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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT113-e][612][POS] LPP proposals (Nokia)

 Scope: Discuss P1-P7 of R2-2101889 and determine which CRs are agreeable.

 Intended outcome: Summary in R2-2102105

 Deadline: Thursday 2021-02-04 0200 UTC

In this email discussion the following contributions are discussed to decide if these contributions or proposals in the contributions can be agreed. Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of these contributions and for Rapporteur’s comments/suggestions. Please also check the contribution themselves before answering the questions in this email discussion.

[R2-2100405](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100405.zip) Correction on NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData, CATT

[R2-2100406](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100406.zip) Corrections on the field description of commonIEsProvideAssistanceData in TS37.355, CATT

[R2-2101382](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101382.zip) Correction of A-GNSS Periodical retrieval of Assistance Data, Ericsson

[R2-2101384](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101384.zip) LPP Layer interaction with lower layers for Positioning Frequency layer and Measurement Gap, Ericsson

[R2-2101827](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101827.zip) Correction to the need code for downlink LPP message, Huawei, HiSilicon

[R2-2101828](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101828.zip) Discussions on PRS configurations, Huawei, HiSilicon

[R2-2101858](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101858.zip) Discussion on the need for fields in the uplink LPP message, Huawei, HiSilicon

# 2 Discussion

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

In [R2-2100405](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100405.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

1. Delete ul-srs from the IE nr-AdType within the NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData message
2. Add a field description for the IE *nr-AdType* in the *NR-Multi-RTT-RequestAssistanceData*

**Question 1**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2100405](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100405.zip)?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | No | Agree Rapporteur’s analysis in R2-2101889.1 NBC change;2 Agree ul-SRS is not transferred via LPP. But It can be used by the UE to trigger the LMF to send the request to serving gNB, just in case. So nothing wrong? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 1**: TBD.

**Proposal 1**: TBD.

## 2.2 commonIEsProvideAssistanceData IE

In [R2-2100406](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100406.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

1. Delete the field descriptions of *commonIEsProvideAssistanceData* in the *ProvideAssistanceData* message.

**Rapporteur’s comments**: The Rapporteur’s comments in the summary in [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) suggested that a field description be added instead of deleting the existing field description. After further investigations, Rapporteur noticed that the *commonIEsProvideAssistanceData* IE in Section 6.4.2 has a description for this IE. So, deleting the field description as suggested in the CR is also an option.

**Question 2**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2100406](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2100406.zip)? If the answer is No, please suggest a text proposal for the field description of *commonIEsProvideAssistanceData* and any preferences as to which releases should we introduce the changes in.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 2**: TBD.

**Proposal 2**: TBD.

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

In [R2-2101384](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101384.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

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

**Question 3**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2101384](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101384.zip)?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 3 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | No | The intention is ok. But changes (start performing Location measurement Indication procedure )are not correct. The LPP has no idea whether RRC measurement gap can work or not. The LPP can only indicate RRC the need of RSTD measurement and corresponding PRS configurations.So we should use OTDOA similar changes. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 3**: TBD.

**Proposal 3**: TBD.

## 2.4 Missing need codes

In [R2-2101827](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101827.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

1. Add the need code for the fields *nr-DL-PRS-ResourceID-List*, *associated-DL-PRS-ID*, *dl-PRS-BeamInfoSet* under *TRP-LocationInformation* and *BeamInfo*, *dl-PRS-QCL-Info*

**Question 4**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2101827](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101827.zip)? Are you aware of any other fields that is missing the need code? If so, please list those as part of your comments.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | Yes | Ok with the corrections. But in the coversheet, affected clause is missing. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 4**: TBD.

**Proposal 4**: TBD.

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

In [R2-2101828](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101828.zip) the following changes are proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1: Accept the changes regarding DL-PRS related IEs.*** **Clarify that the numbering space for *NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* is per TRP across multiple frequency layers**
* **Modify the sentence "*qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specifies the DL-PRS Resource Set ID" to "*qcl-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID* specifies DL-PRS Resource Set configured for the same TRP whose DL-PRS resource serve as the source reference signal for the DL-PRS"**
* **Change the name *nrMaxSetsPerTRP* to *nr-MaxSetsPerTRP-PerFrequencyLayer***
* **In the sentence "The IE *NR-SelectedDL-PRS-IndexList* is used by the location server to provide the selected Frequency Layer index of *nr-DL-PRS-AssistanceDataList* to the target device.", it should be the index of PRS resources**

**Proposal 2: Accept the following changes regarding the *associated-DL-PRS-ID*.*** **In the IE *NR-DL-PRS-BeamInfo***
	+ **In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, remove the sentence "The beam information from the associated TRP is considered to be in GCS if the lcs-gcs-translation-parameter field is not provided, and to be in LCS if the lcs-gcs-translation-parameter field is provided."**
	+ **In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, clarify that when the field is present, the fields *lcs-GCS-TranslationParameter* and *dl-PRS-BeamInfoSet* shall be absent.**
	+ **In the field desctiption for lcs-GCS-TranslationParameter, clarify that the field’s fucntion for the current TRP is applicable when the field associatedDL-PRS-ID is absent**
* **In the IE *NR-TRP-LocationInfo***
	+ **In the field description of *associatedDL-PRS-ID*, clarify that when the field is present, the field *trp-Location* shall be absent.**
 |

**Question 5**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2101828](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101828.zip)? Please refer to the specific proposal number and relevant field/IE being addressed in the proposal when entering your comments or if agreeing to the changes proposed for a subset of the field/IE mentioned in the proposals.

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 5 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | Partially | P11 there is definition on this as "The IE NR-DL-PRS-ResourceSetID defines the identity of a DL-PRS Resource Set of a TRP.", we could clarify this is across mulitple freqncy layers. 2 We do not need to change the name of "nrMaxSetSPerTrp", we just need to clarify this is per frequency under the definition part. nrMaxSetsPerTrp-r16 INTEGER ::= 2 -- Maximum resource sets for one TRP3 ok4 okP2 not sure. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 5**: TBD.

**Proposal 5**: TBD.

## 2.6 Need code and conditional presence tag in fields in UL messages

In [R2-2101858](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101858.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1: Add the sentence in the R16 spec that “For the fields that are included in both uplink and downlink message, the need code is omitted if it is included in the message in the uplink, while the field remains optional.”** **Proposal 2: RAN2 should discuss whether the same sentence should be added for the legacy LTE spec from R9 to R14 and legacy NR spec R15.****Proposal 3: Adopt the text proposal in section 4.2 for the conditional presence tag in the uplink message introduced in R16.****Proposal 4: RAN2 should decide whether the same corrections should be made to the legacy fields introduced in LTE for LPP spec.** |

**Question 6**: Do you agree with the proposals in [R2-2101858](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101858.zip)?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 6 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel |  | For UL message:1 if need code is used for IEs in UL message, network should omit it. I assume it is normal behavior in network, and do not need to change, especially considering this was from R9.2 Change condition to field descriptions, seems ok. But does not need to update legacy spec. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 6**: TBD.

**Proposal 6**: TBD.

## 2.7 Signalling tracking area code for periodical assistance data transfer/delivery

In [R2-2101382](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101382.zip) the following changes are proposed (Please see [R2-2101889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101889.zip) for a summary of the issues):

1. Tracking Area Code have been added and capabilty have been added for peridoical assistance data procedure

**Question 7**: Do you agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2101382](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_113-e/Docs/R2-2101382.zip)?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 7 |
| Company | Yes/No | Technical Arguments/Suggested Text Changes/CR cover issues |
| Intel | ? | For the change, there should not be additional efforts for the UE to read TAC since it is contained together with CGI. But it still needs the change from UE, i.e. legacy UE cannot support it. Seems this is not correction but enhancement.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Summary 7**: TBD.

**Proposal 7**: TBD.

# 3 Conclusion

TBD

# Annex – Contact Points

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Nokia (Rapporteur) | Mani Thyagarajan | mani.thyagarajan@nokia.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |