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# Introduction

This document summarizes remaining issues proposed in company contributions of AI 9.2.4 for the following objective in Rel-19 WI of NR MIMO Phase 5:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Specify enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenarios, assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios, without changing existing cell definition or defining a new cell (e.g. UL-only cell), assuming the Rel-17/18 unified TCI framework and fully reusing the legacy QCL/UL spatial relation rules, targeting FR1 and FR2
	1. Two closed-loop PC adjustment states for SRS, both separate from PUSCH; and pathloss offset configurations for pathloss calculation to UL TRP(s), when the pathloss RS is from DL sTRP.
 |

# Issues for Discussions

## Pathloss Offset

**Offline Consensus**: For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios, study and decide the value range and candidate values of PL offset value

**Proposal 1.4:** For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios, study whether/how to consider PL offset in PHR calculation, including Type 1 PHR based on actual PUSCH transmission, Type 1 PHR based on reference PUSCH, Type 3 PHR based on actual SRS and Type 3 PHR based on reference SRS

* FFS: Whether or not PHR triggering conditions need to be modified to account for PL offset.

**Proposal 1.5:**

Study whether/how to facilitate gNB’s determination of the value of PL offset from specification point of view

**Updated Proposal 1.7a**: For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario,

* When rel-17 unified TCI/ICBM is configured:
	+ For FR1: one joint TCI state or one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
* When rel-18 unified TCI is configured:
	+ For FR1: up to two joint TCI states or one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI states can be applied to the system.
	+ Note: one DL TCI state means only one DL TCI state is applicable.

**Updated Proposal 1.7b**: To facilitate the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario, study whether/how to support a mixed TCI mode of joint TCI state + UL TCI state for FR1 and FR2 additionally:

* In the mixed TCI mode: a joint TCI state + a UL TCI state can be mapped to a TCI field codepoint, and the indicated UL TCI state is applied on UL transmission towards the UL TRP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments** |
| Mod00 | Please share your views/inputs on the issues 1.xRe 1.4b: Samsung commented that 1.4b needs more discussion because they think Type 3 PHR is reported for CC without PUSCH-config and the case of CC without PUSCH-Config is not valid for this UL TRP scenario. I would like to hear your views on this.Re 1.7a: slightly wording. I guess no one comments that the proposal 7.1a is wrong technically and the only concern is whether this conclusion is needed. Some companies did propose to make it clear.Re 1.7b: the views diverged. I think we can conclude to first study this mixed TCI mode for the current moment.  |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1.3 and Proposal 1.4a:** Generally, we think it is immature/unsafe to rush into the formula of PL offset application at the current stage, we suggest to postpone this discussion to Rel-19 maintenance phase. Nevertheless, we think it is worth to discuss all parts of FFS in Proposal 1.3 and Proposal 1.4a, we suggest to discuss them separately due to there is no explicit dependency among them.**Proposal 1.4b:** Not needed. As mentioned by companies in round-1, Type 3 PHR cannot be existed as per the following excerpt in TS 38.213.

|  |
| --- |
| **7.7.3 Type 3 PH report**If a UE determines that a Type 3 power headroom report for an activated serving cell is based on an actual SRS transmission then, for SRS transmission occasion C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps2.png on active UL BWP C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps3.png of carrier C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps4.png of serving cell C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps5.jpg and if the UE is not configured for PUSCH transmissions on carrier C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps6.png of serving cell C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps7.jpg and the resource for the SRS transmission is provided by *SRS-Resource*, the UE computes a Type 3 power headroom report as C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps8.png [dB]where C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps9.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps10.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps11.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps12.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps13.png and C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps14.png are defined in clause 7.3.1 with corresponding values provided by *SRS-ResourceSet*.If the UE determines that a Type 3 power headroom report for an activated serving cell is based on a reference SRS transmission then, for SRS transmission occasion C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps15.png on UL BWP C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps16.png of carrier C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps17.png of serving cell C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps18.jpg, and if the UE is not configured for PUSCH transmissions on UL BWP C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps19.png of carrier C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps20.png of serving cell C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps21.jpg and a resource for the reference SRS transmission is provided by *SRS-Resource*, the UE computes a Type 3 power headroom report as  C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps22.png [dB]where C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps23.png is an SRS resource set corresponding to *SRS-ResourceSetId = 0* for UL BWP C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps24.png and C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps25.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps26.png, C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps27.png and C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps28.png are defined in clause 7.3.1 with corresponding values obtained from *SRS-ResourceSetId = 0* for UL BWP C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps29.png. C:\Users\10262958\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml19728\wps30.png is computed assuming MPR=0 dB, A-MPR=0 dB, P-MPR=0 dB and TC =0 dB. MPR, A-MPR, P-MPR and TC are defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1], [8-2, TS 38.101-2] and [8-3, TS 38.101-3].  |

**Proposal 1.5:** Fine to further study even though we think it should be up to gNB implementation.**Proposal 1.7a:** Agree to FL’s assessment and the refinement for clarification.**Proposal 1.7b:** Not needed. It deviates from the statement in WID that “… assuming the Rel-17/18 unified TCI framework and fully reusing the legacy QCL/UL spatial relation rules…”. |
| QC | **Proposal 1.3/1.4**: Regarding the PC formula and PHR formula, agree with ZTE that this can be discussed during R19 maintenance phase. Regarding the second FFS under proposal 1.4, i.e., “FFS: Whether or not PHR triggering conditions in 38.321 need to be modified to account for PL offset.”, the PHR triggering condition is RAN2 issue, it is strange to FFS this in RAN1.**Proposal 1.5:** Support.**Updated proposal 1.7a**: Regarding the Note, this is something new. We’d like to put this as FFS.**Updated proposal 1.7b**: The current Rel.17 and Rel.18 TCI framework can already work well. We don’t see the need to introduce a new TCI framework which is out of the scope. |
| Nokia | Proposal 1.3: we supportProposal 1.4a: we support. We think the triggering conditions need to be updated. We suggest updating the FFS as “ FFS: Type1 PHR Triggering conditions when the PHR is intended for the UL TRP in the asymmetric deployment’’Proposal 1.4b: We support. We think the triggering conditions need to be updated. We suggest updating the FFS as “ FFS: Type 3 PHR Triggering conditions when the PHR is intended for the UL TRP in the asymmetric deployment’’Proposal 1.5: It is up to the network implementation. we are ok with exploringProposal 1.7a: we are fine with itProposal 1.7b we are fine with it |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.3/1.4:** Support in principle, but it is better up to editor. The only thing we can agree is that whether PL offset value is non-negative value or not, and configuration granularity, which is partially agreed on PL offset associated with TCI state for PUSCH, PUCCH, and SRS which is per BWP/CC.**Proposal 1.4b:** Not support. Our understanding is that Type 3 PHR is reported in a UL carrier in a serving cell when PUSCH-config is not provided, but now we consider UL TRP where there is no DL transmission, then it does not make sense without PUSCH configuration in this scenario. We didn’t see the necessity of this proposal.**Proposal 1.5:** We are fine.**Proposal 1.7a:** We are fine.**Proposal 1.7b:** We are fine with further discussion. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1.3, 1.4a, 1.4b:We support FL’s intension, but we think the specification text details need more careful study. At this phase, it is not clear with all possible signaling which can update PL offset and accordingly which indices are necessary.Proposal 1.5We are fine to further study even we think the determination of PL offset is up to gNB implementation. Proposal 1.7aThis should be a proposal instead of conclusion. And we support the FL proposal.Proposal 1.7bWe support the FL proposal. |
| Docomo | **Proposal 1.3/1.4a/1.4b:** Support. It cannot be up to editor. We need to decide the value range of PL-offset, and it needs a common understanding that PL-offset is applied as PL-PL-offset or PL+PL-offset.**Proposal 1.7a:** It should be agreement. We think the agreement has impact to the following text.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1.5 Antenna ports quasi co-location[…]When a UE is configured with *dl-OrJointTCI-StateList* and is having two indicated *TCI-states*, if the UE receives a TCI codepoint mapped with a sub-set of first and second *TCI-State(s)* and/or a sub-set offirst and second *TCI-UL-State(s)*, the UE shall update the first/second *TCI-State(s)* and/or first/second *TCI-UL-State(s)* mapped to the TCI codepoint, when applicable, and keep the previously indicated first/second *TCI-State(s)* and/or first/second *TCI-UL-State(s)* that is/are not updated by the TCI codepoint. |

**Proposal 1.7b:** We are fine. |
| vivo | **Proposal 1.3/1.4a:** We share similar views as QC and ZTE. It is better to discuss these proposals in mountainous phase. **Proposal 1.5:** Support.**Updated Conclusion 1.7a**: the first bullet can be conclusion for no spec impact is required. The second bullet should be a proposal. Further clarify one of two indicated joint TCI states is used for DL reception and the indicated one DL TCI state is the only DL TCI state instead of updating one of two indicated DL TCI states. We propose the following change:

|  |
| --- |
| **Updated Conclusion 1.7a**: For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario, * When rel-17 unified TCI/ICBM is configured:
	+ For FR1: one joint TCI state or one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system.

**Updated proposal 1.7a**:* When rel-18 unified TCI is configured:
	+ For FR1: up to two joint TCI states or one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
		- Note: When two joint TCI states are applied, the 1st joint TCI state is applied on DL transmission and both joint TCI states can be applied on UL transmissions
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI states can be applied to the system.
	+ Note: one DL TCI state means only one DL TCI state is applicable.
 |
|  |

 **Updated proposal 1.7b**: Not support. There is no need to introduce mixed mode. The benefit is unclear. |
| ETRI | Proposal 1.3/1.4a/1.4b: Support.Proposal 1.5: Support. How to determine the PL offset at gNB side is crucial for commercial service of this WID at least in FR2, as it is closely related to interference boosting, *out-of-synchronization,* and *unknown UL-only TRP*. For example, when a UE transmits UL signals to UL-only TRPs with the Tx power (calculated from the Macro TRP), out-of-synchronization happens because the UE does not know the locations of the UL-only TRPs. To address these out-of-synchronization and unknown UL-only TRPs, there are two solutions. Each of the 1st and 2nd solutions is for the UE to transmit the PRACH preambles and SRSs, respectively, which are headed to the pre-defined directions to find the UL-only TRPs. We prefer to the 1st solution which is robust against out-of-synchronization due to using very long CP. On the other hand, the SRSs transmission synchronized to Macro TRP may be out of uplink synchronization to some UL-only TRPs that are in the vicinity of the UE, which indicates that reusing SRS with usage BM is not enough.Proposal 1.7a: Support. |
| Mod | An offline consensus was reached in offline session And a new the old proposals 1.3/1.4a/1.4b are removed per the comments from companies.A new proposal 1.4 is added to propose we study whether/how to consider PL offset in PHR calculation |
| CATT | Proposal 1.5: Generally ok while it is our view that the wording “from spec point of view” seems unnecessary.**Updated proposal 1.7b**: Agree with QC that it is not necessary to introduce a new TCI framework which is out of the scope. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.5: Not support, it can be left to network implementation.Updated Conclusion 1.7a: The conclusion is to clarify how many DL/joint and UL/joint TCI states can be applied to DL and UL transmission in asymmetric scenario, respectively. For the second bullet of m-TRP scenario, “TCI selection” field in DCI indicates 0 or 1 can be used to indicate the first or second DL/joint TCI state is applied to DL transmission. The “note” in the second bullet can be deleted.Table 7.3.1.2.2-11: TCI selection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bit field mapped to index** | **TCI selection** |
| 0 | The first indicated joint/DL TCI state is applied to the scheduled PDSCH |
| 1 | The second indicated joint/DL TCI state is applied to the scheduled PDSCH |
| 2 | Both indicated joint/DL TCI states are applied to the scheduled PDSCH |
| 3 | Reserved |

**Updated Conclusion 1.7a**: For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario, * When rel-17 unified TCI/ICBM is configured:
	+ For FR1: one joint TCI state or one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
* When rel-18 unified TCI is configured:
	+ For FR1: up to two joint TCI states or one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
		- ~~Note: When two joint TCI states are applied, the 1~~~~st~~ ~~joint TCI state is applied on DL transmission and both joint TCI states can be applied on UL transmissions~~
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI states can be applied to the system.

Updated proposal 1.7b: Not needed.  |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1.4: OkayUpdated Conclusion 1.7a: OkayUpdated Proposal 1.7b: NOT OK |
| CMCC | Proposal 1.5: Not support, it can be left to network implementation.Updated Conclusion 1.7a: The conclusion is to clarify how many DL/joint and UL/joint TCI states can be applied to DL and UL transmission in asymmetric scenario, respectively. For the second bullet of m-TRP scenario, this can be left to network implementation, e.g., network configure same TCI state for two DL/joint TCI states, and the “note” is not needed.**Updated Conclusion 1.7a**: For the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario, * When rel-17 unified TCI/ICBM is configured:
	+ For FR1: one joint TCI state or one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + one UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
* When rel-18 unified TCI is configured:
	+ For FR1: up to two joint TCI states or one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI state can be applied to the system.
		- ~~Note: When two joint TCI states are applied, the 1~~~~st~~ ~~joint TCI state is applied on DL transmission and both joint TCI states can be applied on UL transmissions~~
	+ For FR2: one DL TCI state + up to two UL TCI states can be applied to the system.

Updated proposal 1.7b: Not needed.  |
| Transsion | Proposal 1.4&1.5: OKUpdated Conclusion 1.7a: This should be a proposal instead of conclusion. We share the similar view as Docomo that UE only need to keep up to one indicated joint or separate DL TCI state.Updated Proposal 1.7b: Not needed.  |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1.4: ok.Proposal 1.5: ok. |
| Panasonic | We support Proposal 1.4We support Proposal 1.5Conclusion 1.7a: The text is not clear. We prefer not to have a conclusion since we do not think any further clarification is needed.Proposal 1.7b: This is not needed. We prefer a simple design just like we did with the UL power control which was also not optimal in our view. Also this might be out of scope (again).  |
| Lenovo | Proposal 1.4: OKProposal 1.5: OK |
| Mod | The newly added 1.4 seems ok to companies.**Re updated 1.7a**: Looks like it is ok to all companies but with a few wording change. Add one note per vivo’s suggestion and change to “proposal” per vivo/Ericsson and the first note was deleted per CMCC’s suggestion |
| HW/HiSi | Proposal 1.4: OKProposal 1.5: Not support. It is out of the WID scope and should be based on gNB implementation. Also considering that even a few companies that support the study believe that it should be left to gNB implementation, we think agreeing on this proposal opens the door to lots of discussions just to finally arrive at the conclusion of “no consensus” or “based on gNB implementation”. We should avoid such waste of offline/online time. Updated conclusion 1.7a: Not support. We don’t see the need for such a conclusion. Previous agreements are already clear. Updated Proposal 1.7b: Not support. Out of scope of the WID. Also, Mixed TCI mode was discussed in Rel-18 and was not agreed.  |

## Closed-loop PC for SRS

**Proposal 2.1**: Support to use DCI format 1\_1 to indicate TPC command for the two SRS CLPC adjustment states of Rel19:

* FFS the detailed DCI field design, e.g., introduce 1-bit state indicator and 2-bit TPC command.
* This is subject to UE capability

**Proposal 2.5:** Study whether/how to transmit DCI format 2\_3 when multiple entries are configured in *availableSlotOffsetList*.

**Proposal 2.6**: For asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenario, regardless whether the function of SRS carrier switching is enabled or not:

* The RRC IE *SRS-CarrierSwitching* can be configured so that the DCI format 2\_3 can be used to indicate TPC for the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states in Rel-19.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments** |
| Mod00 | Please share your views/inputs on the issues 2.1 |
| ZTE | Support. |
| QC | Not support. Using DCI 1\_1/1\_0 is not efficient considering the increased DCI overhead and limited range of TPC command. |
| Nokia | Proposal 2.1: we support |
| Samsung | Not support. DCI format 2\_3 is enough to indicated TPC command. |
| Ericsson | Support. We’d like to get more discussion on DCI 1\_1/0\_1 because DCI 2\_3 will degrade the system performance on PDCCH capacity and PDSCH throughput. Separate SRS power control via DCI 1\_1 is more efficient for asymmetric deployment. comparing with the benefits on performance gained by DCI 1\_1/0\_1 supporting separate SRS CLPC, the overhead issue of adding 3 bits to the DCI 1\_1/0\_1 is of much less concern. |
| Docomo | Support. |
| vivo | Don’t support. The motivation is unclear. |
| Mod | The wording in 2.1 was updated per the discussion in offline session. However, the views are still diverged  |
| CATT | Not support but can live if the super majorities are ok. On top of that, please kindly consider the case to extend the usage of IE ***SRS-CarrierSwitching*** to configure SRS CLPC adjustment states indication when carrier switching did not happen. This is a straightforward clarification while such restriction is not necessary at all.. The implementation is up to RAN2. |
| Mod | Two more proposals (2.5 and 2.6) are added per companies’ inputs.**Re the new proposal 2.5**: Fujitsu suggested that one agreement was made in RAN1#116 meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion*** Available slot operation can be used with SRS carrier switching triggered by DCI formats 1\_1, 1\_2, and 2\_3.
* It is an error case if DCI format 2\_3 is used with more than one entry in *availableSlotOffsetList* (no spec change needed).
 |

Per this agreed conclusion, the DCI format 2\_3 cannot be used when multiple entries are configured in this RRC parameter *availableSlotOffsetList*. That might cause trouble to rel19 asymmetric deployment scenario.**Re the new proposal 2.6**: It was proposed by CATT. The reason is that: using DCI format 2\_3 needs the configuration of RRC IE *SRS-CarrierSwitching*. This RRC IE is one part of the configuration used for configuring SRS carrier switching when PUSCH is not configured and independent SRS power control from that of PUSCH. As two SRS CLPC adjustment states can be configured in a carrier with PUSCH configured, the IE *SRS-CarrierSwitching* should be extended to be used for configuring SRS CLPC adjustment states indication for the case with PUSCH configured or not and independent SRS power control from that of PUSCH, regardless whether SRS carrier switching function is enabled or not. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.5:** We thinkthat this is valid issue. Now, based on the above conclusion, if more than one entry of *availableSlotOffsetList* is configured, DCI format 2\_3 cannot be used. We support to fix this.**Proposal 2.6**: We understand that the RRC parameter/structure of DCI format 2\_3 is somehow tied with SRS carrier switching. However, we think that this is handled by gNB implementation whether SRS carrier switching is configured but not enabled. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2.1:** OK**Proposal 2.5:** OK**Proposal 2.6**: OK |
| QC2 | **Proposal 2.5**: Not support. It is already concluded in previous RAN1 meeting that “It is an error case if DCI format 2\_3 is used with more than one entry in *availableSlotOffsetList*”. This should apply for asymmetric DL/UL scenario. We don’t see the need to support available slot operation specifically for asymmetric DL/UL scenario.**Proposal 2.6**: Ok to discuss. Considering this is related to RAN2 RRC parameter configuration, one way is to send LS to RAN2 that RAN1’s understanding is that SRS-CarrierSwitching can be used for separate closed loop power control when PUSCH is configured. And whether and how to implement it is up to RAN2. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2.6: support |
| Transsion | Proposal 2.1: Not support.Proposal 2.5&2.6: OK |
| Fujitsu | **Proposal 2.1:**Since there are still a lot of details on how to use DCI 1\_1, it’s too strong saying “support to use DCI 1\_1…” at current stage. We could be open for further study.We could be ok with the following update.**Proposal 2.1**: Study whether/how ~~Support~~ to use DCI format 1\_1 to indicate TPC command for the two SRS CLPC adjustment states of Rel19:* ~~FFS the detailed DCI field design, e.g., introduce 1-bit state indicator and 2-bit TPC command.~~
* ~~This is subject to UE capability~~

**Proposal 2.5:**Support. This issue should be discussed. According to the conclusion from RAN1 #116, DCI 2\_3 could not be used if more than one entry of *availableSlotOffsetList* is configured. This is too restrictive in the scenario of asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment.@QC, the conclusion is for SRS carrier switching. Now since DCI 2\_3 is enhanced to be applicable for other cases besides SRS carrier switching, this issue should be further discussed. We can’t say the conclusion could be directly applicable to the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenario.**Proposal 2.6:**Generally fine. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 2.1: We do not support. We are not convinced that it is needed. Proposal 2.6: We support |
| Lenovo | Proposal 2.1: Do not support. The current supported DCI format 2\_3 is sufficient.Proposal 2.5: OK.Proposal 2.6: We share the same view as Samsung. This can be handled via gNB implementation. |
| Mod | **Re proposal 2.5**Support: Samsung, MTK, Transsion, Fujitsu, Lenovo, But QC suggested that we should just take the rel17 restrict and no change.**Re proposal 2.6:**Support: MTK, CMCC, Transsion, Fujitsu, Panasonic, Samsung and Lenovo suggested that this can be handled by gNB implementation. QC: send LS to notify RAN2 that SRS-CarrierSwitching can be used for separate closed loop power control when PUSCH is configured and it is up to RAN2 design. |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 2.1:** Not supportWe already have a complete solution for TPC command for the two SRS CLPC adjustment states based on DCI format 2\_3. Adding a second parallel solution based on DCI format 1\_1 is an unnecessary optimization and an over-extension of WID interpretation. Also, it is hardly justifiable to have two parallel solutions for TPC commands of Asymmetric UL/DL while the TPC command of all other cases with separate CLPC rely only DCI format 2\_3. **Proposal 2.5:** Not support the proposal at this time. Neither from the FL explanation nor from Fujitsu’s t-doc, we could not figure out what kind of trouble the above-mentioned conclusion can cause for Asymmetric UL/DL. We suggest Fujitsu and/or other proponent companies to more clearly explain the potential problem in their t-docs in the next meeting so other companies can better understand they would be agreeing to study exactly what. **Proposal 2.6:** Not support. 38.213 is very clear that DCI format 2\_3 can be used to indicate TPC for either case that PUSCH is not configured in the cell or the case of separate SRS CLPC adjustment state (see below). We agree that how to interpret DCI format 2\_3 depends on the parameters configured in *SRS-CarrierSwitching IE* but, to our understanding, nowhere in specifications says that *SRS-CarrierSwitching* IE can be configured only in the case of SRS carrier switching. This is essentially a “bad” naming issue in RAN2 and we don’t see anything required to be done in RAN1.

|  |
| --- |
|  if the UE is not configured for PUSCH transmissions on active UL BWP of carrier of serving cell , or if *srs-PowerControlAdjustmentStates* indicates separate power control adjustment states between SRS transmissions and PUSCH transmissions, and if *tpc-Accumulation* is not provided, where - The values are given in Table 7.1.1-1- is jointly coded with other TPC commands in a PDCCH with DCI format 2\_3, as described in clause 11.4 |

 |

## Others

**Proposal 3.1**: To fulfil the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenarios, support two TAs for single DCI based multi-TRP/panel and single TRP.

* Reuse Rel-18 specification of two TA for multi-DCI based multi-TRP/panel and remove the restriction that *coresetPoolIndex* needs to be configured.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments** |
| Mod00 | Please share your views/inputs on the issues 3.1 |
| ZTE | Support. |
| QC | This is out-of-scope and should be first discussed in RAN plenary. |
| Nokia | Proposal 3.1: we support |
| Samsung | Support, which is an essential feature for asymmetric MTRP scenario. |
| Docomo | Support. This is necessary enhancement for asymmetric HetNet scenario. |
| vivo | We can live with the proposal if it is discussed together with other upscoping issues. |
| ETRI | Support. This is an essential feature to address out-of-synchronization between UE and some UL-only TRPs. |
| CATT | Not support. It is clearly out of scope. |

# Proposals for Online Discussion

…

# Contributions in RAN1#117

1. R1-2403849 Discussion on Rel-19 Asymmetric mTRP Operation InterDigital, Inc.
2. R1-2403903 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios MediaTek Inc.
3. R1-2403947 Enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Huawei, HiSilicon
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