 is already supported in rel16. Reproing RSRP of one or a few selected PRS resource is equivalent to reporting the AoD information. I think what you want need multi-port PRS resource. Simply multiplexing multiple PRS resource on same symbol by implementation can not do the work because the coherence between them is not ensured. Receiving multiple PRS is another story. The UE does not need to assume phase coherence between them. The UE stil receive and process them individually. Re Option 4: The abolute phase in each received signal at UE side is twisted by many factors. The value of absolute phase does not give us any meaningful information. Proposal 1d: For both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD study the following enhancements that enable the UE to measure and report (for UE-A) information related to the first arriving path* Option 1: Information corresponds to PRS-RSRP of the first arriving path
* ~~Option 2: Information corresponds to the DL-AoD of the first arriving path~~
* Option 3: Information corresponds to the arrival time of the first path
* ~~Option 4: Information corresponds to phase of the CIR corresponding to the first arriving path~~
* FFS: reporting of additional path to the first path.
* FFS: Measurement definition details
* FFS: additional assistance data to support these enhancements
* FFS: how the “first path” is selected among PRS resources in a PRS resource set
* Note 1: Supporting multiple options above are not precluded.
 |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Apple4 | Support the FL’s proposal |
| Xiaomi  | We want to clarify the information corresponds to the DL-AoD of the first arriving path in Option 2. In our understanding, the information corresponds to the DL-AoD is the PRS-RSRP, thus there will be a overlap with Option 1. |
| LG | Support. |
| CATT | Support Proposal 1d in principle. The wording change from ‘support‘ to ‘study‘ in this version is fine for us, since these four options need further study to clarify the benefits. |
| China Telecom  | Support |
| Intel | Support. To OPPO: Regarding comment on Option #4, it seems that you have incorrect understanding. The phase information can be used to derive/estimate DL-AOD as it was shown in Intel’s contribution and considered in tdoc from Qualcomm. To FL: Should we use the “first arrival path” instead of the “first arriving path”? |
| ZTE | 1. Agree with OPPO’s revision
2. Although we think how the“first path”is selected among PRS resources in a PRS resource set is up to UE implementation, we’re fine to keep it as FFS.
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Okay with the proposal. Suggest to slightly change the last note to say multipe or none of the options is not precluded. |
| Qualcomm  | **Reply to OPPO**: Reporting RSRP is NO way the same as reporting AoD. We have a technical disconnect here. I will try to provide more technical descriptions and references. In current specification, the network needs to beamform the PRS resources, and the UE only measures the RSRP (just take the frequency-domain Res, average the energy and report it back). The network may need to send a lot of PRS resources, each one with different precoder. The AoD is determined by pattern matching the received RSRP vector with a database.Lets look at the example with 2 antennas at the TRP shown below. In NR Rel-16, the nework would pick a first precoderand transmit a first port, pick a second precoder and transmit the 2nd port, etc, etc. The UE derives RSRP for each port. Now lets consider the cases within the scope of Option 2 (and likely within Option 4) for this small example: The network just transmits 2 ports, each one mapped to one physical antenna (NR specification calls this 2 PRS resources in a set). UE measures the phase difference between the 2 PRS resources, and derives the AoD as shown in the formula above. It is up to the network whether they will want to do this or any other approach. There is NO need of multi-port PRS, when we already have multiple single-port PRS resources. The UE will just need to know the „lambda“ and the distance „d“. This is what i mean „codebook precoder“; or just some antenna configuration information (e.g. ULA, UPA config; similar info as CSI codebook config (N1,N2)). In UE-B AoD, the network will send this information to the UE (the „lambda“ is already known actually, but the antenna configuration is not). The network will configure to the UE with X PRS resources, and ask to measure/report the phase difference (i guess within the framework of Option 4) or the AoD (Option 2) between the PRS resources. Yes, the phase difference between the 2 PRS resources need to be consistent, but why is that a problem?* If the network configures the UE with such information & measurement rquest, then it is network‘s responsibility to ensure any needed coherency across the PRS resources. Thats always the case. Arent the networks able to do that already for multi-port DMRS, CSIRS, etc, etc? Why is it a problem whether we call it multi-port PRS vs multiple single-port PRS. Thats just a technically/terminology in the NR spec.
* If the network does not have coherency between PRS resources, or transmits beformed PRS that results in loosing the direct link between the phase-difference and the Angle, it will just configure an RSRP measurement as legacy approaches.

Regarding the comment: “The abolute phase in each received signal at UE side is twisted by many factors. The value of absolute phase does not give us any meaningful information.”* As explained above, and the simple image pasted (coming from a bluetooth 5.1 tutorial; a lot of references in IEEE and google), the phase difference has important information. It is a method that has been specified in competing technologies (Bluetooth SIG. Core specication v5.1, Jan 2019), and can work well with even small number of antennas at the gNBs; consistent with the general trend for indoor/InF scenarios
 |

### Aspect #2 support of NLOS identification

#### Summary and FL proposal

The support of a LOS/NLOS detection/indication was brought up in [6][4][8][15][21].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
|  [4] |  Proposal 1: RSRP measurements can be associated with a LOS/NLOS identifier for supporting DL AOD positioning. |
| [6]  | ***Proposal 1***: For the purpose of improving accuracy, methods to identify NLOS direction and the corresponding mitigation methods for DL-AoD measurements should be supported including the usage of transmissions and measurements of PRS signals with relative changes in their polarization orientation. ***Proposal 2***: Consider reporting additional CIR measurements back to the network for improving NLOS detection and positioning accuracy.***Proposal 3***: To improve positioning accuracy by regularization techniques the UE should report LOS indicators as soft values for each link for UE-assisted positioning. |
| [8] | ***Proposal 3:**** For the purpose of accuracy improvements, support enhancements so that the LMF knows a LoS direction of a TRP’s transmission beam to the UE.
 |
| [15] | ***Proposal 1: For DL-AoD positioning method, UE can report the RSRP measurement for first arrival path together with a LOS/NLOS indicator.***  |
| [21] | Proposal #3:● Support signaling indicating the LOS/NLOS link propagation type for DL-AOD positioning● Support signaling of reliability metric (with probability meaning) for NLOS detection (variable u in the range from 0 to 1, with absolute value showing reliability of decision) |

Since there is a variety of way to indicate LOS/NLOS on the proposals, we propose to agree on the principle of reporting LOS/NLOS information, and leave the details such as granularity (e.g. if the report is a binary indicator or a soft metric) to a future agreement.

For DL-AoD positioning method, UE can associate a measurement on a PRS resource with a report of LOS/NLOS state for the measurement

* + FFS: granularity of the state (binary indicator or soft metric)

####  First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | If UE can measure first path RSRP, we don't think the need to report LOS/NLOS state  |
| vivo | We prefer to discuss LOS/NLOS together with all methods (e.g. LOS/NLOS in angle-based method, LOS/NLOS timing-based method). So we propose to discuss it along with the discussion of LOS/NLOS identification in WID. |
| CMCC | We share similar views as MTK, in case that LOS link exists in the scenario, the solution proposed by Proposal 1 also helps the LMF decide the LOS beam direction. On the other hand, as we commented in AI 8.5.2, LOS/NLOS identification related issue is not included in the WID yet, we could postpone this discussion in the next meeting. |
| ZTE | This can be discussed in next meeting when LOS/multipath mitigation is in WID. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with above. Should wait to discuss based on potential WID update.  |
| CATT | Support. The LOS/NLOS identification is important for the accuracy improvement of DL-AoD positioning method. |
| Intel  | We are supportive of this proposal.We are OK to consider it later based on the WID revision.To MTK: the RSRP measurement may be not the best metric to identify the LOS/NLOS state. More acucrate approach is to use a channel impulse response realization and not the RSRP measurements.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  | Support the FL’s proposal in principle to support a LOS/NLOS reporting mechanism for DL-AoD RSRP measurements to the network (at least for UE-assisted positioning). The extension to other positioning measurements and details could be handled as an FFS in conjunction with the previous RAN1 agreements relating to NLOS/multipath identification.  |
| Qualcomm | Similar view with CMCC |
| Apple | LOS detection is out of current scope. We share similar view as MTK/CMCC…  |
| Ericsson | We also think the LOS indication is currently out of scope.  |
| DOCOMO | Agree with CMCC. |
| OPPO | The intention of this proposal seems be already covered by the proposal in Section 2.1.1.2. So we do not support it. We can focus on the proposal in section 2.1.1.2. |
| LG | Support. |
| Sony | This can be discussed in the next meeting when LOS/multipath mitigation is approved to be part of WID. |
| China Telecom | Agree with CMCC |
| Xiaomi | Share same view with CMCC, proposal 1 can help to decide the LOS if existed. |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal.As discussed in our tdoc, the first path is not necessarily the LOS path. And even LOS path exists, it may not be the first path as well. |
| CATT-2 | In our point of view, the LOS/NLOS identifier may be more important than the first path. We can consider such an example: all paths seen by UE are NLOS paths, the first path is also NLOS path. If only the first path information is reported, LMF still does not know whether the first path is LOS path. Therefore, reporting the LOS/NLOS identifier becomes more important, which can help LMF identify whether the currently reported RSRP and other information come from the LOS path or NLOS path. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The first round of comments can be summarized as follow:

* Postpone decision on LOS identification, based on future WID updates: vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Qualcomm, Apple, Ericsson, DOCOMO, Xiaomi Sony ,China Telecom
* Agree with proposal: CATT, Lenovo, LG, Samsung
* Already covered by other proposals: Oppo, Mediatek

As there is a majority agreement to postpone the discussion until the WID is reviewed and potentially updated, the proposal is updated as follow:

Proposal 2a: discussion on support of NLOS identification is left to future meetings, pending an update on the WID.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualocmm | OK |
| ZTE | Support. |
| CATT | Although we support to further discuss NLOS identification in this meeting, we can accept proposal 2a above, considering that majority of companies want to discuss the scheme in the future meetings. |
| LG | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with FL.  |
| OPPO | Support  |
| Xiaomi | Supoort  |
| China Telecom | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Intel | Support.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support based on companies preference to wait for the WID update to discuss all positioning measurements under the common NLOS identification objective. |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |
| Sony | Support |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

Aspect #2 seem to be stable. It can be concluded that RAN1 will wait for a WID update at next RAN plenary before revisiting the issue of LOS detection support.

### Aspect #3 adjacent beam reporting

#### Summary and FL proposal

To enhance the granularity of AOD estimation, several contributions proposed to report adjacent beams in addition to the “best beam”[1][5][8].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1]  | Proposal 2: In DL-AoD UE measurement reporting, support the UE to report the RSRP of a few DL PRS resources carrying adjacent Tx beam directions.  |
| [5] | * ***Report up to 8 DL PRS-RSRP including the strongest PRS resource and adjacent PRS resources.***

Proposal 4: • To balance the accuracy and robustness, AoD enhancement by adjacent DL PRS-RSRP and limited beam information (the intersection point of multiple beams) need to be considered. |
| [8]. | ***Proposal 2:**** Need discussions on how to utilize the reception beam index for the accuracy improvements of DL-AoD based positioning, such as finding UE’s location when the UE is located between the transmission beams.

***Proposal 5:**** Consider enhancements for the accurate UE’s location estimation when the UE is located in between two different transmission beams.
 |

For DL-AoD positioning method, UE can associate a measurement on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement

* + FFS: how to define / identify adjacent beams
	+ FFS: required signaling to support use of adjacent beams

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | In 37.355, we can see that,NR-DL-AoD-MeasElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE { dl-PRS-ID-r16 INTEGER (0..255), nr-PhysCellID-r16 NR-PhysCellID-r16 OPTIONAL, nr-CellGlobalID-r16 NCGI-r15 OPTIONAL, nr-ARFCN-r16 ARFCN-ValueNR-r15 OPTIONAL, nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL, nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL, nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16, nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-Result-r16 INTEGER (0..126), nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex-r16 INTEGER (1..8) OPTIONAL, -- Cond SameRx nr-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 OPTIONAL, ...}NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurements-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..7)) OF NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16NR-DL-AoD-AdditionalMeasurementElement-r16 ::= SEQUENCE { nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceID-r16 OPTIONAL, nr-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID-r16 OPTIONAL, nr-TimeStamp-r16 NR-TimeStamp-r16, nr-DL-PRS-RSRP-ResultDiff-r16 INTEGER (0..30), nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex-r16 INTEGER (1..8) OPTIONAL, -- Cond SameRx ...}1, So we think the current spec structure already supports UE to report differential RSRP from the beams which are adjacent to the strongest beam.2, what can be further clarified is, whether the beams with incremental PRS-resourceID value are adjacent |
| vivo | Support.From our evaluation, the performance benefit of this enhancement is clear, so we agree with that.For question 1 of MTK, as my understanding, the spec only supports reporting multiple RSRP of different PRS resource, we can not guarantee to contain the RSRP corresponding to the strongest Tx beam and adjacent Tx beams. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We do not think it is practical to define or identify adjacent beams. |
| CMCC | We are open to discuss it. It seems that the proposal can provide benefits in accuracy; however, we are curious about how to identify adjacent beams.  |
| ZTE | Not support. This can be realized by implementation. In our understanding, if one beam is detected with highest RSRP, so adjacent beams will normally be received with high RSRP. In current specification, UE supports up to 8 RSRP per TRP, so it’s possible UE will report those beams including central beam and adjacent beams. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are open to potentially discuss further but would like the proponents to clarify the specification impact as we tend to agree with the above comments.  |
| CATT | We prefer not to define adjacent beams and related signaling. |
| Intel | Do not support. We do not see what will be additionally defined in the specification.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support. Details on how to define/identify the reporting of RSRP measurements based on such a co-located group of adjacent beams and corresponding signalling aspects can be FFS. |
| Qualcomm | The UE can already report up to 8 RSRPs, each one with a different beam index. In other words, the UE already, in one report can add up to 8 PRS resources, these might or might not be adjacent; but this is up to UE implementation. Likely, beams that are pointing to a complete different direction than where the UE is located, would result in very low RSRP (i.e. bad measurement), and the UE would not report those measurements. Note that the UE in UE-based AoD, already knows which beams are next to each other, since it gets the assistance data that contains the boresight directions of each PRS resource, so if indeed it makes sense to report RSRP on adjacent beams, it can do this already in Rel-16. If the concern is that this information is not available in UE-assisted, then we can discuss sending this assistance data also for UE-A DL-AoD. In other words, this enhancement is an assistance data enhancement rather than a reporting enhancement. To continue on how the UE-A RSRP-based AoD is supposed to work, the UE reports the RSRP vector and then the LMF (assuming that it has the beam pattern information) it compares the RSRP vector vs. the expected RSRP vector (some people call it fingerprinting, others vector matching, pattern matching, etc, etc). In this procedure, it is up to the UE to pick PRS resources to be reported, and indeed, if the UE has the knowledge of which beams are adjacent, it could help the UE to have a good report. However, in this case, it is a gNB-to-the-UE-signaling enhancement. |
| Apple | The benefit of such an “association report” is not clear. Given that PRS-RSPR reports are associated to PRSs, and LMF knows the beams next to other beams, report from UE brings no more benefit.  |
| Ericsson | In the current state of the specifications, the LMF knows how the beams are organize and can derive the adjacent beams. However, the UE may chose to instead report a selection the strongest beams which may not be adjacent. Therefore we support the proposal.  |
| OPPO | Support. We share the same understanding as Ericsson. In current RSRP report, the UE may choose the strongest one or a few but they are generally not adjacent. |
| LG | We have similar view with MTK. We think that current specification cover the issue. The TRP can transmits multiple PRS resources through multiple adjacent transmission beams.  |
| Sony | The benefit is unclear as reporting multiple DL-RSRPs have already been supported in the rel-16. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal in general. And since current spec already supports UE to report up to 8 RSRPs per TRP, we think that what we need to enhance is that how to let the UE know which beams are adjacent beams.  |
| vivo2 | We agree with QC’s view this enhancement is more like an assistance data enhancement. And we also want to further explain the previous reply about the strongest Tx beam, it is only an example of selecting adjacent Tx beams to calculate the finer angle. If we only rely on implementation by some companies’ suggestion, performance is difficult to guarantee. |
| Samsung  | How to decide the “adjacent” beams, based on the PRS id, e.g., neighboring PRS id? Or based on the RSRP, the closed RSRP value?  |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| CATT-2 | We share the same view with QC. The standard impact of adjacent beam scheme look like focusing on assistance data enhancement.  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The first round of comments can be summarized as follow:

* Support:vivio, Xiaomi, Oppo, Ericsson, Lenovo~~, Nokia~~, CMCC, Fraunhofer
* Open to further discuss: Nokia
* Do not support:Sony, LG, Apple, Qualcomm (open to AD update), intel, CATT,ZTE, Huawei, mediatek

There is a majority of companies who do not want to support adjacent beams enhancements. With the argument that the adjacent beams can already be supported. Supporting companies argue that the decision of selecting beams is currently left to the UE and the UE, without knowledge of the beams organization, may not select the adjacent beams.

We propose a slight rewording of the proposal to account

* Comment from Qualcomm and other mentioned regarding assistance data.
* Comment from Oppo and other on how to let the UE know it should include adjacent beams.

Proposal 3a For DL-AoD positioning method, UE can be requested to associate a measurement on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement

* + FFS: definition of LMF assistance data to identify adjacent beams
	+ FFS: how to define / identify adjacent beams in reporting
	+ FFS: required signaling to support use of adjacent beams

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualocmm | We need technical discussion; it is unclear to us what this entails. E.g., UE is configured with 8 PRS resources, and it is requested to measure a subset of PRS resources (“adjacent ones)” with high priority? Isnt the UE, either way currently required to measure all PRS resources based on its UE capability? Why is there the assumption that the UE would not do a good job measuring and replying back with a good set of RSRP values?  |
| Vivo | Based on the before comments and QC proposal in 2.1.1.4, we try to modify the proposal as following**For UE-A DL-AOD positioning method, support following options that enable the UE to measure on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement:****Option 1: UE can be requested to associate a measurement on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement****Option 2:** **enhancing the assistance data to identify adjacent beams****Option 3: enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent beams****FFS: detailed signaling and procedure** **Note: Depending on the discussion results, none/one/multiple of above options may be adopted in Rel-17** |
| Ericsson | Agree with the vivo reformulated proposal. perhaps we can reformulate the first sentence to “**For UE-A DL-AOD positioning method, the following options are candidates to enable the UE to measure on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement**”.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We disagree with the main bullet. It can be further studied, but we do not think it should be supported now. |
| ZTE | Don’t support. We share similar concerns as QC. If the intention is to provide more beam information to UE, we think it should be discussed on aspect #9. |
| CATT | We think it's too early to support the adjacent beam scheme in this meeting. More research and evaluation are needed to verify whether the scheme has performance gain and waht is its impact on the specs. |
| LG | From our understanding, the network knows which PRS resource is transmitted through which transmission beam. If we allow that the network indicate/enforce the UE to report the PRS resource IDs with its RSRP for DL-AoD positioning, the network can obtain PRS RSRP for adjacent PRS beams. For UE-A DL-AoD, the UE does not need to know which PRS resources transmitted through adjacent beams. Just need to report the indicated PRS resource IDs and RSRPs, and adjacent beam transmission is up to network. If the network needs, it will do so. In this phase, we cannot support this proposal. This meeting is the first WI meeting, so we prefer to discuss this issue later with further investigation on the necessity and how to support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We tend to agree with the comments from QC and from Huawei. Open to further study/discuss but too early to agree to support as we are not sure exactly what this would entail. Note: I have also updated the FL summary section (see Red marked part) as I don’t think it was correct to say that we supported the prior proposal.  |
| OPPO | We are ok with the proposal revision by vivo and Ericsson |
| vivo2 | We are ok with the proposal revision by EricssonThanks for the good discussion, we would like to clarify the solution. As our understanding, the UE-assisted AoD enhancement requires the both enhancement of the sending side (such as aspect 9 or 10) and the receiving side (aspect 3 or aspect 6).Based on the above exemplary figure, if the RSRPs of other resources are reported other than {yellow, green, purple}resource, it will affect fingerprint matching and the UE-A AoD performance.To ZTE:As my understanding，Aspect #9 is the Tx beam information reporting from gNB to LMF, it is different from what we discussed in here.To LG:I agree with your understanding that ” LMF knows which PRS resource is transmitted through which transmission beam”. But we have concern about what you said “ If we allow that the network indicate/enforce the UE to report the PRS resource IDs with its RSRP for DL-AoD positioning...”, since in current spec LMF cannot indicate/enforce UE to report which resources. Besides, if LMF doesn’t know the UE location, it also difficult to indicate/enforce UE to report which resources. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the revised proposal from vivo and Ericsson. |
| Intel | Do not support. We do not see what will be additionally defined in the specification.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support revised proposal 3b and could be seen to benefit UE-assisted DL-AoD, e.g. option 2. |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

The second round of comments can be summarized as follow:

* Several companies want to clarify that the proposal should keep the options open. Vivo proposed a reformulation of the proposal, and Ericsson proposed an update on Vivo’s.

Based on the feedback, the proposal is revised as follow:

**Proposal 3b: For UE-A DL-AOD positioning method, consider the following options to enable the UE to measure/report a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement/report:**

* **Option 1: UE can be requested to associate a measurement on a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement**
* **Option 2: enhancing the assistance data to identify adjacent beams**
* **Option 3: enhancing the reporting to include the measurements of adjacent beams**
* **FFS: detailed signaling and procedure**
* **Note: Depending on the discussion results, none/one/multiple of above options may be adopted in Rel-17**

#### third round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Fraunhofer | Fine in principle. Slightly prefer to modify the main proposal instead of the note:Proposal 3b: For UE-A DL-AOD positioning method, consider if any, one or multiple of the following options are required to enable the UE to measure/report a PRS resource with an additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement/report: |
| Vivo | We have concerns about the performance if there is not enough assistance information to help UE choose the resources which need to be measured/reported. For example, compared with recevied RSRP report containing the adjacent beams(the green, yellow and purple) on the left figure, the RSRP report without the adjacent beams(green and purple) is easily mapped to wrong angles(ie, the two wrong angles will be mapped without the received RSRP of adjacent beams in the right figure). Especially, when the number of reported PRS- RSRP for each TRP is fewer, the gain will be extra significantIf companies still worry it’s too early to support the proposal, at least, we can reach an FFS for further study**FFS: the signalling to enable the UE to measure/report PRS resource(s) with additional, adjacent PRS resources measurement/report** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the proposal given we are just consdiering the options.  |
| OPPO | Ok with the proposal  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | It may be technically infeasible for identifying adjacent beams considering 3D-beamforming, and considering non-DFT or non-DFT-like beam cofficients. |
| Sony | We are fine with the current wording and the note should be kept there. |
| Qualcomm |  |
| Vivo | We are okay with the proposal.To Huawei, at least, in the current specification, the LMF can obtain the angle(both Azimuth and Elevation ) of each beam and judge which beam is adjacent through *NR-PRS Beam Information* ( such as the following table), no matter which kinds of cofficients are used to generate the analog beam for PRS. Similarly, we think it is also feasible for the UE to identify adjacent beams.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IE/Group Name | Presence | Range | IE type and reference | Semantics description |
| **NR-PRS Beam Information** |  | *1 .. <* *maxPRS-ResourceSets >* |  |  |
| >PRS Resource Set ID | M |  | INTEGER (0..7) | The resource set in which the resources are associated with the angle. |
| **>PRS Angle Item** |   | *1..<* *maxPRS-ResourcesPerSet >* |   |  |
| >>NR PRS Azimuth | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  |
| >>NR PRS Azimuth fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |
| >>NR PRS Elevation | O |  | INTEGER (0..180) |  |
| >>NR PRS Elevation fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |
| **LCS to GCS Translation** |  | *0 .. <maxnolcs-gcs-translation>* |  | If absent, the azimuth and elevation are provided in GCS. |
| >Alpha | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  |
| >Alpha-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |
| >Beta | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  |
| >Beta-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |
| >Gamma | M |  | INTEGER (0..359) |  |
| >Gamma-fine | O |  | INTEGER (0..9) | Fine angles |

 |
| CMCC | We believe „consider“ here in the main bullet has the same meaning of „study“ in the revised proposal 1d, therefore, we are ok with the proposal. |
| Apple | Do not support. In our understanding, the procedure is already supported in current specification.  |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal |
| LG | We have similar view with Huawi/Hisilicon and vivo. It seems appropriate to consider it lower priority and we prefer to discuss it at the next meeting. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To vivo: the current NRPPa PRS beam information is a compromised one, which does not support complex beamforming scheme, e.g. the differnetial beamforming in [15 R1-2101212], where multiple peaks could be possible, and does not provide a fine angle-RSRP mapping to facilitate a fine AoD estimate, which is why Aspect #10 was proposed to resolve this.In addition, for 3D beamforming in UE-assisted DL-AoD, how to “define” adjacent beam based on the beam direction is quite challenging, as we have 2D beam grid.For UE-based DL-AoD, how to calculate the AoD is up to UE implementation, and we do not even need to touch how adjacent beams are defined/signaled.The current RSRP report is sorted by RSRP values, and considering the lower RSRP values may be more affected by noise, we think that using the up to 8 highest RSRPs should be more robust, and normally the “adjacent” beams have higher RSRP than “non-adjacent” one, and thus the existing mechanism is in most cases aligned with selecting the adjacent beam without any specification work of strictly defining what adjacent beams mean. |
| China Telecom | We have the same understanding with CMCC, and also fine with the prposal |
| vivo2 | To Huawei:Thanks for the reply. We agree that the enhancement of aspect 10 may introduce more different beams and there are many uncertainties, but we believe the adjacent beam can be judged as long as there is relevant information about the beam, at least, it is feasible for the current gNB beam information and DFT beam.Besides, we agree with that reporting RSRP by sorted RSRP values is a solution, but it needs to measure all beams and it cannot ensure “adjacent” beams are always reported along with the beam with the highest RSRP. Furthermore, based on our evaluation, reporting the received RSRP of adjacent Tx beam has better performance when the number of reported PRS-RSRP for each TRP is fewer. And if UE can measure a few Tx Beam other than all beams to choose, it is better for power saving(this is also a target in R17).To Apple:From our understanding, R16 only supports reporting up to 8 RSRP without any restriction, and enable UE to report RSRPs of the adjacent Tx beam has not been supported.So, we hope the proposal can be agreed upon given are just considering the options |
| Intel | Do not support. Share the same view as HW, that it may not be feasible to identify adjacent beams.We do not see a spec impact. |
| ZTE | We doubt the benefits that can provide, especially when the beam patterns may be different or asymmetrical among different resources . We’re open to further discuss aspect#9, this proposal should be very low priority. |
| CATT | We prefer to make more study on this topic before we make decision on this proposal. |

#### Summary of 3rd round of comments and updated proposal

### Aspect #4 Rx Beam reporting enhancements

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [9], it was proposed to associate a Tx and Rx beam pair of indices with the RSRP report, indicating the beam pair resulting in the strongest RSRP. In [11], it is proposed to report the Rx beam information to the LMF. [3] proposed to enhance the report by providing detailed Rx beam information including antenna okiaingtion and beam direction. In [7] it was proposed to enhance the report by informing the LMF of the Rx beams relative angular difference.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [9]  | **Proposal 4: Introduce an indicator associated with a PRS resource/resource set or RX beam index to indicate TX beam or RX beam corresponding to the highest RSRP measurement.** |
| [11] | **Proposal 2: Support the enhancement of reporting the UE Rx beam information to the LMF. FFS the details of what/how to report the Rx beam information.** |
| [3] | ***Proposal 2:*** *Rel-17 NR positioning should support detailed Rx beam information, in which UE can provide its antenna virtualization and reception beam direction information.* |
| [7] | **Proposal 3*:*** Study angle difference measurements for AoA of DL PRS resources in Rel-17. |
| [8] | Proposal 1* A further restriction would be required so that the UE uses a reception beam to avoid worst case of the reception beam selection, even if the UE can ignore QCL type-D configuration of the PRS resources to use a fixed reception beam for DL-AoD technique.

***Proposal 2:**** Need discussions on how to utilize the reception beam index for the accuracy improvements of DL-AoD based positioning, such as finding UE’s location when the UE is located between the transmission beams.
 |
|  |  |

For AOD, the UE may optionally indicate the following Rx beam information

A) An indicator that the reported resource gives the highest RSRP measurement

 B) Rx beam direction information

 C) Antenna virtualization for the Rx beam

 D) angular difference between Rx beams when using different Rx beams.

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | 1, we think, finding the direction between a TRP and a UE lies in using a vector in which the elements are the differential RSRP between beams. Each vector stands for a direction implicitly. 2, so the key should be UE to fix the RX beam, so that the measured differential RSRP correspond to the beam response with each beam having its own pointing direction. It is less significant to consider using which RX beam |
| vivo | In general, we are okay with the main bullet. But for the sub-bullet, we have some questions and hope the proponents can clarify them.For A), as RSRP value has been reported, why we need an indicator for the highest PRSP.For B) and D), we think it may beneficial for positioning, but how the UE obtains the Rx beam direction information or angular difference needs to be explained clearly.For C) we support it if Antenna virtualization for the Rx beam is the Rx Beam index. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We do not think the proposal has any convergence. In general, we are OK to support UE panel reporting for associated RSRP or any enhancement of measurements for DL-AoD, similar to the method for mitigating UE Rx/Tx timing error. |
| CMCC | Support. The DL-AoD performance gain relies on both the Tx beam and Rx beam, especially for FR2. The best result would be obtained by the alignment of Tx and Rx beams. Therefore, it is beneficial to provide UE Rx beam information to the LMF, the details can be further discussed.  |
| ZTE | Support the main bullet. Details can be discussed in next meeting since we need to update WID in next RAN plenary. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are okay with the ZTE proposal of agreeing main bullet but some of the proposals are quite different. We do not see what the motivation for A) is. For B) wouldn’t this require that the UE is aware of its orientation for it to be useful? For C) more details from the proponents would be helpful. D) We support it. To respond to vivo: we think that the angle difference between the RX beams could be the measured by the UE by assuming that the direction of the beam with the highest power (i.e., similar to AoD for DL side) and then taking the difference between such angles of 2 RX beams.  |
| CATT | We prefer this proposal as low priority in this meeting. |
| Intel | Do not support. The UE orientation in space is not known/calibrated, so any change in the UE orientation causes changes in the RX beam direction information.  |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. We are supportive of B). Our view is that sudden change in UE orientation will deteriorate AoD measurements. Therefore, UE orientation information (proposal captured in 2.3.4) will be helpful for the LMF to determine the UE position based on the measurements. The UE rotation information may be obtained by implementation. Details can be discussed in future meetings. Option A) may have came from [9]. One of the use cases is to indicate that without reporting RSRP, include an indicator for in the measurement report that the corresponding PRS beam yields the highest RSRP. For example, such operation may be useful to judge which way the UE is facing without asking for excessive amount of measurement reports. The indicator can be obtained by comparing multiple groups of averaged RSRPs across PRS resources. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, support the intention of the main bullet proposal. The overall aim of the candidate information solutions B, C), D) is to improve the DL-AoD performance in NLOS scenarios. For C) this might depend on UE’s capability, while for D) the details for computing the DL-AoA need to be decided upon (also related to Aspect#8 of FL’s summary). For A) , wondering if the LMF can already derive this based on the reported RSRP values.  |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear to us how this information will be used, or whether we are in that level of optimization of this procedure that such detailed Rx beam information is needed to do a good DL-AoD method. RSRP-based DL-AoD is about the angle at the gNB, and what is needed is the UE’s measurements to not be affected by other factors (e.g. changing Rx beam) and a way to map the RSRP-report to an Angle. The aspects that these proposal treat seem secondary to us.  |
| Apple | We do not support this proposal. Basically it is not clear how the UE’s Rx beam information at LMF would be useful, given that UE’s orientation may change.  |
| Ericsson | For A) We think that the discussion on rx beam delay group / panel identification in agenda 8.5.1 will probably yield a solution also for AoD. Therefore we could probably skip the discussion in this agenda item regarding Rx beams. B) we have a similar concern from other companies regarding how to maintain UE orientation C) how the LMF will use this is unclear.D) support the principle. However, the beams where the two measurements are performed should be in the same panel/delay group to provide a meaningful result.  |
| OPPO | We do not support this proposal. For A: that is already supported in current spec.For B: we do not see the use case of reporting UE Rx beam direction. Furthermore, just as concerned by other companies, how to maintain the UE orientation.For C: Antenna virtualization is purely UE implementation issue. That is not useful for LMF.For D: similar to B, do not see the use case of reporting angle of Rx beam |
| LG | Support. For B), if it is difficult to report the Rx beam direction, we could consider reuse of source RS of QCL type-D or spatial relations.  |
| Sony | Regarding the UE RX beam, we can consider the UE can report the antenna panel information. |
| China Telecom | We support the main bullet.For B), C), D), we think they are beneficial for improving the DL-AoD accuracy; For A), we wonder what the motivation is since the RSRP has already been reported. |
| Xiaomi | For A), we are wondering what an indicator is, is it a PRS resource ID?For B)/C)/D), what format will be used as Rx beam direction information, an angle or a RS ID indicating an Rx beam? |
| Samsung  | it seems we may look into how this Rx information can help, and what kind of Rx information is really useful, then we can make decision that whether this is needed. |
| Fraunhofer | Support the main bullet as suggested by ZTE.  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

Since there is no consensus on any of the proposed options regarding Rx beam enhancements, it is proposed to postpone the discussion to a future meeting. Other topics, such as RxTx timing error mitigation will also cover the issue regarding panel/delay group identification, so waiting a little longer should clarify what further proposal should include.

Proposal 4a: postpone the discussion on Rx beam reporting enhancements for DL-AOD to the next meeting.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Support. |
| CATT | Support Proposal 4a. |
| LG | OK |
| Qualcomm | Small suggestion: postpone the discussion on Rx beam reporting enhancements for DL-AOD for a future meeting |
| OPPO | We think the suggestion from QC is better wording. |
| Xiaomi | Support  |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Intel | Support.  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

The second round of comments agrees to postpone the discussion for a future meeting.

### Aspect #5 CIR reporting for AoD

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [21] it was proposed to support reporting the complex channel coeffient per path for DL-AOD, for a number of channel taps. In [13], it is proposed to report the channel impulse response to be able to exploit correlation information.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [21] | **Proposal #1:*** + **Support measured channel reporting per DL-PRS resource from UE to gNB to facilitate accurate DL-AOD estimation, including:**
		- **Complex channel coefficient *h*(*m*) = *A*(*m*) × exp(*jφ*(*m*)) for the *m*th propagation path (channel tap) per DL-PRS resource:**
			* ***A*(*m*) – channel amplitude for the *m*th propagation path; and/or**
			* ***φ*(*m*) – channel phase for the *m*th propagation path**
 |
| [13] | **Proposal 2: To improve the DL-AoD accuracy in UE-assisted mode, support enhanced UE measurements and reporting by considering the following:** * **Reporting additional correlation information (ex. CIR reporting)**
* **Reporting of the estimated first arriving path, multipath and noise power**
* **Reporting of timing measurements on the DL-PRS resources along with the RSRP report.**
 |

For DL AOD, support reporting information of the measured complex channel, h(m) = A(m) × exp(jφ(m)) per path.

* FFS: details on the reporting (including whether to send phase and amplitude separately, quantization, number of paths, etc)

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | The same view with LOS/NLOS, we propose to discuss it after multipath mitigation is in WID |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| ZTE | It’s unclear what’s the benefit of reporting phase and amplitude together. Regarding the amplitude and multipaths, it can be discussed in proposal 2. |
| CATT | Support. Rich measurement report will help LMF to improve the positioning accuracy. |
| Intel  | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Is this proposal trying to enable a phase-difference based DL-AOD, rather than an RSRP-based AoD? Wouldn’t it make more sense to enable this in UE-based and avoid all the reporting overhead? Have companies performed comparison or overhead / performance analysis to understand what is being discussed here? We are talking about raw channel reporting here, a feature that has been discussed over a variety of different Wis, releases, and contexts; and hasn’t been specified.  |
| Apple | Assuming that PRS-RSRP measurements associated to path is specified, then the benefit of CIR reporting is unclear…  |
| Ericsson | Support the principles. But we share the concern on overhead.  |
| OPPO | Do not support the proposal.Such kind of full channel information report has been discussed for many times in various agendas. The first concern is the overhead. The second concern is there is clear benefit for improving positioning because the PRS is single-port.  |
| LG | We understand the motivation of the proposal. However, we have doubts about how much we can gain the better performance by giving up signaling overhead. |
| Sony | Similar view with Ericsson, as it increases the overhead. |
| Intel | To Qualcomm:Is this proposal trying to enable a phase-difference based DL-AOD, rather than an RSRP-based AoD?Yes, it allows for more accurate DL-AOD estimation compared to the RSRP-based method. It was shown by simulations provided in (R1-2100659).To be clear the proposal is to report A(m) and φ(m) for the mth channel tap. The number of channel taps can be limited. For example, in the simulation results in (R1-2100659) we use only single first arrival path and the perfromance is much better compared to the RSRP-based method. This is because we use phase information to compute the DL-AOD.In the aspect #1, considered above, we introduce RSRP for the first arrival path. We would like to suggest to add reporting of the phase information. By reporting only a signle tap, the overhead will be limited.Wouldn’t it make more sense to enable this in UE-based and avoid all the reporting overhead?We belive it is better to keep the antenna configuration and codebook design as implementation specific, which provides more flexibility in implementation as it is currently assumed for the DL-PRS transmission.To ZTE, Apple:It’s unclear what’s the benefit of reporting phase and amplitude together.Assuming that PRS-RSRP measurements associated to path is specified, then the benefit of CIR reporting is unclearReporting of the phase for the first arrival path allows for using of the phase-based estimation methods for the DL-AOD. As it was shown by simulations in (R1-2100659), it provides a significant performance gain compared to the RSRP-based method.To Ericsson/OPPO/LG/Sony:Reporting of the phase for the first arrival path (in addition to the RSRP) limits the overhead significantly. However, as it is shown by simulation results provided in (R1-2100659), it improves the accuracy significantly.  |
| Fraunhofer | Support. Suggest the following modification:For DL AOD, support reporting information of the measured complex channel, h(m) = A(m) × exp(jφ(m)) per path.* FFS: details on the reporting (including whether to send phase and amplitude separately, quantization, number of paths, etc)

In our view this is one of the main enhancements Rel-17 can introduce. The whole channel information might not be necessary but probably reported information around the FAP (and other information FFS) will enhance accuracy in multipath environments.  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The comments are split between support and no support. Among the concerns, many have reported issues with overhead. Qualcomm proposed to minimize overhead by focusing on a UE based positioning framework. Intel commented that overhead can be kept low and maintain gains even for a single path reported.

Since the discussion is not yet complete, it is propose to continue discussing until the next checkpoint. Note: The missing word pointed by Fraunhofer is added to the original proposal.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Considering we have discussed this in former releases, we don’t think we can get consensus this time. Meanwhile, the path information(phase,amplitude,time) is for use at gNB side, this would lead to large spec impact on signaling structure. Furthermore, as mentioned by other companies, this will consume high overhead for quantifying channel with precise granularity. |
| CATT | Supprt to further discuss this proposal in this meeting, especially how to achieve a balance between improving positioning accuracy and reducing reporting overhead.Suggest the following modification in order to address the concern about the overhead:For DL AOD, support reporting information of the measured complex channel, h(m) = A(m) × exp(jφ(m)) per path.* FFS: details on the reporting (including whether to send phase and amplitude separately, quantization, number of paths, etc)
* FFS: how to reduce the reporting overhead for UE-assisted solution.
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Based on our understanding, reporting phase (or alternatively I/Q info for a path) will for DL-AoD enables a new operation of coherent angle detection compared with the existing RSRP pattern matching, but there should be a premise that the gNB beamformer initial phase is known (phase contiguity is maintained) across multiple Tx beams. With that, estimation of the CIR on each antenna elements is possible, making it similar to UL-AoA in FR1.To our understanding, this may also help timing based positioning, and even enable Doppler info reporting. However, if there is Doppler effect, the path phase may rotate on different symbol even within a single resource, which makes it difficult to report a single phase to represent the CIR.Therefore, we would suggest to further study, which should be also depend on the WID scope update. |
| Intel  | Support. We think that the RSRP-based DL-AOD method accuracy is too coarse and does not achieve the requirements for IIoT use case. As it was shown by simulations in (R1-2100659), the phase-based method is more accurate and achieves the requirements.  |
| Ericsson | With the update to the proposals for aspect 1 (proposal 1b/1c) to include phase , it seems that there is an overlap with the proposals 1c and 5b. Thus we think we could close this aspect. Alternatively, we can soften the proposal and wait for evaluations of the overhead vs performance before making a decision. We propose extending the proposal from Huawei as follow:For DL AOD, consider support reporting information of the measured complex channel, h(m) = A(m) × exp(jφ(m)) per path.* FFS: details on the reporting (including whether to send phase and amplitude separately, quantization, number of paths, etc)
* FFS: how to reduce the reporting overhead for UE-assisted solution.
 |
| Fraunhofer | Okay with the modifications from CATT and Ericsson |
| LG | Our understanding, It may be effective under the conditions where the phase of beamformer is sustained between the antenna elements. In addition, we worry that additional reporting of phase information itself is an overhead. So, it seems appropriate to discuss the issue at the next meeting rather than hastily decided at this meeting. |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

TBD

### Aspect #6 extension of number of reported RSRP measurements

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [4], it was proposed to increase the maximum number of measurements per TRP, in order to account for different RX beam. In [5] it is propose to either fix the RX beam for the 8 reported PRS RSRP, or introduce a new list of PRS Rx Beam indices to map the measurements to Rx beams.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [4] | ***Proposal 2: The maximum number of RSRP measurements per TRP for DL-AoD positioning should be increased for reporting the RSRP measured from different RX beams.*** |
| [5] | ***Proposal 5**** ***To improve the accuracy of AoD and to avoid the impact of Rx beam, choose one of the following options.***
* ***Option 1: Report up to 8 DL PRS-RSRP corresponding to the same RX beam index***
* ***Option 2: Adding an additional DL PRS-RSRP list with different nr-DL-PRS-RxBeamIndex for a PRS resource.***
 |

For DL AOD, the RSRP measurements per TRP is reported for

* Option 1 : up to 8 measurements per TRP per Rx beam index. Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS.
* Option 2 : up to 8 measurements per TRP, for the same Rx beam index
* Option 3: up to N>8 measurements per TRP for all Rx beam indices, Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS.

 FFS: value for N.

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | 1, Option 1 seems to consider UE RX beam sweeping for a fixed TRP TX beam. We doubt the benefit when comparing with TRP TX beam sweeping for a fixed UE RX beam. Also the UE orientation may change with time, so the RX beam direction changes also. As such we don’t see the benefit of this option2, For option 2, in rel-16 we think we already agree and it is a common understanding to fix RX beam for multiple RSRP measurements3, the angle granularity is determined by a vector with several differential RSRP elements, because different angle may correspond to a different vector. As long as UE is to fix the receive beam, the multiple differential RSRP values can be used to determine the direction. We don’t think it is meaningful to change RX beam for measurement  |
| Vivo | In general, we are okay with all three options and slightly prefer option2 or option3. Option 3 is better for achieving optimal performance based on our evaluation, but if consider latency, option 2 is better. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | OK. |
| ZTE | This could be the scope of Rx beam enhancements, we suggest to discuss this in proposal 5. |
| CATT | Support. We prefer Option 3.  |
| Intel  | Do not support. It is not clear for us, how the RX beam index can be taken into consideration since the orientation of the UE in space is not known and it may change in time.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Open to support option 1 and 3 since this takes into account a UE’s general orientation with respect to the gNB, however there can be a possibility of high UE reporting overhead especially for cases where the UE rapidly and drastically changes orientation. Option 2) seems to be Rel-16 operation. |
| Qualcomm | We are open discussing increasing the number of RSRP measurements in a single report. For example, we may want to include multiple RSRPs for the same TRP across multiple timestamps in a single report. Suggest to keep the proposal more general for this first meeting:***For UE-assisted DL AOD, support enhancements to increase the number of RSRP measurements per TRP (PRS-ID) a UE can include in a single measurement report.*** |
| Apple | If the intention is to have more diverse RSRP report for different RX beams, as we commented in previous proposal the benefit of such UE’s Rx knowledge at LMF is unclear.  |
| Ericsson | Since the benefits of extending the reporting to more than 8 beams is not clear yet, we propose to keep all options for now and down-select in future meetings.  |
| DOCOMO | We have similar view as Ericsson. |
| OPPO | It seems the intention of this proposal is to increase the number of RSRPs in one report. The motivation and benefit for doing that is not clear. We need more discussion and study for that. Is the current number not enough.For Option 1 and 2: that is what we already supported in rel16 but just with smaller number.For option 3: we do not support. Reporting RSRP of one PRS with respect to multiple Rx beam do not improve the system performance.  |
| LG | We are okay. We prefer to discuss which option would be better after analyzing each alternative, before this meeting is over. |
| Sony | We need to further discuss this aspect, to investigate the benefit of the proposed scheme (e.g. gain versus overhead cost). |
| China Telecom | Support. We prefer Option 1 or Option 3, whether to increase the measurement times needs further discussion. |
| Xiaomi | We are slightly prefer to discuss the motivation first. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal, and we slightly prefer option 3 especially if the benefits can be more explicitly. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

the support for this aspect is as follow:

* Support/ downselect later/ continue investigation: Xiaomi, Sony, China Telecom, LG, Oppo, docomo, Ericsson, Lenovo, vivo, Huawei, CATT
* Reworded option3, propose to increase the number of measurement per report from the exisiting 8: Qualcomm
* Combine with proposal 5: ZTE
* do not support: Apple, intel.

Since there is a majority of companies willing to discuss the issue, it is worth to continue discussing. We propose the following rewording to take into account the feedback:

Proposal 6a For DL AOD, the RSRP measurements per TRP is reported for (downselect )

* Option 1 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16)
* Option 2 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, for the same Rx beam index
* Option 3: up to N>8 measurements
	+ Note: Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS.
	+ FFS: value for N.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Okay |
| ZTE | Before we make a decision, we want to know the actual benefits. |
| CATT | Support. We prefer Option 3. For Option 1, maybe we can remove it since it is Rel-16 scheme.For Option 2, there is limitation on only 8 RSRP for the same RX beam index for one TRP.And we try to explain the motivation of this scheme below:For a UE with multiple RX beams, the RSRP can be measured using different RX beams. If all these RSRP measurements are reported to the LMF, LMF would calculate multiple candidate UE locations, which provides the opportunity of correcting the estimation error of the UE location. In other words, for each DL PRS resource, multiple RSRP measurements associate with different RX beams should be reported. However, in Rel-16, the number of reported RSRP measurements per TRP is limited to 8. And the number of RX beams is allowed to be 8. It will limit the reported RSRP measurements per Rx beam. For enhancement, we may increase the total number of RSRP measurements allowed for each TRP.  |
| LG | Support. We have a minor comment. In the note of Option 3. We suggest to add “resource” at the end of PRS, that is, “a given PRS” would be “a given PRS resource”, |
| Qualcomm | We are generellay supprotive, even if we think that reporting more than 8 RSRPs should not be motivated only from the fact that the UE has multiple Rx beams. So Option 3 is more generic and we tend to prefer it, even though the „Note“ seems not needed. If there is consensus to increase the number of RSRPs to be reported per TRP, we can live it at that this meeting. If not, we can make it „study futher“. |
| OPPO | We support in principle. Regarding Option 3, we share the same understanding as QC that supporting > 8 RSRPs shall not be limited for different Rx beams for one PRS. Thus suggest to remove the NoteProposal 6a For DL AOD, the RSRP measurements per TRP is reported for (downselect )* Option 1 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16)
* Option 2 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, for the same Rx beam index
* Option 3: up to N>8 measurements
	+ ~~Note: Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS.~~
	+ FFS: value for N.
 |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal 6a. |
| CATT | Support the updated proposal 6a from OPPO above. i.e., we prefer to delete the Note in Option 3. |
| DOCOMO | OK to support. |
| Ericsson | Ok to keep the 3 options for now and study further. We also think option 3 should be for more than or equal to 8 measurements.  |
| Intel  | Do not support. It is not clear for us, how the RX beam index can be taken into consideration since the orientation of the UE in space is not known and it may change in time.  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

All but one companies are ok with at least study further, and some companies haved expresed their preferred options, and one company does not support further enhancements. As this is the first meeting, we propose to keep the options and downselect in a future meeting. The proposal is updated to take into account the comment from LG (PRS-> PRS resource) and Ericsson (to also include 8 in the number of possible Rx beams). Regarding the removal of the note proposed from oppo, we can discuss this in the GTW. Since the statement is “may be reported”, it should not preclude extending the number of measurements even for the same Rx beam.

Proposal 6b For DL AOD, the RSRP measurements per TRP is reported for (downselect )

* Option 1 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report (as in release 16)
* Option 2 : up to 8 measurements in a measurement report, for the same Rx beam index
* Option 3: up to N>=8 measurements
	+ Note: Multiple measurements corresponding to different Rx Beam index may be reported for a given PRS resource.
	+ FFS: value for N.

#### third round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| vivo | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are skeptical that anything other than option 1 is needed but we are okay with agreeing to the proposal.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Sony | We believe option 1 is sufficient. However, we are fine to support this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Generally supportive. Quick explanation on Option 3: Adding RSRP measurements just because the UE may have multiple panels it is not the only reason. The UE may be measuring PRS resources across multiple instsances, it may want to add RSRP measurements on the sape PRS resources across different time-stamps within a single report.  |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal 6b |
| LG | We are OK with proposal 6b |
| China Telecom | Support |
| ZTE | Although we think option 1 may be enough, we’re open for further discussion |

#### Summary of 3rd round of comments and updated proposal

###  Aspect #7 Signalling to assist reference UE calibration

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [4], it was proposed to support calibration by a reference UE, by allowing to send measurement and location coordinates of a reference UE, as well as TRP beam characteristics, to the LMF. In [12] it is proposed to use a reference node with a very accurate knowledge of the node location to

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [4] | ***Proposal 3: In order to improve DL-AOD estimation accuracy, the measurements provided by a reference UE with known locations should be supported to assist the calibration of the TRP transmitting beam direction.**** ***The measurements and location coordinates of the reference UE are reported to LMF***
* ***The transmitting beam characteristics of TRP should be reported to LMF***
 |
| [12] | *Proposal 3: Estimate the angle error by a reference node whose accurate location is known.* |

For DL AOD, support introducing high accuracy reporting of the UE location, for the purpose of supporting reference Ues.

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Support it  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | This could be covered by the generic device-assisted (FFS UE/TRP/other) timing/angle calibration. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| ZTE | It’s unclear to us what is the expected spec changes? In our understanding, the reference can be a UE or TRP. For the reference UE, the reporting mechanisms can be nothing different from normal UE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Huawei. To ZTE, there clearly need to be some changes to the current setup for a reference UE/device to be supported. At least the ability for UE/device to report capabilities (as it relies on reference location with very high accuracy) and combine the reference location with the measurements. There may also be signaling needed to/from the LMF to ensure that the calculated values can be used by TRPs/Ues to assist in future positioning calculations.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Do not support.It needs to be considered as a part of the more general discussion, including UL-AOA and timing measurements. |
| Qualcomm | The spec already supports high accuracy positioning reporting, independent of method; so its unclear what is the first part of the suggested enhancement* Independent of that, if the purpose of this proposal is to support DL-AoD calibration procedures, we have a similar comment to the UL-AoA summary;
	+ Comment 1: we can just talk about a “reference node/device/entity” and not specifically a UE for now. A gNB could also measure PRS (and has an accurate knowledge of its information all the time). It could eventually be a UE that can be “attached” in the gNB as it is the case in IAB, etc. We prefer to discuss these details later.

Having a generic notion of “reference node/device/entity” for RAN1’s discussion would enable using it for calibration of other methods, like the timing errors in 8.5.1 and UL-AoA. Having a unified and forward-looking approach should be preferred.  |
| Apple | Support the intention |
| Ericsson | Do not support. Reference UE’s locations can be acquired via a proprietary solution.  |
| OPPO | Do not support. Reference UE location can be supported by implementation.  |
| Sony | Do not support. We have similar view as Ericsson and OPPO |
| China Telecom | Do not support. How the reference UE’s locations be acquired need to be determined first. If the location is calculated by TRPs/Ues then reported, why the location of the UE is more accuracy and can be used as the reference; if the location is acquired by other methods such as implementation, then this proposals is useless. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

the support for this aspect is as follow:

* Support: Xiaomi, Apple, Qualcomm (but make it more generic), CATT, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, vivo, CMCC
* do not support: China Telecom, Sony, OPPO, Ericsson, Intel, ZTE.

Since there is no consensus, we propose to continue the discussion until the next checkpoint.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | The reference UE/TRP has been proposed across all sub-agendas, we think it has similar mechanisms for all methods. In order to save time, FL or rapporteur should make a decision on which sub-agenda should discuss this topic. |
| CATT | We support to introduce the reference UE/TRP in Rel-17. In GNSS domain, it is common to correct the positioning errors and provide high accuracy positioning services based on the reference station. The reference UE/TRP will play different roles for different positioning methods, e.g., timing delay error mitigation for time-based positioning method or antenna calibration for angle-based positioning method.  |
| Qualcomm | Support the concept of reference UE/TRP/node across all methods. Suggest to FLs of the 3 subagendas to try to coordinate the efforts to converge on some wording related to this item, which has been brought up by many companies across all 3 agendas.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with all above comments. This is clearly an important topic to progress and should be high priority among the 3 FLs to discuss how to discuss together.  |
| CATT | Support to coordinate and disucss the topic of reference UE/TRP across the 3 sub-agendas, in order to promote the progerss and reach a consistent conclusion. |
| China Telecom | We are acutally supportive of reference UE/TRP, what we have concerns is how the location be known. As above comments have mentioned, we agree that the issue should be converged and discussed in 1 subagenda. |
| Intel | It needs to be considered as a part of a more general discussion, including UL-AOA and timing measurements.We also would like to hear justification why it cannot be left up to implementation.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar to the agreement made on RX and Tx timing delays, specification impact can be investigated to consistently handle this concept across all agenda items. |
| Nokia/NSB\_2 | Agree with Lenovo’s comments. This should be handled the same in the different AIs and needs to be discussed online in our view.  |
| LG | We also think that the similar issues are being discussed in the different agenda items at the same time. To save the discussion time and progress efficiently, we need to discuss the issue in one agenda. Regarding the issue, we slightly do not support. |

## gNodeB signalling aspects

### Aspect #8 beam orientation error handling

#### Summary and FL proposal

Several contribution propose to account for the beam orientation error in the gnodeB[5][7].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [5] | ***Proposal 3**** ***Beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms need to be considered in R17.***
 |
| [7] | **Proposal 1:** RAN1 to study beam orientation errors and potential correction mechanisms in order to improve the positioning accuracy achievable with DL-AoD. Including:* UE-based positioning: the beam offset (BO) could be signaled to the UE, as either an indicator, e.g. low/medium/high, each specifying an error range or as a specific value computed by the network
* UE-assisted positioning: LMF should be aware of the BO and compensate for the errors when computing the position estimate.
* Signaling aspects:
	+ LMF signals to TRPs that a BO recomputation and beam re-tuning is needed.
	+ UE measurement reports to facilitate BO identification and potential correction.
 |
| [18] | ***Proposal 3: Support mechanisms to consider beam orientation impairments and related assistance information for improving DL-AoD positioning accuracy.*** |

Support mechanisms to consider beam orientation impairments and related assistance information for improving DL-AoD positioning accuracy.

* + FFS: gnodeB and UE to support beam orientation impairements mitigation.

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | This could be covered by the generic device-assisted (FFS UE/TRP/other) timing/angle calibration. |
| ZTE | Not support. In our view, if gNB has the prior information of beam errors, gNB can adjust beam direction in advance rather than inform this to UE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Same comments as on aspect 2.1.7. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Do not support.We think that it can be done by implementation. Additionally, we belive that overall calibration aspects are in the scope of RAN4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Qualcomm | * Unclear on the meaning “mechanisms for beam orientation impairments”. Is that the same as the calibration procedures in the previous proposal? If not, can we be more specific?
* We are supportive of assistance information enhancement (for both UE-based and UE-Assisted) to support beam orientation impairment mitigation.
 |
| Apple | The intention is unclear, basically what does this proposal bring on top of the previous proposal! |
| Ericsson | Do not support, we see this as an implementation issue.  |
| OPPO | DO not support. Share the same understanding as Ericsson. It is implementation issue.  |
| LG | Support.  |
| Sony | Do not support. We have similar view as Ericsson and OPPO |
| China Telecom | Support. |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

the support for this aspect is as follow:

* Support: vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB, CATT, Lenovo, Qualcomm, LG, China telecom, Apple (same as proposal 7)
* do not support: ZTE, Intel, Sony, OPPO, Ericsson, Intel, ZTE.

Since there is no consensus, we propose to continue the discussion until the next checkpoint.

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | It’s a implementation issue. If the intention is to provide more beam information, this can be discussed on aspect#9. |
| CATT | In our understanding, beam orientation impairments is similar with timing delay error, it will be pre-calibrated but still have residual error. If such residual error can be identified and mitigated, the positioning accuracy can be improved for DL-AoD method. It is worth to be further studied on the benefits and standard impact. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest to discuss it more in #9 |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with QC and CATT.  |
| Intel | We think that it can be done by implementation. Additionally, we belive that overall calibration aspects are in the scope of RAN4. |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

Based on the feedback, it is propose to move this aspect into aspect 10 (which includes aspect 9). Please see the update proposal 10c.

### Aspect #9 gNodeB beam Shape information signalling

#### Summary and FL proposal

in [5][6] [11] [13] [14] [17], it is proposed to have the gnodeB transmit additional beam information to the LMF or the UE for AOD enhancements. In [4] it was proposed to support calibration by a reference UE, by allowing to send measurement and location coordinates of a reference UE, as well as TRP beam characteristics, to the LMF.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [4] | ***Proposal 3: In order to improve DL-AOD estimation accuracy, the measurements provided by a reference UE with known locations should be supported to assist the calibration of the TRP transmitting beam direction.**** ***The measurements and location coordinates of the reference UE are reported to LMF***
* ***The transmitting beam characteristics of TRP should be reported to LMF***
 |
| [5] | ***Proposal 2**** ***Report additional beam information to the LMF or the UE for the enhancement of AoD.***
	+ ***E.g. intersection point of multiple beams:*** $\left(angle ,RSRP\right)\_{intersection point}$
 |
| [6] | ***Proposal 6***: Consider reporting beam-shape information to the UE for DL-AoD techniques. |
| [11] | **Proposal 3: Support the enhancement of reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF. FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.** |
| [13] | **Proposal 1: Introduce the possibility to report the radiation characteristics of the transmitted PRS resources (i.e. main lobe power-level, sidelobe level, etc.).** |
| [14] | **Proposal 2-1**: It is preferred to have a table provided by each TRP which may characterize all the beam responses (EIRP) for covering a range of angles. The table is like a look-up table when UE reports a number of differential RSRP values for finding the angle between a TRP and UE**Proposal 2-2**: A look-up table with differential EIRP across beams for a range of angles could also be considered |
| [17] | ***Proposal 1: For the purpose of enhancements to the RSRP-only DL-AoD method, support the signaling of beam responses (or equivalent information) to increase the accuracy precision while ensuring a tractable signaling overhead for both UE-based and UE-assisted solutions.**** ***Note: For UE-Based AoD, the above signaling enhancements correspond to assistance data signaling (unicast or broadcast). For UE-Assisted DL-AoD, the above signaling enhancements correspond to NRPPa signaling enhancements from gNB to LMF.***
 |

Support the enhancement of reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.

* + FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | support |
| vivo | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We think the specification impact is large compared to the proposal 10, and we consider it lower priority. |
| CMCC | We believe that the principle can bring benefits; however, it is mentioned by several companies that the signaling overhead would be huge.  |
| ZTE | Agree in principle. Leave details to next meeting when WID scope is stable. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are open to discuss but perhaps the signaling details to consider the overhead should be discussed before fully agreeing to support it.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel  | We think that it is more complex solution compared to the DL-AOD reporting.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Open to Support. |
| Qualcomm | It is within scope of the WI to include enhancements for both UE-B and UE-A DL-AOD. Enhancement of gNB beam information should be applicable towards both the UE and the LMF. Support the enhancement of reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF (UE-assisted) and the UE (UE-based). **FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.**  |
| Apple | Support the intention. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia, overhead should be considered before fully agreeing.  |
| DOCOMO | We are supportive and agree with the necessity of overhead discussion mentioned by some companies. |
| OPPO | Support in principle |
| LG | Support. |
| Sony | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support the intention, but the overhead should be considered firstly.  |
| Fraunhofer | Support |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

the support for this aspect is as follow:

* Support: MTK, vivo, CATT Lenovo, Qualcomm (including UE-B), Apple, OPPO, LG, Sony, China Telecom, Fraunhofer
* do not support/low prio: Huawei/HiSilicon, Intel
* postpone / consider overhead first:, CMCC, ZTE, Nokia, Ericsson, DOCOMO, Xiaomi

~~given the concern by multiple companies on overhead, we propose to postpone the discussion until the next meeting, so that companies can analyse the overhead impact.~~

~~Proposal 9a further discuss Support the enhancement of reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF (UE-assisted) and the UE (UE-based) in future meeting, including overhead aspects.~~

.

Update after second GTW: proposal 9 and 10 are merged as proposal 10b in section 2.2.3

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo |  Given this is first meeting in WID, the update proposal from Huawei in 2.2.3.2 can be considered  |
| FL | Agree. Since there is convergence between the two issues in 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, let’s merge them. A new proposal 10b is available in 2.2.3.3. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We disagree with splitting Aspect #9 and Aspect #10 as they are addressing the same issue. This approach is forcing a hard down-selection without technical discussion.We also disagree with the comments that other WGs had extensive disucssion in Rel-16, which is not correct to our understanding. There is no technical reason why it cannot be supported, while we explain the technical benefit on Proposal 10 without being challenged.As the compromise, we offer the following proposal combining aspects #9 and #10.**Proposal (9&10 revision)**Support angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD* Alt.1 Reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.
	+ FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.
* Alt.2 Angle report from gNB to LMF via e.g.
	+ Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or
	+ UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)
* Note: Alt.2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1 during the WI discussion
 |
| ZTE | We have to decide the scope of angle based enhancements in next RAN plenary. So it’s better to use more general wording, and simply say “Support the enhancement of reporting the gNB beam”. When this topic is in WID, we can further decide whether UE-assisted and UE-based are both supported or not. |
| CATT | OK to merged proposal 9a into proposal 10. |
| Qualcomm | First we are OK to merge #9 and #10, and thanks to HW for teh effort. However, we would prefer to not add the subbulets at this stage, especially if these are higher-layer impacting. We can go one step at a time. Also, this proposal should be for both UE-B and UE-A. Finally, as it was pointed out by HW’s some of the aspect of #11 can be related to the gNB beam information; whether there can be a parametrized way of sending this info to reduce the overheadSo we adjust HW’s proposal as follows:**Proposal (9&10 revision)**Support angle calculation enhancements for both UE-A and UE-B DL-AoD* Opt.1 Reporting the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF (for UE-A) or to the UE (for UE-B).
	+ FFS the details of what/how to report the beam/antenna information.
* Opt.2 Angle report from gNB to LMF ~~via e.g.~~
	+ FFS: Mechanisms/Signaling of such report
	+ ~~Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or~~
	+ ~~UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)~~
* Note: Opt.2 could be down prioritized to Opt.1 during the WI discussion
 |
| FL | Please see aspect #10 for the merged proposal.  |

### Aspect #10 gnodeB based calculation of AOD

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [21], it was proposed to have the gnodeB report the calculated AOD to the LMF, using received measurement from the UE. The proposal relies on a companion proposal to support complex channel reporting from the UE to the gnodeB. In [2] it was proposed to support mechanisms to have the LMF request the gnodeB to calculate the AOD.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [21] | * + **Support DL-AOD reporting from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE), including:**
		- ***φ* – azimuth angle of departure**
		- ***θ* – zenith angle of departure**
 |
| [2] | ***Proposal 1: Support LMF to request angle calculation to the gNB for DL-AoD in Rel-17, i.e. the following Option from R3-197794.**** ***The RAN nodes calculate the AoD with the RSRP information based on gNB configuration and send the AoD information back to LMF, who then calculates the UE position.***
 |

DL-AOD reporting from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE) is supported

FFS: details on the report content

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Do not support.For us, we prefer P9. Because P9 only needs one-time assistance data request and response between LMF and gNB for all Ues, but P10 needs AoD request and report between LMF and gNB for each measurement of every UE. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| CMCC | To our understanding, it avoids the complication of reporting detailed beam information to the LMF. Meanwhile, other details such as how does the serving TRP obtain the DL-AoD of neighboring TRP (maybe from neighboring gNB) should also be further considered. |
| ZTE | Not support. DL-AOD measurement report is from UE to LMF in Rel-16, this would lead to large spec impact. If the intention is to provide beam-shape information, it can be discussed in proposal 9. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer not to reopen what was a long discussion during Rel-16 and in addition the decision (which this would overturn) was not made in RAN1.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel  | Support.  |
| Qualcomm | Unclear why we need to enhance DL-AOD in this direction: We already send the measurements to the LMF (NR rel-16). We either way, need additional assistance data (e.g. beam information) to be sent to the LMF to enhance this legacy method and to support UE-B DL-AoD. Why send the measurements to the LMF, and then the LMF send them to the gNB? Why not having the gNBs sending the beam information to the LMF (rather static information), so not really a big overhead.  |
| Apple | Do NOT support. We share similar view as ZTE |
| Ericsson | Do not support. The specification impact of such a decision is not reasonable, and as other companies mentioned the architecture of AOD was discussed at length by ran2 and ran3 to conclude that the LMF was the suitable node (R3-197794)  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | It seems like opponents have different understandings for the proposal. We would like to clarify as below.To vivo/Qualcomm/Nokia/Ericsson:In our view, we do not think there has been extensive discussion. RAN3 discussed it without consulting RAN1 (No LS to RAN1) at all, while RAN2 simply followed RAN3 recommendation. We did not see any technical discussion to resolve the DL-AoD angle calculation issue in RAN2 or RAN3 and we also believe RAN1 should be more involved. Thus we do not think using the argument that other WGs has discussed it is the best approach that RAN1 can come up with.To our understanding, specifying the beam pattern not only requires extensive specification work, but also consume large overhead, over NG-interface/F1-interface and Uu-interface (for UE-based). The static beam pattern does not allow TRP-implementation based beam shape optimization. This will also increase the calculating burden at the LMF.For the measurement request effort mentioned by vivo, we think the existing UL-AoA procedure can be reused, which is also per UE per gNB. In particular, instead of sending SRS configuration to each TRP, the power can be sent over NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST for requesting the AoA measurement. The specification change is minimal even from RAN3 perspective.To ZTE/Apple:We are trying to avoid specifying/reporting beam pattern, as in our mind, specifying/reporting the beam pattern will on one hand have large spec impact and on the other hand have large overhead. The beam pattern can be kept within each TRP without disclosure to the LMF, and TRP is only tasked to provide the angle based on the RSRP from the LMF, which is collected from the UE.To CMCC:In our mind, we do not think the RSRP should be sent to the serving gNB only. It should be more like the non-UE associated NRPPa measurement procedure, via the existing MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE to convey RSRP instead of SRS configuration for requesting AoA (which is equivalent to AoD) |
| LG | We are on the same page with Nokia/NSB. |
| Sony | Do not support |
| vivo2 | Reply to Huawei:First, SRS configuration is needed for UL rather than DL.Besides, in R16 DL-AoD positioning, as my understanding, LMF doesn’t need to request gNB to measure and report measurement result. But for P10 enhancement, as shown in the figure below, multiple gNBs need to be requested for the measurement report of each UE and report these results after receiving the requests. This is our concern about the additional signaling and procedure. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To vivo:I think the illustration from vivo is aligned with our intention. I used SRS as the analogy because those LMF-gNB signalings are the same as those signalings sending SRS configuration to gNB. How many gNBs are involved depends on the concerned TRPs associated with PRS measurement. For one case in particular, only single gNB can be selected if all the TRP are hosted by the same gNB.We have concern on the completion of proposal 9, but the goal of proposal 10 should be the same, which is filling in the gap on angle calculation assistance for DL-AoD. In this regard, we suggest to combine aspect #9 and #10 together. For example,**Proposal (9&10 revision)**Support angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD* Alt.1 Reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.
	+ FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.
* Alt.2 Angle report from gNB to LMF via e.g.
	+ Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or
	+ UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)
* Note: Alt.2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1 during the WI discussion
 |
| Fraunhofer | Do not support |
| Qualcomm | Replied above. Suggest to merge this to #9 |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

the support for this aspect is as follow:

* Support: Huawei, CMCC, CATT, Intel
* do not support: ZTE, Nokia, Qualcomm, apple, Ericsson, vivo, LG, Sony, Fraunhofer.

~~Most companies do not support the proposal. As there is quite a strong opposition, it is proposed not to revisit the issue and conclude not to support it.~~

.

~~Proposal 10a (conclusion) DL-AOD reporting from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE) is not supported in release 17~~

Update after the second GTW call:

The proposals 9 and 10 can be merged as options of a common proposal, based on the merge proposed by Huawei. I have added the third option of not supporting either alt1 or alt2:

Proposal 10b regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, select from the following option:

* Alt.1 Reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.
	+ FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.
* Alt.2 Angle report from gNB to LMF via e.g.
	+ Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or
	+ UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)
	+ Note: Alt.2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1 during the WI discussion
* Alt.3 do not support further enhancements

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We disagree with splitting Aspect #9 and Aspect #10 as they are addressing the same issue. This approach is forcing a hard down-selection without technical discussion.We also disagree with the comments that other WGs had extensive disucssion in Rel-16, which is not correct to our understanding. There is no technical reason why it cannot be supported, while we explain the technical benefit on Proposal 10 without being challenged.As the compromise, we offer the following proposal combining aspects #9 and #10.**Proposal (9&10 revision)**Support angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD* Alt.1 Reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.
	+ FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.
* Alt.2 Angle report from gNB to LMF via e.g.
	+ Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or
	+ UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)
* Note: Alt.2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1 during the WI discussion
 |
| ZTE | OK with the conclusion. |
| LG | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | If alt.3 is added, we suggest to have alt.1 and alt.2 combined as one alternative that says angle calculation enhancement fro DL-AoD is supported, and to be selected if we decide to have this enhancement.Proposal 10b regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, select from the following option:* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is supported in Rel-17
	+ Alt.1-1 Reporting the gNB beam information to the LMF.
		- FFS the details of what/how to report the beam information.
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF via e.g.
		- Reusing existing NRPPa MEASUREMENT REQUEST/RESPONSE, or
		- UE reporting measurement to its serving gNB (based on limiting the PRS measurement to only the TRPs hosted by the serving gNB or PRS config exchange over Xn)
	+ Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supported
* Alt.2 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17
 |
| CATT | We prefer Atl.1 in Proposal 10b, or Alt.1-1 in Huawei’s revised proposal 10b, i.e., gNB report its beam information to the LMF, then LMF finish the AoD calculatioin.  |
| Intel | Support FL’s proposal.  |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

Based on the comments, it is proposed to keep all alternatives in the latest version of the proposal in the comments. Additionally, it was commented in aspect 8 that beam orientation impairments issues could be included in the proposal, and a rewording was proposed in aspect 9 by qualcomm. Both are included in the proposal.

the following rewording is proposed:

Proposal 10c regarding support of angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation impairement mitigation for DL-AoD, select from the following option:

* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD / beam orientation impairement mitigation is supported in Rel-17 for both UE-A and UE-B
	+ **Alt.1-1 Reporting the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF (for UE-A) or to the UE (for UE-B).**
		- FFS the details of what/how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supported
* Alt.2 beam orientation impairments mitigation and Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17

####  third round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support FL’s revised proposal 10c. |
| vivo | We are a little bit confused with ‘antenna information ‘ here, can proponents list some antenna information here to make this proposal more clear?And we got some replies from Huawei in email, if Huawei’s explaination is a common understanding, that is, the antenna information is for reducing the overload of beam information, we are okay with that. And then, whether a note needs to be added to restrict the antenna information is associated information of beam? |
| Nokia/NSB | We are a bit confused by this proposal. For example, we understand for the disucssion that Alt 1-1 is mostly about reporting information like beam shape, etc to the LMF. This is not the same as addressing beam orientation (which in our view should be handled by reference UE/device). So we think that angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation are not necessarily needed to be grouped together as is currently reflected. These can be parallel topics in our view. Why do we group them here?On Alt 1-2 we think it should be noted that the decision to make the DL-AoD measurement at LMF was not made by RAN1 in Rel-16. So we likely need to involve RAN2/3 before concluding on that aspect if we evetually go in the direction of Alt 1-2. |
| CATT | Support proposal 10c. We think providing the gNB beam/antenna information to LMF or UE can help both angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation impairement mitigation for DL-AoD. Moreover, we prefer some modificaitons as follows:Proposal 10c regarding support of angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation impairement mitigation for DL-AoD, select from the following option:* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD / beam orientation impairement mitigation is supported in Rel-17 for both UE-A and UE-B
	+ **Alt.1-1 Providing~~Reporting~~ the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF (for UE-A) or to the UE (for UE-B).**
		- FFS the details of contents of ~~what/how to report~~ the beam/antenna information.
		- FFS the details of ~~what/~~how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supported
* Alt.2 beam orientation impairments mitigation and Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17
 |
| OPPO | Ok with principle to consider thos options:Proposal 10c regarding support of angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation impairement mitigation for DL-AoD, considering ~~select from~~ the following options:* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD/ TRP beam orientation impairement mitigation is supported in Rel-17 for both UE-A and UE-B
	+ **Alt.1-1 Reporting the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF (for UE-A) or to the UE (for UE-B).**
		- FFS the details of what/how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supported
* Alt.2 beam orientation impairments mitigation and Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We have similar feeling to Nokia that angle calculation for DL-AoD is not so relevant to beam orientation correction. Given we already made the following agreement, I wonder whether we still need beam orientation impairments.Agreement:* Study specification impact for enabling a reference device with known location to support the following functionalities:
	+ Measure DL PRS and report associated measurements (e.g., RSTD, Rx-Tx time difference, RSRP) to the LMF;
	+ Transmit SRS and enable TRPs to measure and report measurements (e.g., RTOA, Rx-Tx time difference, AOA) associated with the reference device to the LMF;
	+ FFS: The details of the signalling, the measurements, the parameters related to the Rx and Tx timing delays;
	+ FFS: The report of device location coordinate information to the LMF if the LMF does not have the information
	+ FFS: The device with the known location being a UE and/or a gNB
	+ FFS: Precision to which location of reference device is known
* Note: RAN1 assumes using these enhancements for the purpose of network synchronization is NOT within the scope of the WI

In response to Nokia, we think RAN2/RAN3 may be involved if eventually we go with Alt.1-2, but I think a late-stage LS should be sufficient, which I believe could be done by adding some new parameters in the higher layer parameter list. |
| Sony | We are fine with Proposal 10c |
| Qualcomm | Followin up to what HW’s pointed out, do we need the debate the „beam orientation mitigation“ given the agreement above? Why dont we just clarify that the above agreement includes the aspect of angle measurement calibration, and focus this proposal 10c on the AoD calculation enhancement? Either way, we are OK with Proposal 10c evne if we keep the „beam orientation mitigation“ inside. |
| CMCC | Share similar views as NOK and HW that mitigation of beam orientation seems a different thing with the calculation enhancement. Otherwise, we are fine with the Proposal 10c. |
| LG | We are fine with proposal 10-c. There are some typosProposal 10c regarding support of angle calculation enhancement and beam orientation impair~~e~~ment mitigation for DL-AoD, select from the following option:* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD / beam orientation impair~~e~~ment mitigation is supported in Rel-17 for both UE-A and UE-B
 |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | To QC, in our understanding, the reference device reporting RSRP (or what first path RSRP) to LMF, or the reference device transmitting SRS for gNB to measure AoA, given the AoA/AoD of the reference device is already known can serve the functionality of beam orientation/panel orientation calibration, although the first FFS only mentions Rx and Tx timing delays.Our suggestion would be to amend the first FFS bullet of the agreement, e.g.* FFS: the details of the signalings, the measurement, the parameters related to the Rx and Tx timing delays, the parameters related to beam/panel orietation

And we only focus on AoD angle calculation enhancement in Proposal 10c. |
| Intel  | Support the proposal 10c in principle. Agree to focus the proposal on the AOD enhancements only and do not mix it with the beam orientation correction issue (Aspect #8). |
| ZTE | Agree with Huawei, this proposal should only focus on AoD angle calculation enhancement. |

#### Summary of 3rd round of comments and updated proposal

Based on the comments, some companies have an issue with the inclusion of the beam orientation error issue. Since it has some overlap with the issue of reference device and calibration (as noted by Huawei), it is proposed to remove it. The beam orientation error issue may be revisited in a later meeting if we think the current agreement are not enough.

* Small rewording based on CATT comment on alt 1-1
* Change “select” to “consider” (Oppo)
* Removed beam orientation (comments from Huawei, Qualcomm, CMCC, nokia, zte, intel)

the following rewording is proposed:

Proposal 10d regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, consider the following option:

* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is supported in Rel-17 for both UE-A and UE-B
	+ **Alt.1-1 Providing the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF (for UE-A) or to the UE (for UE-B).**
		- FFS the details of contents of the beam/antenna information.
		- FFS the details of how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supported
* Alt.2 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17

#### fourth round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **LG** | For clarification, it is prefer to modify UE-A and UE-B to UE-assisted and UE-based as discussed in the previous GTW session. Regarding Alt.1, based on our understanding, the overhead from UE side can be different between UE-assisted and UE-based, which should be considered for study. In Alt 1-1, we prefer to discuss UE-assisted rather than UE-based. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | To LGE, how about the following change.Proposal 10d regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, consider the following option:* Alt.1 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is supported in Rel-17
	+ **Alt.1-1 Providing the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF.**
		- FFS the details of contents of the beam/antenna information.
		- FFS the details of how to report the beam/antenna information.
		- Note: The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD
	+ Alt.1-2 Angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ FFS: Applicability of Alt.1 to either or both of UE-assisted DL-AoD and UE-based DL-AoD
* Note: Alt.1-2 could be down prioritized to Alt.1-1 if Alt.1 is supportedAlt.2 Angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is not supported in Rel-17
 |
| **CATT** | We share the same view with LG and Huawei, with regard to the overhead of providing beam/antenna information to UE for UE-based solution. And the updated Proposal 10d from Huawei above is fine for us. |
| **LG 2** | we are generally fine with HW‘s propsoal, but we have minor suggestion for FFS as follows:* **FFS: Applicability of Alt.1 to either or both of UE-assisted DL-AoD and UE-based DL-AoD**
 |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | To LGE, we are Ok with the suggestion. Changed above. |
| **Intel**  | Generally, we are OK with the proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | As we are just considering options we are okay in principle but to be honest the structure of the proposal is confusing so we suggest a modification here (we hope that this more accurately reflects the situation and did not intend to change the meaning):Proposal 10d Regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, consider the following options:* **Option 1: Support providing the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF.**
	+ FFS the details of contents of the beam/antenna information.
	+ FFS the details of how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Note: The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD
* Option 2: Support angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Option 2 could be down prioritized to Option 1 if supported
* FFS: Applicability of both options to either or both of UE-assisted DL-AoD and UE-based DL-AoD
 |
| Apple | Few further questions: 1) In Alt1. Can we have more specific about the additional (on top of Rel-16) information that is provided? In my understanding from Rel-16, LMF is able to associate each PRS-RSRP report by UE tot he corresponding PRS beam. 2) in Alt 1-2, where gNB calculates the AoD, does it mean UE reports the RSRP to gNB and then gNB/TRP, instead of LMF, calculates the AoD? |
| Qualcomm | OK generally with the updated proposal, evne though Opt. 2 was debated iN Rel-16 in RNA2/RAN3. Can we at least add a sentence related to this option that: „Input from other WGs may be needed to evaluate this enhancement“.They have already debated this in rel-16, and if indeed it needs to be reconsidered for rel-17, we believe any new arguments should be also made in the corresponding WGs. To **Apple**: Rel-16 does not have any beam information (except the booresight directions in the UE-B Assistance Data). To actually do RSRP-based AOD, one needs to have this information to do a reasonable job. In QC’s paper we talked about this in Secton 3 (R1-2001470), not repeating the whole section here.Overall, from our side, the proposal 10d is really needed, we actually consider it the most basic enhancement in this summary, and think that Rel-16 DL-AoD specification rather broken without this (and i assume any companies that showed results on rel-16 AoD, likely used the asusmption that somehow the LMF, through proprietary signaling between gNBs <-> LMF, has received such information). To Alt. 1-2: Yes UE sends the measurements to LMF, LMF forwards to gNB, gNB computes AoD, and forwards the measurements back. |
| vivo | We repeated our concerns of ‘antenna information ‘ here.And we got some replies from Huawei in email, if Huawei’s explanation is a common understanding, that is, the antenna information is for reducing the overload of beam information, we are okay with that. And then, The note should be captured (The antenna information is related to reducing the overhead of beam information). Otherwise, can proponents list some antenna information here to make this proposal more clear? |

#### Summary of 3rd round of comments and updated proposal

the following proposal is based on nokia’s revision, with wording from qualcomm and vivo also added:

Proposal 10e Regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, consider the following options:

* **Option 1: Support providing the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF.**
	+ FFS the details of contents of the beam/antenna information.
	+ FFS the details of how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Note: The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD
	+ Note2: The antenna information is related to reducing the overhead of beam information
* Option 2: Support angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Option 2 could be down prioritized to Option 1 if supported
	+ Note 2: Input from other WGs may be needed to evaluate this enhancement.
* FFS: Applicability of both options to either or both of UE-assisted DL-AoD and UE-based DL-AoD

#### fifth round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support with the following clarification due to ambiguity.Proposal 10e Regarding support of angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD, consider the following options:* **Option 1: Support providing the gNB beam/antenna information to the LMF.**
	+ FFS the details of contents of the beam/antenna information.
	+ FFS the details of how to report the beam/antenna information.
	+ Note: The gNB beam/antenna information can be provided to the UE for UE-based DL-AoD
	+ Note2: The antenna information is related to reducing the overhead of beam information
* Option 2: Support angle report from gNB to LMF.
	+ Note: Option 2 could be down prioritized to Option 1 if angle calculation enhancement for DL-AoD is supported
	+ Note 2: Input from other WGs may be needed to evaluate this enhancement.
* FFS: Applicability of both options to either or both of UE-assisted DL-AoD and UE-based DL-AoD
 |

### Aspects #11 TRP antenna Array configuration signalling

#### Summary and FL proposal

In [21] and [17], it is proposed to provide additional information on the TRP antenna array configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [21] | Proposal 4* + **Support reporting of two DL-AOD azimuth angles *φ* and (π – *φ*) in addition to the zenith angle *θ* from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE)**

Proposal 5 **(Alternative to Proposal #4)*** + **Specify the TRP antenna array orientation in the local coordinate system**

Proposal 6* + **Support DL-AOD *φ’* = arcsin(sin(*φ*)×sin(*θ*)) angle reporting for the linear horizontal array, where *φ* is the azimuth angle of departure and *θ* is the zenith angle of departure**
	+ **Further discuss if it is necessary to indicate information on antenna array structure/type**
 |
| [17] | ***Proposal 2: For the purpose of enabling a phase-difference-based DL-AoD method, support the following signaling enhancements:**** ***gNBs’ UPA antenna Configuration, PMI Codebook configuration & their association to the transmitted PRS resources***
* ***Note: Enhancement should be applicable to both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AoD***
 |

For both UE-based and UE-assisted DL-AoD, and for the purpose of supporting linear horizontal array types of gnodeB antenna configuration, consider the following options:

* + Support reporting of two DL-AOD azimuth angles *φ* and (π – *φ*) in addition to the zenith angle *θ* from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE)
	+ Specify the TRP antenna array orientation in the local coordinate system
	+ Support DL-AOD *φ’* = arcsin(sin(*φ*)×sin(*θ*)) angle reporting for the linear horizontal array, where *φ* is the azimuth angle of departure and *θ* is the zenith angle of departure
	+ Support of signalling gNBs’ UPA antenna Configuration, PMI Codebook configuration & their association to the transmitted PRS resources

#### First round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | This proposal is not clear. Are all the sub-bullets supported for the purpose of ‘supporting linear horizontal array types of gNB antenna configuration’ in the main bullet ? Further clarification may be needed. For the first sub bullet, could proponents explain which type of panel can receive the signal from both the front side and backside? |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | The first bullet has some overlap with angle ambiguity in ePos-02. We suggest to make it general.The second bullet, we wonder why would the LCS setup based on TRP array orientation.The third bullet, we think, depends on whether gNB can report the angle calculation back to LMF, i.e. Aspect #9 (Second one, should be Aspect #10) is the premise.The four bullet, to our understanding, has some overlap with Aspect #9 (First one). If the beam shape overhead can be reduced using parameterized configuration. |
| ZTE | Our understanding is that the beam-shape information is highly related antenna configuration. So, we should decide first whether beam-shape related enhancement is supported or not. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think it is hard to group/discuss these different proposals into one big proposal.  |
| CATT | It looks like there are some overlaps between this proposal with previous proposals. We prefer to narrow down the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | * The support of signaling of the antenna config, & codebook confirmation is not for the purpose of ULA. It is assistance data enhancement for DL-AoD for the purpose of enabling phase-difference-based AoD.
* For UE-A DL-AoD, the gNB does not report an AoD to the LMF, so I am confused about the first subbelt.
* I thought the discussion here can be more generic. Do we see reasons of having better knowledge of the TRP antenna configuration/orientation at the LMF or the UE?
	+ At least from our side, such a knowledge, together with a mapping of PRS resources into the antenna configuration (similar as it is happening for CSIRS) would enable a phase-difference-based DL-AoD and determining the DL-AoD directly at the UE.
 |
| Apple | Open to further discuss, maybe with lower priority. |
| LG | We think the proposal is intended to contain too much. For example, first and third bullet are related with reporting perspective. Fourth bullet is intended to support of antenna configuration itself. As vivo’s comment, it seems that further clarification may be needed and each bullets need to be grouped and discussed separately.  |
|  |  |

#### Summary of 1st round of comments and updated proposal

The proposal is seen as too large, so it is proposed to break it in the following proposals:

Proposal 11a to support measurement ambiguity resolution

* + Option 1: Support reporting of two DL-AOD azimuth angles *φ* and (π – *φ*) in addition to the zenith angle *θ* from gNB to LMF (or from gNB to UE)
	+ Option 2: Specify the TRP antenna array orientation in the local coordinate system

Proposal 11b: Support DL-AOD *φ’* = arcsin(sin(*φ*)×sin(*θ*)) angle reporting for the linear horizontal array, where *φ* is the azimuth angle of departure and *θ* is the zenith angle of departure

Proposal 11c Support of signalling gNBs’ UPA antenna Configuration, PMI Codebook configuration & their association to the transmitted PRS resources

#### second round of comments

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

**Proposal 11a**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Could proponents explain which type of panel can receive the signal from both the front side and backside? |
| ZTE | Generally TRP will not receive signal from backside since it only covers one sector (e.g. 1200). |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 2 is already supported in the current spec, no? Not sure this proposal is needed.  |
| CATT | We prefer this proposal as low priority. |
|  |  |

**Proposal 11b**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | In general, angle reporting isn’t supported for AoD methods. So it is too early to enhance reporting which angle. |
| ZTE | Similar topic is under discussion in AI 8.5.2 for ULA deployment. In our view, DL-AOD is generally for high frequency scenario, we doubt that whether TRP will have such antenna configuration. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with angle reporting from UE to the gNB, but what is mainly needed is assistance data to be able to do so. This discussion seems to be related to other elements, e.g. #1 has angle reporting as an option that can be discussed further. Whether the exact formulation shown above is really needed, is a second detail from our side.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree with vivo’s comments.  |
| CATT | We prefer this proposal as low priority. |

**Proposal 11c**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | The proposal is unclear. The signaling is for LMF or UE? |
| Qualcomm | Signaling from gNB to LMF (UE-A) and LMF-> (UE-B). Suggest to merge the tne TRP antenna configuraiton signaling to #9 (as already done in a suggested propsoal there), since it is related to ways to parametrize the antenna config/beams so that the UE can derive better measurements and help with AoD. |
| CATT | It looks like this proposal is related to Proposal 10b, suggest to merge Proposal 11c to Proposal 10b(Alt-1). |
| FL | The latest proposal for aspect #10, 10c, has the signalling details FFS. Would it be ok to leave it as it is or should be explicitely add the wording of 11c? |
| LG | We think that the issue need to be postponed since aspect #10 covers 11c. |

#### Summary of 2nd round of comments and updated proposal

Regarding proposal 11a and 11b: the feedback is that the proposals are either low priority, already supported (11a), or too early in the discussion. Therefore, it is proposed to postpone discussing these proposal to future meetings, when the issues ahave matured further.

Regarding proposal 11c: we could close the proposal, if there is consensus that proposal 10c covers it.

## Other Aspects for discussion

The following aspects have been proposed by one company. It is proposed to delay discussion on these issues to give a chance to other companies to consider these issues in future contributions.

### Aspect #8 Differential angle reporting

In [15] it was proposed to study angle difference measurement for the AOA of DL PRS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [15] | ***Proposal 2: Support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.*** ***Proposal 3: aspects of PRS resource configuration, DL transmission beam indication and UE measurement and report needs to be considered in order to support differential beamforming technique for DL-AOD positioning methods.***  |

### Signalling of preferred SSB

In  [8], it is proposed that the you may signal the preferred SSB to obtain timing mesasurements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [8] | ***Proposal #4:**** Support enhancements to enable the UE can use the reception beam in a direction corresponding to the minimum propagation time.
	+ E.g., the reporting of the preferred SSB to obtain timing measurements.
 |

### UE specific beam refinement

In [1] and [6] it was proposed to support configuring UE specific beam refinement on DL PRS resouces:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [1] | Proposal 1: To enhance the performance of DL AoD, support UE-specific beam refinement on DL PRS resource for DL-AoD measurement. |
| [6] | ***Proposal 5***: Consider two stage beam-sweeping for DL-AoD to improve angular resolution in a time and power efficient manner. |

### UE orientation reporting

In [9], it was proposed to include the UE orientation in the information reported to the LMF from the UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [9] | **Proposal 2: The UE should report its orientation information to the LMF.****Proposal 3: Define conditions for the UE to report the orientation.** |

### UE panel ID reporting

In [9], it was proposed to include the UE panel ID in the information reported to the LMF from the UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Proposal |
| [9] | **Proposal 1: Include Rx panel ID in the measurement report.** |

# Conclusion

Aspects #1, #3, #6 and #10 were discussed in GTW sessions. Aspects #5, #8,#9 were merged in other aspects. Aspects #2 and #4 were not treated and it was agree to postpone these discussion to a future meeting.
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