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# Introduction

This document is for the phase 1 discussion of M-TRP PUSCH and PUCCH enhancement for Rel-17. Previous FL summary versions can be found in R1-2108298 and R1-2108299.

R1-2108298 Summary#1 of Multi-TRP for PUCCH and PUSCH Moderator (Nokia)

R1-2108299 Summary#2 of Multi-TRP for PUCCH and PUSCH Moderator (Nokia)

Latest proposals are in yellow.

FL Instructions are in red text.

FL updates are in blue.

# Multi-TRP PUCCH transmission

## 2.1 Per-TRP closed loop power control

The following proposal had multiple rounds of discussion. Two issues from ZTE and vivo,

* **Issue #1**: ZTE keep on arguing that we shall discuss a scenario “two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions”. Based on the FL reading, the suggestion from ZTE is not in line with the earlier agreements (we had mentioning that per-TRP closed-loop power control valid when closed-loop indexes are different).
* **Issue #2**: vivo is arguing that text in the TS38.213 (see below under their comment), should be valid for the case with two TPC commands are configured in the DCI. In summary, if sTRP mode is active for a given PUCCH transmission, vivo mention that the other TPC command can still be used to determine sum of TPC commands. Based on FL reading, as this two TPC fields are introduced in Rel-17, the text in 38.213 cannot be fully refer to the behavior corresponding to the second TPC field. If RAN1 conclude that the second field is unused, that means the indicated TPC in that field is not considered to determine sum of the TC commands.

**Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,

* When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission [or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions], the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.
* Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).

Concerns: vivo and ZTE.

@ZTE, vivo >> please reconsider your opinion.

@Others >> please provide your views on Issue #1 and #2 to convince ZTE and vivo.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **vivo** | First of all, when we reading the current spec in TS38.213  -  is a sum of TPC command values in a set  of TPC command values with cardinality  that the UE receives between  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  and  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  on active UL BWP  of carrier  of primary cell  for PUCCH power control adjustment state, where  is the smallest integer for which  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  is earlier than  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  If there is no spec change on above power control text and two TPC fields have been configured with previous agreements that each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively, do we go to this proposed conclusion 2.1-1? Our interpretation is NO. Because the TPC commands forming the cardinality between  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  and  symbols before PUCCH transmission occasion  includes all possible TPC commands.  So in our view, if no agreement is made the possible conclusion should be  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission,  ~~the other~~ both TPC fields are used ~~associated with the other “~~*~~closedLoopIndex~~*~~” value is unused~~. * Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).   In **Fl Update #3**, FL thought removing the first bullet will not result vivo’s interpretation when there are two TPC fields, which is different from Apple’s interpretation on that. However, our reading on Apple’s point is same as ours.  So we’d like ask for the companies’ interpretations and proofs on closed-loop power control when no spec change is adopted. If companies still have the same interpretation as the proposed conclusion given by FL, we think the Proposed conclusion 2.1-1 should be an agreement. |
| **Apple** | **If this is still controversial, we are ok not to agree anyting, since the agreement in last meeting is already completed as follows.**  **Agreement**   * To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUCCH with DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, a second TPC field can be configured via RRC. * When the second field is configured by RRC, a second TPC field (similar to the existing TPC field) is added in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2 (option 3).   + Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively     - FFS: Whether or not the mapping between the TPC field and the PUCCH transmissions is needed * When the second field is not configured by RRC, a single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is used in DCI formats 1\_1 / 1\_2, and the TPC value applied for the closed loop index(es) for the scheduled PUCCH * To support per TRP closed-loop power control for PUSCH with DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2, adopt the same solution as with M-TRP PUCCH schemes.   + FFS: any additional considerations * Support UE to report the capability on whether it supports the second TPC field * Note1: Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “closedLoopIndex” values are not the same for TRPs. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | **Thanks for the good discussion. I think the key point is whether the note in proposed conclusion 2.1-1, “**1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively**”, is a common understanding. We prefer to take it as an agreement.**  **Based on this common understanding, a single TPC command indicated by the corresponding TPC field shall be applied to PUCCH/PUSCH transmitted to different TRPs regarding ZTE’s scenario, i.e.,** *a same closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions**.**  **Regarding issue#2, we share the same view with vivo that if one of the TPC field is unused, it should has spec impact as vivo highlighted, otherwise, the other “unused” TPC field should be included in the** **.**  **How about the following update on conclusion:**  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission, only one TPC command carried by the corresponding TPC filed is applied to the PUCCH transmission ~~the other TPC field associated with the other “closedLoopIndex” value is unused~~. * Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). |
| **ZTE** | **On issue #1:**  Regarding the scenario “two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions”, as we mentioned many times, we think this case can be possible at least for gNB scheduling flexibility, and its indication is the same as the scenario “one single “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission”.  Basically, we respect the previous agreement specifies that “To support per TRP closed-loop power control... second TPC field can be configured via RRC... Note 1: Per TRP closed-loop power control is only applicable when the “*closedLoopIndex*” values are not the same for TRPs.”. However, it should be noted that the above two cases (highlighted as this) can be true and the corresponding indication rules should be clarified.  In order to avoid any confusion and to make progress, we suggest using the following revision to try to reach a consensus here:  **Proposed conclusion 2.1-1:** For closed-loop power control in Rel-17 MTRP PUCCH repetitions scheme,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused. * Note: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively).   @Apple: the part you highlighted in the previous agreement is only valid when two CLI are different, please pay attention to the Note 1 below. Hope that clarifies.  @Lenovo: thanks for sharing your view technically, I appreciate we are on the same page now.  **On issue #2:**  In general, if following the current specification shown by vivo, it can be a valid way to jointly use two TPC fields to indicate one TPC value for a single CLI or two same CLIs, we have also proposed and supported this way before. However, we can compromise to another way ,as FL explained above, to restrict the use of the second TPC field, which at least can ensure that the indications of the above two cases to be clear. |
| **MediaTek** | Our preference is that the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused.  We can be fine with ZTE’s update as we fail to find agreements strongly suggesting per-TRP power control is mandatory for M-TRP PUCCH/PUSCH repetition schemes. However, if it is common understanding among companies, then an explicit agreement may be good.  On the other hand, if making the proposed conclusion 2.1-1 as agreement can resolve vivo’s concern, we are fine with making it an agreement. |
| **Samsung** | For issue 1, if gNB configures the same closed loop index for both TRPs, gNB doesn’t need to configure ‘twoPUCCH-PC-AdjustmentStates’ for mTRP PUCCH repetition and RRC parameter for two TPC command field in DCI.  For issue 2, we cannot see the strong reason why TPC field for the other TRS should be used. This is Rel-17 mTRP enhancement and we are making specification to support mTRP PUCCH repetition. So, FL’s proposed conclusion doesn’t make any problem because the operation is clear. And if gNB wants to update value of closed loop index for the other TRP, gNB can transmit other DCI (e.g. DCI format 2\_2) to update that value. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Similar view with MediaTek. |
| **CMCC** | We can be fine with ZTE’s version.  We have the same view with MTK. If there is a case that the PUCCH resource for Multi-TRP transmission is configured with a same close loop index, meanwhile the second TPC is configured, we could make an agreement to clarify the behavior. |
| **CATT** | Support ZTE’s version. |
| **OPPO** | Issue 1: If the same “closedLoopIndex” values are used for multi-TRP repetitions, why does gNB configure the 2nd TPC field?  Issue 2: The current spec still needs some modification even for vivo’s interpretation because there are two TPC fields in this case and the current spec only supports on TCI field |
| **ZTE** | @Samsung, OPPO: Please note that CLI is configured by RRC per PUCCH spatial relation, and it can be possible that MAC CE activates one PUCCH resource with two spatial relations and with the same RRC-configure CLIs. Similarly, for PUSCH, due to CLI is configured per sri-PUSCH, two SRI fields in DCI may indicate two SRIs for MTRP PUSCH repetitions with the same RRC-configure CLIs. Therefore, “two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions” is the valid case for MTRP PUCCH as well as MTRP PUSCH. |
| **Intel** | the update from ZTE seems reasonable to us. |
| **FL Update #1** | **Comments on Issue #1**  @**ZTE**>> Few comments.  On “Regarding the scenario “two same “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP repetitions”, as we mentioned many times, we think this case can be possible at least for gNB scheduling flexibility, and its indication is the same as the scenario “one single “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission”.” : In the use case you suggest, the same closed-loop index is applied for both TRPs. In that case, there is no per-TRP closed loop power control and also different to assumption we had in earlier agreements. To my reading, your suggestion cannot be under “per-TRP” closed-loop power control, it is more about gNB flexibility, if yes, lets discuss that separately.  Furthermore, you seem to be agreeing that use of same *closedloopindex* is not fully inline with the earlier agreements on per-TRP close-loop power control. It should be ok to mix things in that sense.  Please check my update.  @**others**>> some companies are ok with ZTE suggestion and some are not. Please see FL update to address ZTE suggestion.  **Comments on Issue #2**  As several companies provided inputs that making an agreement (instead of conclusion) is better, I added a note to clarify the behavior suggested by majority.  **Proposal 2.1-1:** For per-TRP closed-loop power control,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with one “*closedLoopIndex*” value for single TRP transmission ~~[or with two same “closedLoopIndex” values for multi-TRP repetitions]~~, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused. * Note1: Each TPC field is for each closed-loop index value respectively (i.e., 1st /2nd TPC fields correspond to “*closedLoopIndex*” value = 0 and 1, respectively). * Note2: When the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused, the unused TPC field is not applied for any legacy procedures of calculating sum of TPC command values.   **Proposal 2.1-2:** For mTRP PUCCH (or PUSCH) repetitions schemes,   * When the second TPC field is configured and the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 (or PUSCH transmission in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2) is associated with the same “*closedLoopIndex*” value for mutli-TRP tranmission, the other TPC field associated with the other “*closedLoopIndex*” value is unused. |
| **QC** | Support both proposals. We think both are needed to avoid ambiguity in the future.  Also, we think ZTE’s suggestion makes sense, and ok with separate proposals, but both should be discussed at the same time. |
| **Futurewei** | We can support both. Does Note2 also apply to Proposal 2.1-2? Please clarify. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We support both proposals since it clarify the specific impact for the TPC filed issue. |
| **ZTE** | According to FL’s assessment, we can live with both proposal 2.1-1 and 2.1-2 as separated, and we have the similar view with QC the two proposals should be agreed at the same time.  In addition, we also think it is better to add Note2 to proposal 2.1-2 for the same clarification. |

## 2.2 Default beam for PUSCH

LG and intel concerns are not fully technical according to the FL reading. Mainly suggesting that this is not an important issue.

**Proposal 2.2:** If the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info, the spatial relation info with lower ID, is used as the default beam for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.

Concerns: LG and Intel

@Intel, LG >> please reconsider your opinion.

@Others >> please provide further justifications than just indicating “support”.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG | We don’t support. It can be addressed by scheduling restriction without additional issue.  The following is our proposal:  UE does not expect the PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is activated with two spatial relation info if PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_0. |
| **Apple** | **OK with either proposal 2.2 or LG’s proposal** |
| **QC** | **We also prefer to close this issue and have a clear behavior or restriction. We are Ok with LG’s Proposal.** |
| **ZTE** | Support proposal 2.2, which can ensure the flexibility on PUCCH resource configuration especially when considering STRP/MTRP dynamic switching. It is unreasonable to restrict the above flexibility from the side of gNB scheduling. |
| **MediaTek** | Same view as Apple. |
| **Samsung** | Support Proposal 2.2.  If the clear specification is not defined, other parts of specification for activating spatial relation info. (Single MAC CE based activation, PUCCH resource group activation etc.) can be ambiguous. On the other hand, if the restriction is introduced, we should make some spec impacts according to the restriction (e.g. restriction for PUCCH resource group activation). So, if we make Proposal 2.2 as agreement, we don’t need to make additional spec change except this and make the spec clear and no need to do more discussion for this issue. |
| **Vivo** | We think any PUCCH resource can be activated with two spatial relations without exception. The scheduling restriction is not needed. With this proposal, the network will be safe to activate the spatial relations for PUCCH resources and schedule the PUSCH with DCI format 0\_0. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Similar view with vivo. |
| **CMCC** | Support Proposal 2.2 for the sake of scheduling flexibility and less spec impact. |
| **CATT** | Support Proposal 2.2. |
| **OPPO** | Support Proposal 2.2 as it can provide more flexibility for gNB’s configuration |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are fine with LG’s version. |
| **Intel** | If this is agreed then we also have to reflect this change such that when the PUCCH group including this PUCCH resource is activated with 2 spatial relation info, this resource would be an exception – right ?  what is “lower ID” ? |
| **FL update #1** | Do not support FL proposal: **LG**  Ok with LG’s version: **Apple, QC, MTek, HW**  Not Ok with LG’s version: **ZTE, SS, vivo, DCM, CMCC, CATT, OPPO**  **@LG >>** situation should be clear. Lot of companies do not support your suggestion.  **@Intel >>** Assume a case of PUCCH resource with the lowest ID is included in a PUCCH group and activated with 2 spatial relation info, still the above agreement does not have to be different as the spatial relation with lower ID (among activated spatial relation info’s) shall be used as the default beam. There should not be any issue there. If the above is not agreed, other restrictions may be needed when grouping of PUCCH resources. Lower ID shall be the lower ID among the activated spatial relation info’s. if that is not clear, we can clarify as “the spatial relation info with lower ID among the activated spatial relation info’s” |
| **Futurewei** | Support LG’s version. We can accept the FL proposal if it is the majority view. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We support proposal 2.2 since it provide more flexibility. |

## 2.3 Frequency hopping

This discussion is extending also without any convergence. Some companies suggest more results to justify the case. FL view is that it is bit late for simulating these further, but there are certain benefits that proponents justified multiple time.

**Proposal 2.3:** When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with Scheme 1, support the following,

* If sequential mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed on slot level (as in Rel-15).
* If cyclical mapping pattern is configured, frequency hopping is performed among the repetitions with the same beam.

Concerns: ZTE, vivo, OPPO, HW

@ZTE, vivo, Oppo, HW >> as there is good support on this. RAN1 can support it. Suggest you to reconsider.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ZTE** | If all other companies can live with proposal 2.3, we can compromise it for progress. |
| **MediaTek** | We do not support Proposal 2.3. The mentioned benefits by proponents are not convincing.  To have frequency diversity and spatial diversity, sequential mapping with FH can achieve the same full diversity without additional specification impact. |
| **vivo** | Firstly, we are not convinced to support the proposal. Secondly, there could be other specification impact which needs us to fix, such as the configuration restrictions, etc.  Thus, our suggestion to go forward is to encourage companies to show the performance comparison between the two bullets to see how much benefit of the second bullet can provide before we make decision. |
| **CATT** | Support the proposal in principle. As we have mentioned for many times, according to current proposal, different frequency hopping schemes would be used for case 1) repetition=2, sequential mapping pattern is configured and case 2) repetition=2, cyclical mapping pattern is configured. In our opinion, a uniform solution should be used for repetition = 2, regardless of the configured beam mapping pattern. We prefer to change the proposal with the following FFS added:  FFS: the frequency hopping scheme when repetition number = 2 is configured. |
| **OPPO** | As we commented several times, the claimed benefits are not convincing. With this new feature, the existing solution can work well. Since we have only two remaining meeting, we prefer to focus on the completion of essential features. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We are still not convinced that the cyclical mapping plus frequency hopping is needed. The benefits of cyclic mapping plus frequency hopping can already be achieved by sequential mapping and frequency hopping. |
| **Intel** | we think that intra-slot freq. hopping can be used to achieve freq. diversity |
| **Fl update #1** | Thanks, ZTE for compromise.  CATT>> I do not understand your concern on repetition = 2. We agreed to the below.  **Agreement**  For multi-TRP PUCCH (scheme 1 and 3) and PUSCH (Type A and B) repetition, when the number of repetitions is equal to two, the first and second transmission occasion shall be associated with two TRPs, respectively (two UL beams or Power control parameter sets), regardless of the configured mapping pattern.   * Note: For M-TRP PUSCH type B, the number of repetitions refers to ‘nominal’ repetition.     **MTek, vivo, OPPO, HW, Intel** have concerns. |
| **Futurewei** | We do not support it but we won’t object it if it has majority support. |

## 2.4 Closed discussion (PUCCH grouping)

ZTE seems to be the only company with concerns. At least their concern is not clear to the FL.

**Possible Agreement (for comeback)**

For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,

* Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC.
* Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC.
* When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters, the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters.
* When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters.
* The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide.
* Note: Impacts coming from coverage enhancement work item on associating PUCCH resource with repetition factor can be discussed separately

Concerns: ZTE (support option 3).

@ZTE >> indicate your views such that we can try to resolve them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **ZTE** | Generally speaking, we understand that the remaining budget in Rel-17 is running out. To make progress, we can compromise option 1.  Technically though, our concern of option 1 is actually about the third and fourth bullets, and we have same question as LG ventilated in GTW that it is possible to mix PUCCH resources with one or two spatial relations in one PUCCH group according to option 1. As shown in the following figure, due to the third bullet only indicates the PUCCH resources with two spatial relations in one group can be updated simultaneously, but which of beam#2 and beam#3 can be referred by beam#1 to update? Likewise, the fourth bullet only indicates the PUCCH resources with one spatial relation in one group can be updated simultaneously, but which of beam#2 and beam#3 should be updated with beam#1?    To address the above issue, as we discussed in GTW session, the situation of mixing PUCCH resources with one or two spatial relations in one PUCCH group should be avoided. In other words, a PUCCH group for Rel-17 MTRP PUCCH should only includes one type of PUCCH resource (activating with one or two spatial relations). Accordingly, the total number of PUCCH groups of Rel-17 MTRP PUCCH and the respective number of PUCCH groups with PUCCH resources activated with one or two spatial relations only should be discuss additionally. All in all, we suggest:  **Possible Agreement (for comeback)**  For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters, the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters, then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide. * Note: Impacts coming from coverage enhancement work item on associating PUCCH resource with repetition factor can be discussed separately * Note: PUCCH resources in one PUCCH group should be activated with the same number of spatial relation info’s (for FR2) or sets of power control parameters (for FR1). * Note: The total number of PUCCH groups can be discussed separately.   + FFS: the method on determining the respective number of PUCCH groups with PUCCH resources activated with one or two spatial relations (for FR2)/ sets of power control arameters (for FR1). |
| **MediaTek** | Fine with the possible agreement. |
| **NTT Docomo** | Our understanding of the possible agreement regarding the cases mentioned by ZTE is   * For the 3rd bullet, resource#1 will be updated to a M-TRP PUCCH with beam#2 and beam#3 * For the 4th bullet, resource#2 will be updated to a S-TRP PUCCH with beam#1 |
| **CATT** | Support FL’s proposal. |
| **OPPO** | Ok with the proposal.  Regarding ZTE’s example, we failed to get the point. The 3rd and 4th bullets are talk about the same spatial relation info, but the examples are talking about different beams for different PUCCH resources of the same set. Please feel free correct me if I missed something. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Fine with FL’s proposal. |
| **FL Update #1** | **Offline Agreement**  For the grouping of PUCCH resources in Rel-17 multi-TRP PUCCH repetition schemes,   * Support MAC-CE activating two spatial relation info’s (for FR2) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * Support MAC-CE activating two sets of power control parameters (for FR1) for a group of PUCCH resources in a CC. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters (via a MAC-CE that activating two spatial relation info’s or a MAC-CE that activating two sets of power control parameters for a group of PUCCH resources, respectively), the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same two spatial relation info’s or two sets of power control parameters. * When the PUCCH resource is indicated with one spatial relation info or one set of power control parameters (via a MAC-CE that activating single spatial relation info or a MAC-CE that activating single set of power control parameters for a group of PUCCH resources, respectively), then the other PUCCH resources in the group also get updated to have the same spatial relation info or the same set of power control parameters. * The signalling details are up to RAN2 to decide. * Note: Impacts coming from coverage enhancement work item on associating PUCCH resource with repetition factor can be discussed separately   Discussion is over email. |

## 2.5 Scheme 2

FL views that Scheme 2 can be supported as there is not much impact on that for other work. But there are several companies who still not willing to support this. Some companies have valid reasons, but most others have not provided technical views on ‘not supporting’.

**Proposal 2.5:** Support intra-PUCCH resource beam-hopping (Scheme 2):

* Reuse frequency hopping mechanisms for number of symbols in the first / second beam-hops, and number of DMRS symbols and locations.
* The configured value of *secondHopPRB* can be the same as or different than *startingPRB*.

@All >> I copied the older replies (that has some points for discussing). Please do not reply that we can not accept (indicate your technical/procedural comments to justify it).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | Support the proposal.  In the previous meeting, some companies asked for evaluation results and comparing Scheme 2 versus Scheme 3. We have provided detailed evaluations illustrating that PUCCH schemes 2 and 3 have the same performance under both cases of with or without blockage for both RM and polar codes. Only when the UCI payload size becomes large (code rate becomes large) with Polar code and with blockage, PUCCH Scheme 3 is slightly better (1dB) than PUCCH Scheme 2. Critical UCIs (HARQ-Ack) do not have very large payload size.  Also, Scheme 2 has multiple important advantages over scheme 3:   * With PUCCH repetition (Scheme 1 or 3), UCI multiplexing is not possible, which includes the case of multiplexing different UCIs or multiplexing UCI with PUSCH. However, UCI multiplexing rules for Scheme 2 are much more flexible and those restrictive dropping rules are not needed (similar to existing PUCCH frequency hopping). * PUCCH scheme 2 has lower latency as the beam hopping is performed within a given PUCCH resource without the need to conform to sub-slot configurations while in PUCCH scheme 3, different repetitions should be in different sub-slots. * With scheme 2, other PUCCH resources (that do not need mTRP or sub-slot based transmission) can be configured flexibly. With Scheme 3, they have to remain within the sub-slot boundary as in Rel. 16.   The specification impact of Scheme 2 is very small. In our understanding, the proposal above would be enough for the functionality of Scheme 2. |
| Apple | Do not support the proposal. It seems to be redundant since we have agreed intra-slot repetition, and there is not enough time for us to consider a new transmission scheme. |
| QC | Is scheme 2 redundant? No. We explained the benefits of Scheme 2 above. Maybe companies need to explain why they think it is a redundant scheme. I did not see any company questioning the benefits mentioned above.  Is there enough time to consider Scheme 2? Yes. The proposal above takes care of the main functionality of Scheme 2. Maybe companies need to explain why there is not enough time. |
| Ericsson | One challenge on the TRP side with scheme 2 is that the two TRPs have to coordinate within a slot (as PUCCH symbols corresponding to a single PUCCH is split across the two TRPs. This type of coordination is very challenging and hence, we think Scheme 2 can be deprioritized in this release. |
| vivo | Support Scheme 2. The gain is obvious when the PUCCH is transmitted only once which has less resource requirement. Regarding the requirement on TRP coordination, it is up to the network capability to configure Scheme 2 or not. |
| QC | @ Ericsson: In Rel. 16, for PDSCH, we have SDM and FDMSchemeA which are joint encoding / rate matching. Scheme 2 for PUCCH is similar. In fact, this is another reason to have scheme 2 to allow for multiple levels of TRP coordination. The feature can be enabled/disabled depending on the TRP coordination and use case (similar to Rel. 16 MTP discussions). |
| Lenovo/MotM | Do not support. The total UCI can be received when two hops successfully are received since the UCIs are divided into two parts and there are transmitted to different TRPs. If one hop is lost due to the blockage between the UE and one TRP of TRPs, the whole UCI can’t be received. Besides, the multiplexing of PUCCH may be complicated if PUCCH Scheme 2 is supported. |
| vivo | @Lenovo: the decoding can be successful if the code rate is low enough even one hop is completely lost. Besides, Scheme 2 also provide spatial diversity gain. Both QC and us provides the gain of Scheme 2. |
| Xiaomi | We support scheme2. Besides the reasons mentioned by QC and vivo, it’s that scheme 2 can be specified for UEs not implementing sub-slot operations, since Scheme 3 support only sub-slot PUCCH. |
| Ericsson | @Qualcomm: Note that implementation complexities of Rel-16 SDM/FDMSchemeA and MTRP PUCCH scheme 2 are very different things. In the uplink case, it is more challenging because MTRP PUCCH Scheme 2 requires symbol level coordination between TRPs which is very challenging. Such symbol level coordination becomes even more challenging with higher numerologies. Note that we don’t have joint encoding/rate matching support for MTRP PUSCH in Rel-17 because of similar issues. So, we are skeptical whether this scheme is practically deployable from network implementation point of view.  Also, given the already high workload in Rel-17, we have concern with adding yet another scheme/option in Rel-17. Note that we should prioritize finalizing the details of the already agreed schemes/options which is much higher priority at this time. So, we do not support Scheme 2. |
| QC | @ Ericsson: Can you please explain how Rel. 16 SDM/FDMSchemeA does not require symbol-level coordination but PUCCH Scheme 2 does? I do not follow this part. One is about encoding, and the other is about decoding. In both cases in the absence of this coordination, latency will occur: For DL, latency is a result of having to make scheduling decision earlier. For UL, latency is a result of decoding later. In both cases, with backhaul close to ideal (Rel. 16 assumption), there is no additional latency.  In addition, mTRP PUCCH in Rel. 17 is not only about non co-located TRPs, it equally applies to multiple panels at the receiver side.  As mentioned, Scheme 2 does not have many specification impacts. It is much simpler than Scheme 3 with more benefits. Please also see the FL’s comment above wrt remaining time. We see that most of the issues are already decided and close to be complete. What is more important in our view is the technical benefits of Scheme 2 we mentioned above. |
| **Ericsson** | @Qualcomm. I think you misunderstood my comment. What I mentioned is that for multi-TRP PUCCH scheme 2, the symbol level coordination between TRPs (over the backhaul) is very challenging. With multi-TRP PUCCH scheme 2, half the symbols of one PUCCH are targeted to TRP1 and the other half the symbols of the PUCCH are targeted to TRP2. In order for the network to perform decoding, one of the TRPs will have to send the baseband data over the backhaul to the other TRP. This will increase the requirement on the backhaul capacity. This is a very challenging network implementation issue which is why we have concerns over Scheme 2. |
| **QC** | @ Ericsson: I do not follow your comment. “one of the TRPs will have to send the baseband data over the backhaul” is the case also for PUCCH Scheme 3. Do you not count LLRs as “baseband data”?  Also, we would like to understand what is more challenging compared to DL Schemes SDM and FDMSchemeA. How joint encoding and rate matching across two TRPs is less channeling than joint decoding and de-rate matching?  Furthermore, we would like to understand why the case of co-located panels / TRPs and/or split options 7-8 (lower layer split options) should be excluded from Ericsson’s point of view? If backhaul in a particular deployment is not good enough for PUCCH Scheme 2 or PUCCH scheme 3 or DL SDM scheme/FDMSchemeA (or any other single-DCI based scheme), the feature is not configured. In some other deployments, theses features can be configured. That has been the Rel. 16 principle for supporting both single-DCI and multi-DCI based mTRP models. We miss the point about the real concern here. |
| **Ericsson** | @Qualcomm:  Regarding your first question, for MTRP PUCCH Scheme 3, the network implementation can choose to do separate decoding of the repetitions in each TRP. So, there is no need to exchange LLRs over the backhaul between the two TRPs for Scheme 3. But this is not the case with MTRP Scheme 2.  Regarding your second question, I am not sure what you are trying to achieve by discussing DL Schemes SDM and FDMSchemeA. Let’s focus the discussion on MTRP PUCCH, and the need to support a third multi-TRP PUCCH scheme in Rel-17 instead.  For the third paragraph, whether we should introduce MTRP PUCCH scheme 2 for use cases such as single-TRP with multiple panels, co-located TRPs, etc. I’d like to hear more views from other concerned companies. |
| **Apple** | We still have concern for this proposal. We doubt the feasibility for this issue if there is no gap between two beams. Based on RAN4’s LS, some guard period should be needed. |
| **QC** | @ Ericsson:  For the first point: Just to clarify, for PUCCH Scheme 3 with soft combining at the network side, you are also skeptical whether it can be done practically. Is that the right understanding? The reason that I am asking is that it has been the assumption in both design and in most evaluations in this AI (e.g. that was the reason that we did not select different PUCCH resources. Otherwise, it would have been more flexible and still ok with individual decoding).  For the second point: I am just trying to understand if Rel. 16 design had the same issue or not in your view.  For the third point: In addition to the use cases you mentioned, this would be also applicable to non co-located TRPs with good backhaul (just like single-DCI based mTRP in Rel. 16)  @Apple: Isn’t it same as PUSCH Repetition Type B when different beams are back-to-back? Also, with regard to RAN4 LS, please see the answer to Q4:  Also, for refence, the RAN4 requirement for freq. hopping is copied below [38.101]:  **Question 4**: In particular to multi-TRP intra-slot beam hopping (Scheme 2), can RAN1 assume the same requirement as RB hopping with respect to transient period in current RAN4 requirements, if the two hops have different UL beams in addition to different RBs?  **Answer 4**: The current RAN4 requirements for transient period are applicable when RB hopping, or power change is applied. For RB hopping, transient period is defined as 5us for FR2 UE. In case of RB hopping with different UL beams, the transient period depends on different scenarios and it is the same as the answer to Question 1 for FR2 UE.  The transmit ON/OFF time mask defines the transient period(s) allowed  - between transmit OFF power and transmit ON power symbols (transmit ON/OFF)  - between continuous ON-power transmissions when power change or RB hopping is applied.  In case of RB hopping, transition period is shared symmetrically. |
| **Samsung** | We can share the same view with Ericsson.  For the scheme 3, each repetition can be self-decodable and both TRPs share the result of LLR calculation for combining or just share the CRC result for each repetition when separate decoding is supported. On the other hand, for the scheme 2, each hop is transmitted towards each TRP unlike FDM scheme 2a for PDSCH repetition. One TB is split and both TRPs should exchange the symbol level received signal to calculate LLR. Therefore backhaul capacity can be burdened and more latency to exchange information between two TRPs can be required for non-ideal backhaul.  So for this reasons, we think the scheme 3 is enough because we already introduced the scheme 3 that can support both ideal and non-ideal backhaul cases and has similar or (1dB) better performance for all code rate regions and can be self-decodable. |
| **OPPO** | Not support. We share similar view as other accompanies that it is redundant feature. The claimed benefits are not convinced. For example, the latency doesn’t depend on whether it is beam-hopping or intra-slot repetition, but depends on the whole symbols (from the 1st symbol to the last symbol) used for the whole transmission/repetition.  Moreover, as Apple commented, a guard period is also needed for beam hopping, which is different from frequency hopping. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Support the proposal.  It’s not redundant as it can achieve the benefits that Scheme-3 cannot provide, such as low latency, especially for UEs not supporting sub-slot PUCCH.  On the concern of not being self-decodable, for Scheme-2, if the coding rate is low enough, the part received by each TRP can still be decoded ensured by the encoding/decoding scheme, such as Polar coding or RM coding. And for the gap/guard-period, we don’t see the difference between Scheme-2 and Scheme-3 on gap, if a UE is able to switch beam for Scheme-3, then it would also be able to switch for Scheme-2. |
| **Fl update #1** | Based on latest comments, **SS, OPPO, E///, Apple** still have concerns. |
| **QC** | The technical concerns from companies are summarized below and a short description why they are not valid for easier reference:   * **Scheme 2 is redundant**: It is not due to the following reasons:   + Unlike other schemes, Scheme 2 supports UCI multiplexing with each other, and UCI multiplexing with PUSCH. With other schemes, we have to drop one channel.   + It does not have sub-slot based restrictions: PUCCH can have any length. Also, other PUCCH resources (that do not need mTRP or sub-slot based transmission) can be configured flexibly. With Scheme 3, they have to remain within the sub-slot boundary.   + It reduces latency. To achieve the same latency with Scheme 3, PUCCH resource length should match the sub-slot length, which is very inflexible with coarse granularity. * **It is too late**: It is not due to the following   + Spec impact is minimal. Specifically, we think the FL proposal is enough for all the functionality of Scheme 2. We asked concerned companies about the spec impacts, but answer was not provided.   + Most issues are being wrapped up. In particular, for PUCCH, we see the work is nearly completed for Scheme 1 and 3. * **Requires tight coordination at the network side**: Yes, it requires but so does Scheme 3 with soft combining, and so does PDSCH schemes in Rel. 16. Also, the feature can be used for co-located panels, non co-located TRPs with good backhaul, split options 7-8 for disaggregation (just like sDCI based mTRP) * **Guard period is also needed for beam hopping**: No, transient period is needed not guard period. This should be crystal clear from RAN4 LS in answer to Q4. PUCCH Scheme 3 and PUSCH repetition Type B also have back-to-back transmissions with different beams. We do not see any issue here. |
| **Futurewei** | Support the proposal |
| **ZTE** | Support Proposal 2.5.  QC’s elaboration is quite clear and reasonable to us, and proposal 2.5 is enough to support scheme 2. we think no other works need to do according to this proposal, and we do not see the concern on time budget of RAN1. |
| **Apple** | In our view, beam hopping is different from repetition, the GP should be more important, since the signals for each beam may not be self-decodable.  So we still have concern. |

# Multi-TRP PUSCH transmission

## Default power control

**For comeback in Week2**

**Alt.1 – QC, MTek, E///, HW, OPPO, Xiaomi, FW**

**Alt.2 – Apple, Intel**

**Alt.3 – LG, Lenovo, DCM, Fujitsu, SS, vivo, CMCC, Nokia, CATT, ZTE, Fraunhofer, Apple (can accept)**

The situation is clear on majority support, we need to pick a solution. Let’s go with majority view.

**Proposal 3.2:** For single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, when one SRS resource per SRS resource set is configured (i.e., when two SRI fields are absent in DCI formats 0\_1 / 0\_2), per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined by,

* + If the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the first SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 0} is used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS corresponding to the first *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* associated with the second SRS resource set and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if  *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise} is used for TRP2.
  + Otherwise, the first set of values {the first value in *P0-AlphaSet*, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* and closed-loop index *l* = 0} can be used for TRP1, and the second set of values {the second value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id*= 1 and closed-loop index *l* = 1 if *twoPUSCH-PC-AdjustmentStates* is configured, *l*=0 otherwise } can be used for TRP2.
  + Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.

@ **QC, ~~MTek,~~ E///, HW, ~~OPPO,~~ Xiaomi, FW, Intel** >> The situation should be clearer that we shall pick the majority view. Please list objections only if you cannot live with the above. Also, indicate the reasons such that others can help on convincing you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | We prefer some GTW discussions on this if possible. We asked the question that what is the true benefit of Alt3 over Alt1 other than RRC overhead optimization, but we did not hear convincing answers. The benefits of Alt1 over Alt3, as explained before, are more flexibility and simplicity.  FL: We already discussed in last week GTW and there are some others which we have not had any discussion yet over GTW. So, prefer to solve via email if possible. |
| **LG** | We don’t think Alt 1 is simple because even if Alt 1 is agreed, Alt 3 except for 2nd TRP part should be also implemented for legacy behavior. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support the proposal which is Alt 3 since it’s a straight extensional way of the legacy way to determine power control parameter set if SRI is not present. While Alt 1 does not consider the case when the UE is provided*enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS*. |
| **ZTE** | Support Alt. 3.  @QC, as companies and us elaborated many times, in fact, Alt 3 is the most direct extension of the legacy approach to determine the default power control parameter sets when SRI is not present, which will minimize the spec change/effort. By Alt. 1 or Alt. 2, we fail to see the logical to adopt two different mechanisms among Rel-15/16 and Rel-17. |
| **MediaTek** | We can live with Proposal 3.2.  FL: thanks for the compromise. |
| **vivo** | We copied QC’s flexibility concern on Alt3, please correct me if it is not the exact argument.  “Alt2/3 force to use two closed loops while the gNB may prefer to not use both closed loops for this purpose (i.e., may want to use the two closed loops for eMBB versus URLLC, or for initial transmission versus retransmission, etc.)”  We can’t catch the point of flexibility, can the proponents elaborate more?  Does it mean that two TRPs can be configured with same closedLoopIndex or different closedLoopIndex? If yes, does it mean there is a use case for issue#1 for Proposed conclusion 2.1-1?  In our mind, legacy STRP systems don’t support the flexibility to use two closed loops when SRI field is absent, a straightforward way for MTRP is to associate each TRP with a dedicate closed loop index as in Alt3. |
| **CMCC** | Support Alt 3.  Alt 3 is an extension of legacy behavior and Alt 1 doesn’t support the case when the *sri-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided. |
| **CATT** | Support Alt 3. |
| **OPPO** | The proposal is the one with the most complexity, but without obvious benefits. Thus, we don’t think it is a good solution for R17.  Having said that, we can live with it for the sake of progress  FL: thanks for the compromise. |
| **Intel** | We think Alt-2 has minimum specification impact and is sufficient. we can also consider Alt-1 that requires RRC configuration. But Alt-3 has both solutions which we think is strange – 2 default mechanism based on RRC configuration ?  FL: Alt.3 is not introducing two solutions; it is legacy that having two solutions.  Based on legacy for sTRP, there are two mechanisms how the default parameters are obtained. If the RRC parameter *enablePL-RS-UpdateForPUSCH-SRS* configured, there is one method defined in legacy. Alt.2 is followed only when that RRC parameter is not configured. In that sense, Alt.3 extend the same procedures we have in legacy framework. I would say Alt.3 is more aligned with legacy than Alt.2. |
| **FL Update #1** | Based on the last round of inputs, QC and Intel seems to be having issues on agreeing to the proposal. I added some response for some companies above.  **E///, HW, Xiaomi, FW** have not provided any concerns on latest version, and FL assume that they are ok for the sake of progress here.  **@QC, Intel** >> could you please reconsider your opinion on this. |
| **QC** | Given the situation, we can accept the majority view even though we believe this is not a good solutions and is complicated set of rules. |
| **Futurewei** | We can live with the proposal as we believe both Alt1 and Alt3 can be made to work. |

## PHR reporting

**Agreement**

For option 4, support the following:

When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,

* The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16.
* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value, select Alt. 1A or Alt. 2A
  + Alt.1A: Is always actual. When there are more than one repetitions associated with the other TRP, the second PHR is calculated considering on the following repetition,
    - If there are repetition(s) towards the other TRP which transmit after the repetition used to calculate first PHR, the UE select the earliest repetition among them.
    - Otherwise, the UE select the latest repetition which transmitted before the repetition used to calculate first PHR.
  + Alt.2A: Is actual only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. Otherwise, it is virtual.
    - If there are multiple repetitions associated with the other TRP in slot n, the earliest one in slot n is selected.
* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH), select Alt. 1B or Alt. 2B
  + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.
  + Alt2B: a second PHR is not reported
* If the first PHR value is virtual, select Alt. 1C or Alt. 2C
  + Alt1C: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.
  + Alt2C: a second PHR is not reported
* When second PHR is virtual, it is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR)
* Note: the above is applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports

RAN1 needs to further agree on exact solution, and the FL suggestions are as below.

**Proposal 3.2-3**

For option 4, support the following:

When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, second PHR value is determined as,

* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value, select Alt. 1A or Alt. 2A
  + Alt.1A: Is always actual. When there are more than one repetitions associated with the other TRP, the second PHR is calculated considering on the following repetition,
    - If there are repetition(s) towards the other TRP which transmit after the repetition used to calculate first PHR, the UE select the earliest repetition among them.
    - Otherwise, the UE select the latest repetition which transmitted before the repetition used to calculate first PHR.
* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH), select Alt. 1B or Alt. 2B
  + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.
* If the first PHR value is virtual, select Alt. 1C or Alt. 2C
  + Alt2C: a second PHR is not reported

@All >> Please indicate if you have a big concern on supporting the above alternatives (Alt.1A, Alt. 1B, Alt. 2C). Any small optimizations like Alt. 1C (reporting always two PHRs) should not be a main motivation for objecting the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | We do not agree with Alt1A. It results in additional UE complexity for having to calculate power for future slots (computation concern) or for previous slots (memory concerns). We think Alt1B is more aligned with Rel.15/16 principle, and also addresses the mTRP use case as virtual PHR can still be reported. The benefit of actual PHR is all the additional MPR info that gNB gets, but with Alt1A and when PHR is for future, what will actually happen will be different than the reported value as explained before. Then, the benefit of actual PHR is questionable.  For the second part (Alt1B versus Alt2B), what is the motivation to change the sTRP behavior? We prefer Alt2B for this part.  We are ok with Alt2C. |
| **LG** | On the first bullet: we support Alt2A, which is simple and aligned with legacy principle.  On the second bullet: why do we need to consider STRP repetition case? Is there any issue with legacy behavior? From my understanding first and second PHR is related to MTRP operation.  On the third bullet: we support Alt1C. it is up to gNB whether/how to use it. |
| **InterDigital** | Support FL proposal (that is based on Alt1A, Alt1B and Alt2C)  For Alt.1A, there is no issue for computing the actual PHR values, as the UE already has the grant information (resource and power control parameters) for both TRPs, and hence it can calculate and report both actual PHRs. The incurred complexity is very insignificant.  For the second part of the proposal, if the grant is for sTRP, then the grant information does not have any relevance to the second TRP, then UE can report a virtual PHR for the second TRP. Therefore, Alt1B is preferred. |
| **Apple** | Support Alt 2A, 1B and 1C.  We have concern for Alt1A. for the “otherwise” part, there may be no signals toward the other TRP before the repetition used to calculate the first PHR.  It looks Alt 2B are 2C are not aligned with previous agreement where “2 PHR” are reported. |
| **MediaTek** | Support FL’s proposal 3.2-3.  We share the same understanding as InterDigital on Alt. 1A.  For Alt.xB and Alt. xC, we can be flexible. |
| **Samsung** | For Alt 2A, the probability to report both PHRs as actual PHR is lower than Alt 1A. We don’t see big problem for computation and memory because PHR calculation is similar to calculation of transmission power and one calculated transmitted power value (with an indicator for MPR) is stored.  So, we support Alt 1A.  The basic rule of multi-cell PHR is reporting all activated serving cells if PHR is triggered. Even though PUSCH transmission is not scheduled on the certain CC, UE can calculate virtual PHR for the activated serving cell and report it in Rel. 15/16. With similar approach, PHR(s) for TRP that is not scheduled with PUSCH transmission can be reported.  Therefore, we support Alt1B and Alt1C to report the current PHR to gNB. |
| **vivo** | First, we should agree on the basic PHR reporting principle:  1. PHR for overlapped PUSCH transmission on slot n are reported as actual PHR.  2. Two PHRs should be reported according to Option 4.  Thus, our preference is:  1st bullet: Alt.2A  2nd bullet: Alt.1B, because even this slot is scheduled as STRP, the UE will be scheduled MTRP in the future and the virtual PHR for the other TRP is useful for future scheduling.  3rd bullet: Alt1C |
| **NTT Docomo** | We think the cases in second and third bullet are similar, i.e., there is no actual PUSCH to the other TRP. So we think same solution can be selected for second and third bullet. We are fine with either Alt.1B+1C or Alt.2B+2C. |
| **CATT** | We have similar view as NTT Docomo that same solution should be used for the second and third bullet. Alt.1B+1C is slightly preferred. |
| **ZTE** | **On the first bullet, we support 2A.** From gNB scheduling point of view, it is useless to report the second PHR value as actual for either before or after repetitions. When the repetition of the other TRP is before, it is unnecessary to report actual PHR value of the occurred repetition. When the repetition of the other TRP is after, due to it is unknown whether some possible transmissions in other CCs will be transmitted in the same later slot, it is better to report virtual PHR value of the later repetition. Besides, according to the existing formula on virtual PHR value [TS 38.213 section 7.7.1], we are wondering whether per TRP PC parameters (p0, alpha, PL-RS index, CLI) should be taken into account for the second virtual PHR value. For example, which of the default or pre-configured PL-RS indices should be used?   |  | | --- | | If the UE determines that a Type 1 power headroom report for an activated serving cell is based on a reference PUSCH transmission then, for PUSCH transmission occasion  on active UL BWP  of carrier  of serving cell , the UE computes the Type 1 power headroom report as  [dB]  where  is computed assuming MPR=0 dB, A-MPR=0 dB, P-MPR=0 dB. TC = 0 dB. MPR, A-MPR, P-MPR and TC are defined in [8-1, TS 38.101-1], [8-2, TS38.101-2] and [8-3, TS 38.101-3]. The remaining parameters are defined in Clause 7.1.1 where  and  are obtained using  and *p0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId* *=* 0,  is obtained using *pusch-PathlossReferenceRS-Id =* 0, and . |   **On the second bullet, the use case is unclear and invalid to us.** Does it mean the MTRP PHR MAC CE (as option 4) is mandatory even though DCI schedules a STRP transmission here? If no, we suggest to remove the second bullet. Otherwise, we support 1B which is in line with option 4.  **On the third bullet, we support 1C.** That is a valid case and Alt1C is accordance with option 4. |
| **OPPO** | We prefer 1C since the 2nd virtual PHR can also provide useful information to the NW. Moreover, it will be easier for MAC CE design if there are always 2 PHR reporting for all the 3 cases. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We support 1A, 1B and 1C.  For the first bullet: actual PHR is preferred as it provides more accurate information to gNB for scheduling.  For the 2nd bullet: PHR can assist the gNB scheduling, and for a UE configured with multi-TRP PUSCH, it will be scheduled with multi-TRP in high probability, and gNB can use the reported PHR for better scheduling.  For 3rd bullet: for a UE configured with multi-tRP PUSCH, it’s beneficial for gNB to be aware of the PHR towards both tRPs. |
| **Intel** | basic question – is it required that the same two PHRs be reported in all the repetitions of a mTRP PUSCH repetition sequence or can it be reported only in certain repetitions? |
| **FL update #1** | As there are too many questions, I do not have individual replies to all companies. Only few comments on basic questions.  @Intel: MAC-CE carried within the TB, so if the TB is repeated, the PHR report also repeated.  @LG: there is nothing wrong with legacy MAC CE reporting. Here we talk about Rel-17 MAC-CE and information carried there.  @ZTE: comment on the second bullet, your question is not clear. If it is the same question as LG, then please further refer FL’s comment on that.  Overall, the situation in summary is as below (only the views on FL suggestion is captured. Otherwise, this convergence will be a hard task).  Alt.1A:   * + Support: **IDC, MTek, SS, vivo, HW**   + Concerns: **QC** (complexity), **LG** (not simple), **Apple** (concern on otherwise part), **vivo, ZTE** (multiple reasons), * Alt1B:   + Support: **IDC, Apple, MTek, SS, vivo, HW**   + Concerns: **ZTE** (?), **QC/LG** (prefer to keep sTRP behaviors) * Alt2C:   + Support: **QC, IDC, MTek**   + Concerns: **Apple/ZTE** (not align with Option 4), **vivo, OPPO, DCM/CATT** (ok with Alt 1C or consider both Alt2B+Alt2C)), **LG, SS, vivo, HW**   **Start with Alt 2C comments,**   * Apple and ZTE mentioned that it is not aligned with Option 4. However, please read the yellow highlight, as it does not talk about that two PHRs are reported always for CCs that there is not mTRP PUSCH. In that sense Alt2C is aligned with the Option 4 that we agreed.   **Agreement**  For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability for a UE that supports mTRP PUSCH,   * Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs. * DCM and CATT prefer a simpler solution on either Alt1B+Alt1C or Alt2B+Alt2C. That makes sense at least to the FL. * Anyways, there are few others further think that Alt 2C shall be supported as that may still be beneficial to the gNB. * Overall, I do not think there is good support on Alt. 2C. **We can try to converge on Alt.1C.**   **On Alt 1B comments,**   * There is some support on Alt 1B and it can be further justified if Alt. 1C is supported at the same time. Alt.1B + Alt. 1C allows reporting of two PHRs (for all CC) when there is at least one CC having mTRP PUSCH transmission. May be MAC-CE design perspective that is a cleaner solution. * QC/LG have a similar issue “the motivation to change the sTRP behavior”. From FL perspective, this is anyways needing a new agreement in Rel-17 as we talk about new MAC-CEs. When CC1 has mTRP PHR reporting (two PHRs), at the worst case, all other CCs may also report two PHRs (mTRP PUSCH in all CCs), so MAC-CE shall count for the worse case. I do not think there is anything wrong with sending virtual PHR for the other TRP. Please indicate further technical issues on this. * ZTE >> your question on Alt 1B is not clear. But seems you are ok with that. * Overall, w**e can try to converge on Alt.1B.**   **On Alt 1A comments,**   * There are five companies have concerns wit Alt. 1A. At least Apple concern seems not fully accurate (*mTRP repetitions may always have two repetitions. So, if there no one in next slot, there is one in the latest slot*). But I do not disagree with other comments. * Overall, FL feels that agreeing to Alt. 2A may be simpler and less controversial to the companies. W**e can try to converge on Alt.2A.**   Please see the updated FL proposal.  **Proposal 3.2-3**  For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, second PHR value is determined as,   * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value, select Alt. 2A   + Alt.2A: Is actual only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. Otherwise, it is virtual.     - If there are multiple repetitions associated with the other TRP in slot n, the earliest one in slot n is selected. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH), select Alt. 1B   + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR. * If the first PHR value is virtual, select Alt. 1C   + Alt1C: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.   @All >> as some companies get what they prefer at least in one scenario, I would assume companies to be flexible on agreeing to the above. If there is nothing critically wrong, please do not suggest other options. |
| **QC** | We can accept the FL proposal. In particular, we can be fine with Alt1B and Alt1C (not our first preference) as long as Alt2A is agreed simultaneously. |
| **Futurewei** | We support 1A, 1B, 2C, but we can accept the FL proposal. |
| **Samsung** | First of all, the following note in original FL’s proposal is needed:   * When second PHR is virtual, it is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR)   Second, when single-cell is supported or PHR MAC CE is reported on mTRP PUSCH for single-entry or multi-entry PHR reports, the second PHR should be virtual PHR especially, for PUSCH repetition type A because the repetition for the other TRP cannot be in slot n. So, we want to add following note and FFS:  **Proposal 3.2-3**  For option 4, support the following:  When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, second PHR value is determined as,   * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value, select Alt. 2A   + Alt.2A: Is actual only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. Otherwise, it is virtual.     - If there are multiple repetitions associated with the other TRP in slot n, the earliest one in slot n is selected. * If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH), select Alt. 1B   + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR. * If the first PHR value is virtual, select Alt. 1C   + Alt1C: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR. * When second PHR is virtual, it is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR)   Note: Alt.2A is applied when multi-entry PHR MAC-CE is reported on other CC  FFS: For the following cases, two actual PHRs can be each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP   * Single-entry PHR MAC-CE is reported in mTRP PUSCH repetition on the CC * Multi-entry PHR MAC-CE is reported in mTRP PUSCH repetition on the CC * UE is configured with single cell and PHR MAC-CE is reported in mTRP PUSCH repetition   With added note and FFS, we are fine with FL’s update in **FL update #1**. |
| **ZTE** | We support FL update #1 with 2A, 1B and 1C. BTW, actually our preference is 1C of the third bullet, there is just one typo in our previous comment, sorry for the misunderstanding.  We agree with Samsung’s added part of second PHR value calculation when it is reported as virtual, which is aligned with our previous comment on the first bullet. Besides, the FFS part is valid from our point of view, we can openly discuss it in the next meeting if possible. |

## PTRS-DMRS association

**Proposal 3.4:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced (legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions)).

@ ZTE, Apple, E///, LG, vivo, Intel >> Let’s conclude this formally. Not agreeing means also the legacy framework.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Ericsson** | Our preference is Alt2 in the previous proposal.  But if this is the approach everyone wants to take, we can give it a try as long as our following comments are addressed.  The first sentence of the proposal says ‘the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is **not enhanced**’. Not enhanced essentially means no spec change. But the part inside the brackets will need specification enhancements. For instance, we’ll have to capture in the spec that the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs. So, the first sentence of the current proposal contradicts the part inside the brackets.  In legacy framework, there is only one TRP, and the PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to the one TRP. To make the proposal more closer to the legacy framework, we suggest to apply the indicated PTRS-DMRS association field to the first TRP. As to what to do with the 2nd TRP, may be a simple solution is to specify a fixed PTRS-DMRS mapping in the spec for the 2nd TRP.  Could the following be an acceptable compromise?  **Revised Proposal 3.4:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indicated PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to the first TRP (i.e., the first set of repetitions) when maxRank>2. The PTRS-DMRS association for the 2nd TRP is fixed in specifications.  ~~The indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced (legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to both TRPs (to both sets of repetitions)).~~ |
| **Apple** | This proposal seems to be the worst solution compared with all the 3 options we have agreed for further down-selection. It seems what we can do is as follows, if we cannot down-select one option among the 3 agreed options.  **UE shall not expect to be scheduled M-TRP PUSCH with Rank>2 when PT-RS is transmitted** |
| **ZTE** | As we elaborated in previous rounds, if no agreement here or using the legacy framework, it means the case of rank > 2 is not enhanced. Note that there is no agreement/conclusion saying the number of rank should be limited, it makes no sense to preclude the case of rank > 2. We can compromise and live with Alt. 2 to complete this enhancement.  **Alt.2:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2, 1-bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   * + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit indicates one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port. |
| **Vivo** | Don’t support. We don’t understand why per-TRP PTRS-DMRS indication is supported for maxRank=2, while per-TRP PTRS-DMRS indication is not supported for maxRank>2?  Support Option 3 since it supports per-TRP PTRS indication with least bit size.   * Option 3 (2 bits): 1 bit MSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the first TRP, and 1 bit LSB is used to indicate PTRS-DMRS association for the second TRP   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 1, the 1 bit indicates one of the first two DMRS ports.   + if *maxNrofPorts* = 2, the 1 bit *indicates* one of two DMRS ports sharing the same PTRS port. |
| **Intel** | We think its good to have a per-TRP PTRS-DMRS association for rank > 2 (we are flexible in a solution). If no agreement, then fall-back is of course legacy. |
| **FL update #1** | Objecting companies provided valid reasons.  @**E**/// >> I see how you interpret the proposal But I assume intention of this was clear. In summary, there is no common view among companies to agree on one specific method/enhancement on PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 for m-TRP operation. That does not mean legacy framework is not applied for maxRank > 2. I change the FL proposal to avoid any misinterpretation.  Revised proposal sent by E/// >> @others please provide your feedback on that as well.  @**Apple, ZTE, vivo** >> Understand the concerns. But this is how the group stands at this point.  **Proposal 3.4:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH Type B repetition, the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced (legacy framework, i.e., the same PTRS-DMRS association field is applied to ~~both TRPs (to both sets of~~ all repetitions). |
| **Futurewei** | We can accept the FL proposal though our preference is Alt2. |
| **ZTE** | We have strong concern of the wording in this proposal “the indication of PTRS-DMRS association for maxRank > 2 is not enhanced”, why rank > 2 should be precluded for this enhancement only? We suggest to discuss it in GTW session if possible. |
| **Apple** | I suggest we defer the decision and companies can try some evaluation to come back. Since this has no RRC impact, it is not so urgent. |

## Number of SRS resources

**Proposal 3.6-2:** On the number of SRS resource configured in the two SRS resource sets, select one of the following alternatives,

* Alt.1: Support the same number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition.
* Alt.2: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. The first SRS resource set always have the same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.
  + The bit width of the 1st SRI field is determined based on maximum number of SRS resources among two resource sets
  + FFS: How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present”
* Alt.3: Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. The first SRS resource set always have the smaller, same or larger number of SRS resources than the second SRS resources set.
  + The bit width of the 1st SRI field is determined based on maximum number of SRS resources among two resource sets
  + FFS: How to interpret “SRI field is present or not present”

**Alt.1** – TCL, ZTE, LG, Xiaomi, E///, OPPO

**Alt.2** – CATT, NEC, Mtek, vivo, SS, HW (?), CMCC, Apple, DCM

**Alt.3** – Lenovo, Fujitsu, ~~DCM~~, HW (?), Apple, CATT

No discussion needed – Apple

Ok with majority – QC, Nokia

@ All>> Need to conclude this as not agreeing does not mean Alt.3 is supported. If option 3 supported, there are still some work to be finalized. Given that, my suggestion is to take Alt.1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **Apple** | Open to Alt2 or Alt3 |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | Support Alt.3 since it has no limitation of the number of SRS resources of different SRS resource sets which gives a most flexible solution compared with Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| **ZTE** | We have discussed this issue through two meetings, it is unnecessary to waste more budget to finish the derivative works of Alt.2 and Alt. 3. We support to take Alt. 1 as way forward. |
| **MediaTek** | We are fine with FL’s suggestion, i.e., Alt. 1. |
| **Samsung** | We can think Alt. 2 is more flexible than Alt.1 and doesn’t require additional spec impact for the definition of two SRI fields (Alt.2 can work with agreed table for dynamic switching). For alt3, total bit width of two SRI fields can be increased because the 1st SRI field is determined based on maximum number of SRS resources among two resource sets (for Alt2, always first SRS resource set has more or same number of SRS resources so there is no issue). |
| **vivo** | Since majority think different number of SRS resources is useful, can we first agree the following in this meeting?  **Proposal 3.6-x**  Support different number of SRS resources for both CB and NCB based m-TRP PUSCH repetition. |
| **NTT Docomo** | After reviewing companies’ comments in previous round, we can understand some benefit of alt.2.  We can support Alt.2. |
| **CMCC** | Support Alt 2.  Alt 1 is unnecessary limitation on SRS configuration for the two TRPs.  Alt 3 will make the first SRI/TPMI field always be determined by the maximum number of the two SRS resources in the two sets, which will increase the bit of SRI/TPMI fields. |
| **CATT** | Either Alt 2 or Alt 3 is fine. |
| **OPPO** | Support FL’s suggestion. The motivation to allow different number of SRS resource are not justified   * It is not likely for a UE equipped with panels each of which supporting different capability (e.g., layers of data transmission) * If gNB configures different number of SRS resources based on the current status of channel state, there will be frequent RRC reconfiguration when UE is moving or rotating. |
| **Fl update #1** | I updated company views just below the original proposal. No change in the suggestion as that helps to close this issue. |
| **Futurewei** | Support vivo’s version, or Alt2/3 in the FL proposal. |
| **Lenovo/MotM** | We support Alt 3 considering its flexibility of SRS resource number configuration. However, considering the situation, we can accept VIVO’s version for further progress. |
| **ZTE** | Support FL’s suggestion to take Alt.1 as way forward. |

## LS to RAN2

There are multiple agreements in mTRP PUCCH/PUSCH repetition schemes that may be needing more RAN2 work, for example new MAC CE designs. It may be good to send an LS to RAN2 with the latest set of agreements that impact RAN2 work.

**Question:** Please indicate your view of sending an LS to RAN2 with all agreements that related to RAN2 work at the end of this RAN1 106-e meeting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| **QC** | No strong preference, but if we do not have specific questions or critical inputs, RAN2 can always look at RAN1’s agreements (if the purpose of LS is just to copy-paste the agreements). |
| **ZTE** | We share similar view with FL’s assessment, and it is time to discuss Rel-17 signaling design from the end of this meeting. |
| **Apple** | We are open for the LS. But to be honest, in Rel-15, we heard RAN2 complained RAN1 sent some LS just to copy/paste the RAN1 agreements, which they feel meaningless. |

# Agreements from Phase 0

**Agreement**

When DCI schedules a retransmission of CG-PUSCH for type 1 CG or type 2 CG (DCI with CRC scrambled with CS-RNTI and NDI=1) while the CG configuration is RRC-configured with two fields of power control parameters, apply the same procedure as DCI activation for CG type 2 agreed before, i.e.,

* The first (legacy) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the first SRS resource set.
* The second (new) RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ are associated with the second SRS resource set.
* Applying the first, second, or both first and second RRC-configured fields ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’ is determined from the new DCI field (for dynamic switching) of the activating DCI similar to the case of DG-PUSCH.

**Agreement**

When fallback DCI (DCI format 0\_0) activates a type 2 CG or schedules a retransmission of a type 1 or type 2 CG, and the CG configuration is RRC-configured with 2 sets of power control parameters (two ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’):

* The UE uses the first set of values for power control (first RRC-configured ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’).

**Agreement**

When a DCI that includes the new 2-bits DCI field for dynamic switching activates a type 2 CG or schedules a retransmission of a type 1 or type 2 CG, and the CG configuration is RRC-configured with only one set of power control parameters (one ‘*p0-PUSCH-Alpha*’ and ‘*powerControlLoopToUse*’):

* The UE expects the new DCI field for dynamic switching is set to “00”, and all PUSCH repetitions are associated with the first SRS resource set.

**Agreement**

For the new field in DCI for dynamic switching,

* For Codepoint “11”, the 1st SRI/TPMI field associate with the 1st SRS resource set while the 2nd SRI/TPMI field associate with the 2nd SRS resource set. i.e.,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Codepoint** | **SRS resource set(s)** | **SRI (for both CB and NCB)/TPMI (CB only) field(s)** |
| 11 | m-TRP mode with (TRP2,TRP1 order)  1st SRI/TPMI field: 1st  SRS resource set  2nd SRI/TPMI field: 2nd SRS resource set | Both 1st and 2nd SRI/TPMI fields |

* For Codepoint “11”, the first repetition in time is associated with the second SRS resource set, and the remaining repetitions follow the configured mapping pattern (cyclic or sequential).
* For Codepoint “10”, the first repetition in time is associated with the first SRS resource set, and the remaining repetitions follow the configured mapping pattern (cyclic or sequential).

**Agreement**

For PHR reporting related to M-TRP PUSCH repetition, support Option 4 as UE optional capability for a UE that supports mTRP PUSCH,

* Option 4: Calculate two PHRs (at least corresponding to the CC that applies m-TRP PUSCH repetitions), each associated with a first PUSCH occasion to each TRP, and report two PHRs.

**Agreement**

For SP-CSI report on mTRP PUSCH repetition Type A and B activated by a DCI, support the use of a similar mechanism to A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH without a TB, which includes the following,

* When SP-CSI multiplexed on m-TRP PUSCH, SP-CSI multiplexed on the two repetitions associated with the two TRPs, and the number of repetitions is always assumed to be 2, regardless of the value indicated.
* For mTRP PUSCH repetition Type A, or for the first PUSCH after activation for PUSCH repetition Type B**,** reuse similar conditions to support SP-CSI multiplexing on m-TRP PUSCH as defined in A-CSI multiplexing on M-TRP PUSCH, i.e.,
  + The UE is expected to follow the above operation for transmitting SP-CSI on two PUSCH repetitions only if
    - For the first PUSCH after activation for PUSCH repetition Type B, the first and second nominal repetitions are expected to be the same as the first and second actual repetitions, respectively (no segmentation).
    - For PUSCH repetition Type A and B, UCIs other than the SP-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions.
  + When the UE does not follow the above operation, UE transmits SP-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16.
* For subsequent PUSCHs after activation (without corresponding PDCCH) for PUSCH repetition Type B, use the following criteria,
  + If the first / second nominal repetition is not the same as the first / second actual repetition, the first / second nominal repetition is dropped
    - If one of the first or second nominal repetitions is not dropped, SP-CSI is multiplexed on that repetition
  + Else (the first and second nominal repetitions are the same as the first and second actual repetitions)
    - If UCIs other than the SP-CSI are not multiplexed on any of the two PUSCH repetitions, SP-CSI is multiplexed on both repetitions.
    - Otherwise, UE transmits SP-CSI only on the first PUSCH repetition similar to Rel. 15/16 (and the second repetition is dropped)

**Agreement**

For indicating per-TRP OLPC set in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, if no SRI field presents in the DCI,

* Use the existing field (1 or 2 bits) for OLPC set indication and the second p0-PUSCH-SetList-r16.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘0’ or ‘00’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the first and the second default P0 values.
    - Note: per TRP default P0 values to be decided in separate discussion (alt.1, alt.2, alt.3 in default power control parameter sets).
  + if value of the field equals to ‘1’ or ‘01’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the **first value** in the first *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list* and the **first value** in the **second** *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list*.
  + if value of the field equals to ‘10’ or ‘11’, the UE determine two values of P0 for two TRPs (one P0 value for each TRP) from the **second value** in the first *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list* and the **second value** in the **second** *P0-PUSCH-Set-r16\_list.*

**Agreement**

For RV mapping of type 1 or type 2 CG based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, support,

* the configured RV sequence (via “repK-RV”) is applied separately for PUSCH repetitions corresponding to the first TRP and the second TRP with a an RV offset for the starting RV corresponding to the second TRP (similar to the case of dynamic multi-TRP PUSCH repetition).
* if startingFromRV0 set to ‘on’, support that the initial transmission of a transport block may start at:
  + the first RV0 transmission occasion of any TRP if the configured RV sequence is {0 2 3 1},
  + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions that are associated with RV = 0 if the configured RV sequence is {0 3 0 3}, (same as Rel-15/16).
  + any of the transmission occasions of the K repetitions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}, except the last transmission occasion when K≥8. (same as Rel-15/16).
* if startingFromRV0 set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions (same as Rel-15/16).

**Agreement 2.1-2:**

For per-TRP closed-loop power control, when the indicated PUCCH transmission in DCI format 1\_0 (fallback DCI) is associated with two “*closedLoopIndex*” values for multi-TRP PUCCH transmission schemes, the single TPC field (the existing TPC field) is applied to both closed loop indices for the scheduled PUCCH.

**Working assumption 3.7:**

For non-codebook based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition, select Alt.2.

* Alt. 2: the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 1st SRS resource set can be different from the actual number of PT-RS ports corresponding to the 2nd SRS resource set.
* FFS: Whether specification change is needed due to this working assumption

**Agreement**

For option 4, support the following:

When PHR MAC-CE is reported in slot n, for a CC that is configured with mTRP PUSCH repetition, PHR value(s) are determined as,

* The first PHR value is reported same as Rel. 15/16.
* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions associated with a given TRP, the second PHR value, select Alt. 1A or Alt. 2A
  + Alt.1A: Is always actual. When there are more than one repetitions associated with the other TRP, the second PHR is calculated considering on the following repetition,
    - If there are repetition(s) towards the other TRP which transmit after the repetition used to calculate first PHR, the UE select the earliest repetition among them.
    - Otherwise, the UE select the latest repetition which transmitted before the repetition used to calculate first PHR.
  + Alt.2A: Is actual only when a repetition associated with the other TRP is transmitted in slot n. Otherwise, it is virtual.
    - If there are multiple repetitions associated with the other TRP in slot n, the earliest one in slot n is selected.
* If the first PHR value is actual PHR (based on Rel. 15/16) but not corresponding to a repetition among mTRP PUSCH repetitions (corresponds to sTRP PUSCH), select Alt. 1B or Alt. 2B
  + Alt1B: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.
  + Alt2B: a second PHR is not reported
* If the first PHR value is virtual, select Alt. 1C or Alt. 2C
  + Alt1C: a second PHR value is reported as virtual PHR.
  + Alt2C: a second PHR is not reported
* When second PHR is virtual, it is calculated based on a set of default power control parameters defined for the other TRP (that is not associated with the first PHR)
* Note: the above is applicable to both single entry and multi-entry PHR reports

# Reference

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [R1-2106464](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106464.zip) | Enhancements on multi-TRP for reliability and robustness in Rel-17 | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [R1-2106542](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106542.zip) | Multi-TRP enhancements for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | ZTE |
| [R1-2106572](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106572.zip) | Further discussion on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH enhancements | vivo |
| [R1-2106641](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106641.zip) | Discussion on Enhancements for PDCCH, PUCCH, and PUSCH | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [R1-2106667](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106667.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| [R1-2106686](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106686.zip) | Discussion on enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [R1-2106790](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106790.zip) | Considerations on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH, PUSCH | Sony |
| [R1-2106866](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106866.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Samsung |
| [R1-2106936](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2106936.zip) | Enhancements on multi-TRP/panel transmission for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | CATT |
| [R1-2107030](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107030.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH PUCCH and PUSCH | Fujitsu |
| [R1-2107079](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107079.zip) | Multi-TRP/panel for non-PDSCH | FUTUREWEI |
| [R1-2107144](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107144.zip) | Discussion on multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | NEC |
| [R1-2107204](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107204.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | OPPO |
| [R1-2107293](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107293.zip) | Discussion on enhancements on multi-TRP for uplink channels | FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom |
| [R1-2107324](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107324.zip) | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | Qualcomm Incorporated |
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