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1. Introduction

This contribution summarizes the discussions and proposals in AI 8.17 for Rel-17 NR TEI related discussion and following email discussion.

[106-e-R17-TEI-01] Email discussion/approval on Rel-17 TEIs – Hiroki (DOCOMO)

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 25
* 3rd check point: August 27

Based on the discussions summarized in Section 2, following TEI proposals are identified in AI 8.17. According to the guidance from RAN1 chair (i.e., same guidance as in Rel-16 TEI [11] should still hold), it should be checked first whether each TEI proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor so that the discussion on the TEI proposal can be prioritized over other TEI proposals. **Companies are encouraged to clarify which TEI proposal can be supported in the list below, i.e., please add your company name if you support the TEI proposal. Detailed feedback/question on each TEI proposal can alo be provided in Section 2.**

* **TEI proposal #1: Enhancement of NR codeword mapping**
  + Supported by ZTE, CMCC, China Telecom, China Unicom, SoftBank, NTT DOCOMO, Sanechips, vivo, [CATT]
* **TEI proposal #2: Improved Frequency-Domain Interleaving**
  + Supported by Qualcomm, [Ericsson]
* **TEI proposal #3: Enhancements to PUCCH format 2**
  + Supported by Qualcomm, [NTT DOCOMO, Softbank]
* **TEI proposal #4: Enhancements to CSI-RS design to solve false PMI reporting issue**
  + Supported by Ericsson, [NTT DOCOMO, Softbank, Verizon, T-Mobile USA]
* **TEI proposal #5: NR positioning support for TA-based positioning in E-CID**
  + Supported by NTT DOCOMO INC., Ericsson, Polaris Wireless, Verizon, China Telecom, FirstNet, Deutsche Telekom, Intel Corporation, CATT
* **TEI proposal #6: Enhancements on the scheduling of PUSCH over multiple slots**
  + Supported by Huawei, HiSilicon, China Unicom
* **TEI proposal #7: Enhancements on SSB resources for RLM**
  + Supported by CATT
* **TEI proposal #8: Periodic SRS transmission outside DRX active time**
  + Supported by Qualcomm
* **TEI proposal #9: Joint configuration of DRX groups and Rel-16 Power saving features**
  + Supported by Qualcomm
* **TEI proposal #12: Mitigating half-duplex issue in NR V2X groupcast NACK-only case regime**
  + Supported by Intel, Qualcomm
* **TEI proposal #13: Support of 2 Tx codebook configuration to 4Tx capable UE in UL**
  + Supported by vivo, ZTE, CMCC, Samsung
* **TEI proposal #14: Support for dynamic switching of waveform in UL**
  + Supported by vivo, Spreadtrum Communications, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO
* **TEI proposal #15: HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements for TDD-FDD CA**
  + Supported by CATT
* **TEI proposal #16: Support of default power control parameter per TRP**
  + Supported by OPPO, ZTE

Note that although following TEI proposals were discussed at the last meeting, there is no contribution proposing/discussing these TEI proposals in RAN1#106-e meeting.

* TEI proposal #10: Removal of DM-RS restriction for DL MU-MIMO
* TEI proposal #11: UL MU-MIMO enhancements for DSS

Please also note that as announced at the last RAN1 meeting, making any agreement on a particular TEI proposal in this quarter requires to complete all work including CRs for the TEI proposal within this quarter according to the TEI guidance B as shown in Appendix [12].

1. Discussion on Rel-17 NR TEI proposals
   1. Enhancement of NR codeword mapping

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | Currently, NR release 15 and 16 specification has been completed, and many useful features have been actually deployed. One difference between NR and LTE is layer-to-codeword mapping, where NR only supports 1 codeword (CW) but LTE can support 2 codewords in the case when the number of transmission layers is not larger than 4. Taking 2 layers as an example as shown in Figure 1-1, two layers can map to 2 CWs respectively in LTE, and independent MCS can be indicated to the two layers to match the potentially different channel conditions. In NR, in order to simplify implementation complexity, only 1 MCS can be indicated for the two layers no matter channel conditions are closed or different. However, some issues are identified in the real test of NR deployment. The NR performance is impacted by NR CW mapping in some cases when the SINR difference for the two layers are large.    Figure 1-1 Comparison of CW mapping between LTE and NR  In this contribution, we mainly analyze the issues of NR codeword mapping based on the measurement results in real tests and link-level and system-level simulation results. We propose to address the issues in Rel-17 TEI by adopting LTE liked solution in this contribution. The proposal is straightforward, i.e. support 2 codewords with 2 MCS for rank 2-4 uplink transmission (i.e. LTE-like CW mapping).  It is noted that the proposal was discussed in RAN1#105-e meeting, and this contribution is an update of our previous document R1-2104596. Even though the proposal was supported by most companies, some concerns were raised during email discussion, e.g. this proposal requires a lot of specification change which may not be fit into TEI, or this enhancement can be done using multi-DCI mTRP framework. Regarding the concern on the specification change, we have provided some corresponding TPs in previous contribution [R1-2106101](file:///C:\3GPP%20work\RAN1\RAN1%23106e\FL%20summary\Docs\R1-2106101.zip), [R1-210610](file:///C:\3GPP%20work\RAN1\RAN1%23106e\FL%20summary\Docs\R1-2106101.zip)2, [R1-210610](file:///C:\3GPP%20work\RAN1\RAN1%23106e\FL%20summary\Docs\R1-2106101.zip)3 for 38.211, 212 and 214 respectively where only minor update is needed. Regarding the solution using multi-DCI mTRP framework, it will cause larger DCI overhead and much higher UE capability especially when CA-like structure is used to implement multi-DCI based mMTRP. The reason is that to support of one CC with mTRP is equivalent to support of 2 CCs with sTRP in terms of UE complexity. Furthermore, we are open to also support this feature for DL. However, there was concern raised on specification impact if DL is introduced as well. We suggest to do it step by step, i.e., we first agree on this TEI proposal for UL first and then further discuss DL either in TEI-17 or Rel-18.  ~  ***Observation 1:*** *In the real test position 1, the receiving power gap between the two layers is about 10 dB. The constellation demapping of the first layer is much better than that of the second layer in the case of rank 2 transmission.*  ***Observation 2:*** *In the real test position 2, the receiving power gap between the two layers is about 10 dB. The constellation demapping of the second layer is much better than that of the second layer in the case of rank 2 transmission.*  ***Observation 3:***  *The SINR gap between two UL MIMO layers is often large in our test results e.g. larger than 10dB. It is larger than what we observed in simulations possibly due to some practical differences e.g. inaccurate erforman of antenna placements in simulations, different blockage for different antennas, etc.*  ***Observation 4:*** *The current NR codeword mapping has limitations in some scenarios including the scenarios with large receiving SINR gap for transmission layers, and TDD scenarios with heavy DL traffic.*  ***Observation 5:*** *Based on the simulation results from both SLS and LLS, two TB/MCS can bring obvious performance gain than single TB/MCS for the case when receiving power gap is large between two layers.*  ~  Based on the real test results from section 2.1 and 2.2, the analyses and simulation results in section 3, the performance and latency may be impacted due to the limitation of the current codeword mapping mechanism.  To address the issues mentioned in above sections, we propose to support 2 codewords with 2 MCS for rank 2-4 uplink transmission, i.e. LTE-like CW mapping. Since the aforementioned issues reflect the urgent requirement of NR products, and the relevant solution does not need much spec effort, we suggest to discuss them in Rel-17 TEI agenda.  ***Proposal:*** *Support 2 codewords with 2 MCS for rank 2-4 uplink transmission (i.e. LTE-like CW mapping)* |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | NTT DOCOMO | Support. We believe 2 codewords for UL MIMO is erformanc to improve UL performance. | | CATT | Support the proposal. | | SoftBank | Support the proposal | | Intel | This TEI requires a lot of specification change. Suggest considering the required functionality by using multi-DCI mTRP framework. New UE capability can be defined targeting UL only. | | MediaTek | This proposal has HW and specification impact. Comprehensive evaluation and discussion are needed to justify the benefit versus the efforts. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the motivation for this TEI proposal. It was discussed heavily in both Rel-15 and Rel-16. We are open to simple solution to address the issue by following LTE codeword-layer-mapping mechanism so that gNB/UE may reuse LTE algorithm as much as possible. However it is less preferred that it is for UL only since DL and UL design shall be symmetric for this particular matter, from both gNB and NB perspective. If we will only do part of the scenarios, better to study which case is more beficial first with sufficient evaluation. | | ZTE, Sanechips | * In response to Intel and MTK’s comments, we don’t think this TEI proposal requires a lot of specification changes. We have uploaded the corresponding TPs R1-2106101-03 in the Inbox. It can be observed from this set of TPs that the spec impact is not high. * In response to Intel’s comment on multi-DCI mTRP, mTRP can only support TDM on uplink i.e. UL-MIMO with 2CW for rank2-4 cannot be supported. Also, it will unnecessarily introduce extra complexity for Ues to support multi-DCI mTRP for the purpose of uplink enhancement in single TRP only even if a UE capability is defined targeting UL only. * In response to HW’s comment, we are open to also support this feature for DL. However, there is concern on spec impact. That’s why we choose to support this feature UL first. We suggest to do it step by step to agree this TEI proposal on UL first and then further discuss DL. * Regarding evaluation, we have done extensive evaluation in our tdoc [2], where clear gain has been observed. In addition, this issue is observed from the field. That’s why strong support from operators are observed from the current list of supporting companies. | | Ericsson | In general, this is interesting but the scope may be too large for a TEI-17. This can be considered for Rel-18 MIMO WI instead. | | AT&T | We are supportive of this proposal. As debated extensively in Rel. 15/Rel. 16, 2 CWs provides performance gains | | Qualcomm | Not supportive of the proposal and we consider it a lower priority. In the initial version, it included other options, specifically the layer-dependent modulation order, which has smaller specification impact. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  Although the proposal is supported by 9 companies including operator, infra vendor and UE vendor and the proponent tried to address concerns from some companies, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, including whether/how the specification impact can fit into TEI with considering possibility of other options and symmetric design between DL and UL.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | We have a question for clarification: why this enhancement is only applied to UL? It is from consideration of performance (e.g. the SINR gap between layers is smaller for DL) or standardization (e.g. need additional enhancement for CSI feedback)? | | Nokia | We share the same view as Ericsson, Qualcomm and MediaTek, this leads to reworking the data processing path and it is a proposal that has been rejected in the past. Could be considered for Rel-18 MIMO but a proper gain analysis would need to be made before agreeing to specify. | | Intel2 | We have concerns due to the following reasons:  1. Potential I work in RAN4. RAN4 may not have time in Rel-17 to define the requirements for corresponding TEI enahncements.  2. Prefer RAN1 study a bit more on this issue, e.g. taking tin account different deployments (not just indoor) and receiver strcuutres  3. Potetailly can be considered as part of Rel-18 MIMO. Simultaneous UL transmission is likely ot be in the scope, where mDCI framework can be resued to achive multiple CWs transmissions. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #1**

* **Support 2 codewords with 2 MCS for rank 2-4 uplink transmission (i.e. LTE-like CW mapping)**

This proposal is already supported by ZTE, CMCC, China Telecom, China Unicom, SoftBank, NTT DOCOMO, Sanechips, vivo. [CATT]

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. We believe 2 codewords for UL MIMO is erformanc to improve UL performance. |
| SoftBank | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Not support: As stated in RAN1#105, this proposal imposes a major rework on the data path and it is not at all evident that the gain justifies the pain. The single CW approach in Rel-15 was justified by gains over two CW approach, and it would be odd to introduce a parallel MIMO processing for this as a TEI. |
| Ericsson | Our comment is the same as last meeting, this is interesting but too large for a TEI. Could be considered for possible Rel.18 MIMO or Rel.18 UL work item. Can also be compared with layer dependent modulation order as mentioned by Qualcomm. Comparative studies like this is needed. Aspects such as waveform (CP-OFDM and/or DFT-s-OFDM) and coherent/non-coherent UE needs to be taken into account as well. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We think layer-dependent modulation order may be an attractive alternative to consider and would be our preferred approach to addressing the issue flagged above. |
| Intel | We have the concerns raised in RAN1#105e meeting:  1. Potential additional work in RAN4. RAN4 may not have time in Rel-17 to define the requirements for corresponding TEI enhancements.  2. Prefer RAN1 study a bit more on this issue, e.g., taking into account different deployments (not just indoor) and receiver structures  3. Potentially can be considered as part of Rel-18 MIMO. Simultaneous UL transmission is likely to be in the scope of Rel-18, where mDCI framework can be reused to achieve multiple CWs transmissions.  It would be good if proponents can provide comments on the above concerns. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the enhancement for DL is needed for joint consideration given that it is even earlier specified than UL in LTE thus well justified by its commercial need, and the spec impact would be mostly symmetric between DL and UL. Note that 212 already includes two MCS for two CWs which is not the case for UL, hence the spec efforts and implementation impact (for monitoring certain DCI format size) for enhancing DL might be smaller than that for UL. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  Although the proposal is supported by multiple companies including operator, infra vendor and UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since there are some companies not supporting this proposal due to too large scope or other attractive alternative to address same issue.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
| OPPO | We are fine to consider it in Rel-18 UL MIMO. One question for clarification from RAN1#105: why this enhancement is only applied to UL? It is from consideration of performance (e.g. the SINR gap between layers is smaller for DL) or standardization (e.g. need additional enhancement for CSI feedback)? |
| ZTE | Thanks for the comments. Please see some response to above comments:  For spec impact related comments, again we don’t think this TEI proposal requires a lot of specification changes, please see our draft TPs R1-2106101-03 in last meeting. Regarding RAN4 additional work, we don’t think it is a big issue since it can actually be inherited from LTE which supports this feature already. For those companies have concerns on the scope, could you please point out whether our proposed draft TPs are sufficient in your view? If not, what else do you think is missing?  Further, using multi-DCI mTRP to implement this feature will unnecessarily introduce extra complexity, since UE has to support multi-DCI mTRP for the purpose of uplink enhancement in single TRP.  Last, we are open to enhance DL with symmetrical design but we suggested to do it step by step. The issues from our real test for UL are more urgent. That’s why we suggested UL enhancement first. If more companies want to do both, we are also okay to support both UL and DL. For those companies who want to do both DL and UL, are you okay with our draft TPs on UL part? What additional spec change do you expect for DL? |

* 1. Improved Frequency-Domain Interleaving

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [7] | Starting from NR Rel-15, it was identified that at large BWs and high data rates and high rank, several codeblocks (~12) can be mapped onto any single OFDM symbol. When this happens, even though interleaving exists within any given code block, the frequency diversity of each codeblock can be relatively small since each CB occupies only a small set of PRBs. VRB-to-PRB interleaved mapping was introduced to distribute codeblocks across frequency.    Unfortunately, several limitations of the NR Rel-15 VRB-to-PRB solution were identified in practice:   * Small performance gains are observed since CBs are only distributed along two sub-bands that are diverse in frequency. Much larger gains can be achieved with higher-depth interleavers having more diversity. * VRB-to-PRB interleaved mapping is happening within the BWP and not within the UE’s scheduled allocation which limits the ability to multiplex UE’s with different BWP configurations. VRB-to-PRB mapping may preclude coexistence of different UE’s with BWP switching for power savings. * There is no mode of CSI reporting which assumes VRB-To-PRB interleaved mapping, while dynamic switching between the interleaved and non-interleaved mapping is specified. The scheduler does not have an indication from the UE whether, in any given conditions, it will be beneficial to dynamically switch ON/OFF the interleaved mapping.   As a simple simulation example, we consider the case of high throughput / high spectral efficiency (where the interleaving was supposed to provide most of the gains): Rank 4, 100MHz BW, 30kHz SCS, TDL-A 30 nsec with MCS 13, 19 which correspond to the following cases:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **MCS** | **Rate** | **Modulation Order** | **# of CBs** | **# of CBs / Symbol** | | **19** | 0.85 | 6 | 79 | 7.9 | | **13** | 0.55 | 6 | 51 | 5.1 |   The gains in SINR over NR Rel-15 options to reach 90% throughput is shown below:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Interleaver** | **Delta in dB, MCS = 19, MMSE** | **Delta in dB, MCS = 13, MMSE** | | **Rel-15 (No-ILV)** | 0 | 0 | | **Rel-15 (VRB2PRB ILV)** | 1.0 | 0.6 | | **8-Row** | **6.5** | **2.8** |   Based on the above observations, we make the following proposals:  Proposal 1: For the VRB-To-PRB interleaved mapping:   * **Increase the depth of the interleaver (e.g. 4 or 8 rows instead of 2 rows in NR Rel-15)** * **Perform the interleaved mapping within the scheduled allocations and not within the active BWP** |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | Increasing the depth of the interleaver will improve performance in given assumption, but not sure of its urgency. Interleaved mapping within the scheduled allocations and not within the active BWP may cause the multiplexing issue (PRB domain collision) with legacy Ues sharing the same active BWP, further study may be needed. | | NTT DOCOMO | We are supportive to introduce the new interleaver in addition to the existing one to improve the performance. However, we don’t see the necessity of the 2nd sub-bullet. If there is a legacy UE to be scheduled simultaneously, there is no choice but to follow current interleaved mapping rule for coexistence. Also, as mentioned by the proponent, dynamic switching between the interleaved and non-interleaved mapping is supported. Coexistence of Ues with different BWPs can be achieved if non-interleaved mapping is used for the UE with narrower BWP for power saving. | | CATT | Comprehensive evaluation is needed to justify the enhancement. The change of interleaver depth may cause co-existence issue with legacy Ues which should be carefully studied. In addition, the second bullet may lead to large erfor of work in RAN1, and is not suitable for TEI. | | Intel | We can support this proposal if it also include MIMO layer dependernt interleaving mapping. | | MediaTek | We are ok to discuss the first sub-bullet. But we are not sure about the benefit of the second sub-bullet. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not favor this proposal.  The actual gain that can be expected from implementing the proposals is questionable. On one hand, the motivation to have deeper interleaver is to obtain more diversity gain from larger frequency areas, while on the other hand with second sub-bullet, the scheduled locations have smaller frequency range than its BWP size, thus, although it may enable more R17 UE multiplexing (if those Ues all support this new feature), it turns out to restrict the potential gain that can be expected. However, erformance, the multiplexing capacity will not be increased either, since there are legacy Ues only supporting BWP-level interleaving such that multiplexing of different Ues for co-existence could be different and complicated. | | ZTE, Sanechips | In our view, the use case, i.e., if a CB is mapped onto one OFDM symbol and occupies only a small set of PRBs in the symbol, may not be very typical. As for the proposed enhancements, the motivation/benefit does not seem to be clear to us.   * For the 1st sub-bullet, whether there is performance gain in such corner case needs to be carefully verified first. * For the 2nd sub-bullet, current mapping within the active BWP makes the PRB more distributed and therefore better performance, which is more important from our perspective. | | Ericsson | We support TEI proposal#2. This is important to achieve the peak thoughput for NR. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, including necessity of 2nd bullet proposal and whether/how to address the coexistence issue with legacy Ues. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | Maybe the scenario with gain is too erfor for us. We are fine for further study and evaluation on the first bullet. For the second bullet, the application could be very litmied considering there are so many legacy Ues in the same BWP. | | Nokia | This leads to reworking the data processing path. Could be considered as a Rel-18 enhancement but a proper gain analysis would need to be made before agreeing to specify. | | Qualcomm | Thank you for the constructive comments. We’ll take them into account and consider further changes to the proposal. However, we would like the companies to consider the following notes in their future replies:   * A few companies argue that it is “too corner case”. Ensuring that peak throughput/close to peak throught is feasible even in benign channel conditions should not be considered a “corner case” for these later releases of 5G. The issue that we have identified effectively reduces the max/peak throughput that a user will be able to achieve even in the most channel favorable conditions. * We don’t think that there will be a problem of co-existence with legacy Ues if the feature is enabled within each UE’s BWP. To see this, a new UE could still be doing non-interleaved/interleaved legacy VRB->PRB mapping but before doing that, there can be a VRB1->VRB2 mapping (which is what we are describing here) to ensure that the CBs are interleaved before mapping into the PRBs. The frequency diversity gains for the scenarios of max/peak throughput will still be achievable: Rel-17 Ues with large BWP will be able to achieve their nominal throughput compared to previous rel-15/16 Ues. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #2**

* **Support following improvements for the VRB-To-PRB interleaved mapping**
  + **Increase the depth of the interleaver (e.g. 4 or 8 rows instead of 2 rows in NR Rel-15)**
  + **Perform the interleaved mapping within the scheduled allocations and not within the active BWP**

This proposal is already supported by Qualcomm, [Ericsson].

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are supportive to introduce the new interleaver in addition to the existing one to improve the performance. However, we are still not sure how such gain can be obtained while ensuring coexistence with legacy Ues with different BWPs by supporting the 2nd sub-bullet. |
| Nokia, NSB | As we said in RAN1#105, introducing an alternative interleaver in addition to the Rel-15 one hits the data processing path and is difficult to agree given the implications, without having a performance analysis done in RAN1. It could be considered as part of Rel-18 MIMO enh WI, but is too drastic a feature for a TEI. |
| ZTE | We are afraid more time is needed to check the urgency of applicable use cases and verify the performance gain and potential impacts to legacy Ues. |
| Ericsson | We continue to support TEI proposal#2. This is important to realistically achieve the theoretical peak thoughput for NR and is important in favourable conditions. |
| CATT | The target use case is not typical in our view. For the backward compatibility, we would like to clarify whether the proposal is that VRB-to-PRB mapping remains unchanged as in Rel-15/16 and the new interleaver is erformance applied to VRB-to-VRB mapping. In addition, whether the new VRB-to-VRB mapping is semi-statically enabled or dynamically enabled? |
| Intel | In the scenarios with channel correlation across MIMO layers, the proposed interleaving may not perform well even with increased interleaver depth. We proposed to amend the proposal to also include MIMO layer dependent interleaving mapping. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view has not changed given the potential gain that can be expected by the proposal is unclear while its implementation impact would be considerable, according to our analysis previously provided above. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since there are some companies not supporting this proposal due to too large scope or unclearness of its gain and impact. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Enhancements to PUCCH format 2

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [7] | Short PUCCH format, specifically, PUCCH Format 2 spans one to two OFDM symbols and is restricted to use CP-OFDM waveform. The table below summarizes the configurations available for various PUCCH formats. The lack of DFT-S-OFDM support for short PUCCH Format is a significant shortcoming that we wish to address.    Table 1 Configurations for different PUCCH Formats  Short PUCCH formats have found significant use in FR2 deployments where a large number of analog antenna beams are used to serve users in uplink/downlink. Due to large number of antenna beams, long PUCCH formats are not favored since it’s easier to support beam sweeping operations using short PUCCH formats. Further since certain beams are intended to provide cell-edge coverage while certain beams are intended for cell-center Ues, beam-specific PUCCH configurations are ideally desired. However, defining beam-specific PUCCH formats is a tedious effort and adds to overall network configuration complexity. Therefore, short PUCCH formats are typically configured across all beams. Additional details on these aspects are presented in [1].  Further, with uplink being a typical bottleneck in NR deployments, it is worth considering enhancements that help improve uplink control coverage. It is well known that DFT-S-OFDM waveforms have a smaller PAPR compared to CP-OFDM, and this enables them to be transmitted at a higher power.  Using power class 3 UE as a motivating example, Table 6.2.2-1 of 38.101-1 as provided in Table 2 specifies a set of power reduction values dependent on RB allocation and modulation order for power class 3 Ues. The power back off values are then used by the UE to calculate the lower bound on its value.  Table 2 MPR Table from 38.101-1    Note that DFT-S-OFDM with pi/2 BPSK has two sets of values defined, one for the case where the 0 dB MPR is in reference to 23 dBm and another where the 0 dB MPR is in reference to 26 dBm. This change in reference power to 26 dBm is permitted when UE is operating in TDD mode with less than 40% of the slots in a radio frame being used for uplink transmission.  It is thus seen that for a wide range of RB allocations, DFT-S-OFDM waveforms can be transmitted at a transmit power that is 2 dB higher than that possible for CP-OFDM waveforms. This motivates us to make the following proposal:  ***Proposal 2:* Support transmitting PUCCH Format 2 using DFT-S-OFDM waveform.**  Introducing DFT-S-OFDM for short PUCCH format requires a careful consideration of how the resources are split between DMRS and data. To support single symbol PUCCH transmission, it is required that DMRS and data be multiplexed on the same symbol. One option is to multiplex DMRS and data in time domain before the DFT operation [2], [3].  **Transmit-side operations**  The proposed scheme multiplexes data and reference signal within one symbol duration by virtual TDM. The time domain signal before DFT-spread and the transmitter block diagram is shown in Figure 1.    **Figure 1. Transmitter for Virtual TDM of Reference Signal and Data**  The first part of the pre DFT-spread time-domain signal is the reference signal. It is preferable for the reference signal to have low PAPR property on both time and frequency domain to keep the PAPR of the final DFT-s-OFDM waveform low and at the same time make the frequency domain channel estimation efficient.  To reduce inter-symbol interference, an additional virtual CP for reference signal can be optionally added at the beginning of the pre DFT-spread time-domain signal by copying the last symbols of the reference signal.  The reference signal symbols are followed by data symbols to form the pre DFT-spread time domain sequence. The pre DFT-s sequence goes through the conventional DFT-s-OFDM waveform synthesis to generate the final time domain waveform.  Denote the signals in Figure 1 as follows:  : pre DFT-s Reference signal with length  : pre DFT-s Data signal with length  : pre DFT-s Virtual Cyclic Prefix for Reference Signal with length  : pre DFT-s Time-domain signal with length  From the above discussion, we can see that should be , and should be  .  **Receive-side operations**  Figure 2 shows the receiver block diagram for the virtual TDM shown in Figure 1. Except the channel estimation block, the receiver is essentially equivalent to the conventional DFT-s-OFDM receiver. After FFT and tone demapper, the extracted tones are equalized and go through IDFT to obtain M time domain symbols. Then, data symbols are extracted for the decoding.    Figure 2. Receiver for Virtual TDM of Reference Signal and Data  There can be multiple options for the channel estimator. Figure 3 shows a channel estimator for the virtual TDM of reference signal and data. After FFT and tone demapper, the extracted tones go through IDFT to obtain M time domain symbols. Denote the discrete-time equivalent channel between the Tx antenna and Rx antenna for the M time domain symbols as . When the CP length for Reference signal is chosen longer than the propagation delay of , the reference signal is protected from inter-symbol interference and circular convolution is preserved. Therefore, the extracted RS symbols in Figure 3 can be represented as where denotes the -point circular convolution. The channel can be obtained by converting the extracted reference signal symbols to frequency domain by -point DFT. Finally, the estimated channel for tones can be upsampled by a factor of to obtain the channel estimation for tones, which can be used for the channel equalization in the receiver of Figure 2.    Figure 3. Channel Estimator for Virtual TDM of Reference Signal and Data – Option A.  Alternatively, the upsampling block can be further removed by using -point DFT. Figure 4 shows an alternative option for the channel estimator. The extracted tones go through -point IDFT to obtain time domain symbols. Then, the data symbols are replaced by zeros, and the modified time domain symbols converted to the frequency domain by -point DFT. Finally, the channel tones can be estimated in the frequency domain.    Figure 4. Channel Estimator for Virtual TDM of Reference Signal and Data – Option B.  Clearly, this proposed transmission scheme can provide the multiplexing of reference signal and data with arbitrary pilot ratio while keeping the low PAPR property of DFT-s-OFDM waveform.  **Simulation Results**  In this section, we simulate and compare the link performances of the proposed virtual TDM scheme and compare with that of OFDM where the reference signal and data is FDMed.  Figure 5 presents two plots that illustrate the characteristics and the performance of the DFT-S-OFDM waveform. First, Figure 5 shows that DFT-s-OFDM waveform has at least 2 to 2.5 dB PAPR gain over CP-OFDM --- this is a reasonably well known result. Second, Figure 5 also shows that when comparing the link level performance between CP-OFDM (with data-RS FDM) and DFT-S-OFDM, it is observed that there is little to no difference at least for small payloads. For the link level performance, a three-bit payload is considered, and transmitted over 2 RB. The additional virtual CP length for RS is set to be zero, and the pilot ratio is chosen as 50% for both cases. Thus, taking both these observations into account, we see that the proposed scheme can provide up to 2 dB better performance than a CP-OFDM-based approach.   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  |   Figure 5 PAPR for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveforms (on the left) and link level performance comparison between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (on the right).  Based on the discussion above and the simulation results, we make the following proposal:  ***Proposal 3:* Consider pre-DFT data-DMRS multiplexing to enable DFT-S-OFDM waveform for PUCCH Format 2.** |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | It could be beneficial, but it could involve large work in RAN4. | | NTT DOCOMO | We support to introduce PF2 using DFT-s-OFDM.  Short PUCCH format is an important feature for FR2 deployment with beam-based operation. However, current PF2 is CP-OFDM based format and the performance is not good compared to PF3/4, which are DFT-s-OFDM based format. Details of the enhanced format can be discussed further. | | CATT | The motivation is not clear. If UL coverage is an issue,  PF#3/PF#4 with less OFDM symbols, e.g., 4 symbols, can used instead of PF#2. Beam sweeping within one slot is still possible. If UL coverage is not an issue, e.g., for cell-center Ues, PF#2 without enhancement can be used.  Even RAN1 agrees to introduce DFT-s-OFDM waveform for PF#2, the simplest way would be using two symbols PF#2 with TDM multiplexing between DM-RS and UCI where UCI is transmitted with DFT-s-OFDM waveform. | | SoftBank | We support the proposal. | | Intel | Using DFT-s-OFDM waveform for PF2 can improve the PAPR. However, this TEI has substantial impact on receiver implementation, especially channel estimation. Given the large workload for this topic, it is not clear to us whether it can fit into the TEI. | | MediaTek | We are not supportive for this TEI. The overall system performance gain is not clear while the improvement is at expense of design changes. If coverage is a problem, gNB can configure PUCCH formats 3 and 4. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We doubt this can be a TEI proposal. There was a considerable number of suggested PUCCH formats in Rel-15 and a careful downseletction had to be done. The merits of this proposal appear to not have been justified, e.g., with system simulation results. We also note that PUCCH format 3 with 4 OFDM symbols is a viable configuration. In the WI on >52.6 GHz, it is also observed that the UE transmit power is not necessarily limited by the CM, as there are other regulatory constraints. | | ZTE, Sanechips | It is understandable that PAPR could be reduced if DFT-S-OFDM is introduced for PUCCH format 2. However, it would require new signal generation procedure for PUCCH format 2 and corresponding new channel estimation methods, which may degrade the performance compared to the traditional frequency domain channel estimation method. In addition, it seems the provided evaluation results haven’t taken DTX-to-ACK threshold into account. Thus, it needs to first carefully evaluate the potential SNR performance loss, with or without considering DTX-to-ACK threshold. | | Ericsson | We think the problem Qualcomm identifies is an important one. However, the work load does seem large for a TEI, and so should be considered e.g. in the context of Rel-18. Moreover, whether this solution or another has better gain vs. receiver complexity should be considered before proceeding further. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, including whether/how the specification impact can fit into TEI and achievable gain based on evaluation. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | Nokia | Agree with many, we “downselected” to 5 PUCCH formats, and we should be very careful before defining a 6th PUCCH format. A new channel is not TEI item. | | Qualcomm | We thank all the companies for their valuable feedback. Its good to note that this issue is acknowledged by other companies as well. Especially as we move to deploy 5G in FR2 and higher bands, we think these issues become more urgent and important to address. To address some concerns, we don’t think regulatory issues reduce the gap between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM. From a RAN4 perspective, we think this should be no different from PF3 and we don’t see any significant RAN4 impact.  We acknowledge CATT’s proposal to arrive at a possibly simpler solution but feel that data-DMRS multiplexing is a core aspect of this proposal and the solution wouldn’t be complete with this feature.  Quantum of work that can be accommodate in a TEI is subjective. There should be reasonable familiarity with the proposed solution given that it was discussed during the R15 time frame. We are hoping to leverage on those discussions to get this done in one quarter. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #3**

* **Support transmitting PUCCH Format 2 using DFT-S-OFDM waveform**
  + **Consider pre-DFT data-DMRS multiplexing to enable DFT-S-OFDM waveform for PUCCH Format 2.**

This proposal is already supported by Qualcomm, [NTT DOCOMO, Softbank].

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. As mentioned previously, short PUCCH format is an important feature for FR2 deployment with beam-based operation. In some practical situations, long format is not available. |
| SoftBank | We support the proposal as the coverage issue is critical. We want to achieve better PUCCH performance with short format. |
| Nokia, NSB | As said in RAN1#105, we don’t see a new physical layer channel to be a TEI item. |
| ZTE | We think this proposal is more suitable for Rel-18 enhancement, with more thorough evaluation about the performance gain and analysis on potential spec impacts on new signal generation procedure for PUCCH format 2. |
| Ericsson | Similar comment as last time that this seems rather large for a TEI item. |
| CATT | We do not see clear motivation on the proposal. From UL coverage perspective, PF#3/PF#4 with less OFDM symbols, e.g., 4 symbols, can used instead of PF#2 to support larger coverage while beam sweeping within one slot is still possible. |
| Qualcomm | @CATT, in FR2, time domain resources are extremely limited. Further Ues cannot be multiplexed together on the same symbol. This makes it less desirable to switch to long format PUCCH. Improving short PUCCH performance is quite valuable in this context. |
| Intel | As mentioned in previous meetings, we understand the motivation that using DFT-s-OFDM waveform for PF2 can improve the PAPR. However, this TEI has substantial impact on receiver implementation, especially channel estimation algorithm, which is largely different from existing algorithm. Given the large workload for this topic, it is not clear to us whether it can fit into the TEI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view has not changed. The spec efforts required for introducing a new channel format do not fit a TEI and its urgency/erforma is not well justified. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since there are some companies not supporting this proposal due to too large scope. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
|  |  |

* 1. Enhancements to CSI-RS design to solve false PMI reporting issue

Following proposals are made in the contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [5] | As been previously informed [R1-2001918], from OTA testing of commercial NR Ues, a critical issue has been found related to MIMO performance near cell edge. The issue has been detected for both 32 and 8 port CSI-RS and for two Ues with chipsets from different vendors.  This is a real-life network issue related to MIMO which severely impacts NR performance and can be summarized as:   * **Near cell edge**, while still connected to a serving cell, **the NR UE selects PMI as if it was served by an interfering cell**, hence false PMI selection and reporting   + This leads to a sharp drop in PDSCH throughput at cell edge   + PMI selection logged at UE, hence this issue is not due to poor UCI feedback channel quality * The problem occurs **whenever a CSI-RS resource from the serving cell collides with a CSI-RS resource from a neighboring cell**    + The problem occurs even though different seed is used for CSI-RS sequence generation in serving and interfering cell respectively * As the analysis in this contribution shows, a cause of the problem is **due the Rel.15 design that the same CSI-RS sequence** is used for all CSI-RS ports in the CSI-RS resource   + To mitigate this, the UE must perform more advanced channel estimation, which is unnecessary complex and can be avoided if the problem with the CSI-RS design is mitigated * It is argued that the false-PMI selection problem can be solved with **cell planning of non-colliding CSI-RS** in adjacent cells, however,   + Non-overlapping CSI-RS in different cells (reuse larger than one) introduces the need for cell planning which is cumbersome and against the reuse one principle of modern RAN   + Even if non-colliding CSI-RS is configured by the use of CSI-RS cell planning, colliding CSI-RS between different cells is very hard to avoid in practical networks even if such frequency reuse is adopted because the topology is much different from hexagonal and far away gNB with colliding CSI-RS still hits the UE   + Simulations (see section 3.1) shows that the peak PDSCH throughput performance when using colliding CSI-RS (with a new Rel.17 CSI-RS sequence) is better than when non-overlapping CSI-RS. Hence, it seems it is better to have another, well designed CSI-RS as interference than PDSCH.   + Deliberately configuration of colliding CSI-RS has huge benefits for operators as it relives the need for network planning of CSI-RS, ease of migration and densification, lower interference and minimal overhead. This is elaborated in Section 4.     Figure 1 Illustration of the observed problem from field testing with commercial Ues. The Ues served by gNB 1 are reporting PMII instead of PMID where PMII is the PMI the UE would report if served by gNB 2.  To solve this problem, we suggest the following   1. Correct the CSI-RS design as a TEI-17 to remove the false PMI reporting problem.   Note that the repetition of same sequence of multiple CSI-RS ports also lead to high PAPR of the CSI-RS transmission and was discussed to be corrected in Rel.16 eMIMO WI. However, RAN1 was divided on the severity of the issue for CSI-RS and it was concluded to be non-consensus to correct this problem. Only DM-RS PAPR was corrected in Rel.16.  It now turns out that the same problematic CSI-RS design with repetitive behaviour also creates the false PMI problem and if a resolution is introduced by this TEI, it can be designed to resolve both PAPR issue and false PMI selection issue.  ~   1. Using measurements using commercial NR Ues from two different vendors, the PMI reporting fails at low SINR. It seems the PMI reporting when nearing the cell edge behave as the PMI reporting the UE would have been reporting if instead served by the interfering cell. This leads to a erformance drop of throughput of NR at cell edge.   ~  The following sections provides an in-depth analysis of the cause of the problem and why configuration of non-colliding CSI-RS is not a solution that is attractive or even work in all deployments. In this section, we give the standardization based solution together with simulation results that shows that the issue completely disappears.  To summarize, the solution makes the interference from an adjacent base station that transmit CSI-RS appear as spatially white noise at the receiver. This is accomplished by introducing a port specific scrambling of CSI-RS ports while preserving orthogonality between the ports of a CDM group.  The solution is illustrated by Table 1 for the 4 port CSI-RS resource from row 4 of 38.214, where a new Rel.17 sequence per port (is introduced and which is multiplied with the original sequence. The index runs over the resource blocks, so in each RB, a new value of is used for each port. If the CDM group spans multiple OFDM symbols, the same value is used in all these OFDM symbols.  Table 1 TEI-17 proposal to the CSI-RS sequence, to solve the false PMI reporting issue observed in the field    The sequences can be based on the existing Gold-31 pseudo random sequence already used throughout the 38.211 specifications.   1. As a TEI-17, support a port specific multiplier sequence to the CSI-RS resource sequence to remove the false PMI reporting issue.   ~   1. Using raw CSI-RS channel estimates (K=1) that doesn’t utilize the processing gain of the use of pseudo-orthogonal sequences in different cells exaggerate the problem of false PMI selection   ~   1. Due to the use of same sequence sample for all CSI-RS ports, the spatial covariance matrix is dominated by the spatial covariance of the CSI-RS transmitted from the interfering cell if raw channel estimation samples are used   ~   1. If per port sequence is introduced, the spatial interference covariance matrix is randomized and appear “close to spatially white”, which reduce the problem as the spatial colored property in the covariance matrix from the interfering cell is removed   ~   1. So far only Type I CSI feedback has been analysed, the false PMI selection issue may be even more pronounced for Type II CSI feedback. In addition, the impact of this on any new CSI feedback schemes introduced in future releases is at risk. Hence, leaving this issue unsolved may yet again hit us back in a future release.   ~   1. Network deployments where cell planning is used for CSI-RS can only partially mitigate the problem in the general case, due to strongly interfering stray signals transmitted from cells further away which are commonly observed in e.g. metropolitan deployments.   ~   1. Network deployment with colliding CSI-RS between all cells have significant benefits to the operator in terms of no need for such network planning, ease of network densification and evolution when adding new sites, lower reference signal overhead and low interference at low load in network. Deploying with non-colliding RS should be avoided due to these reasons.   ~   1. It must be ensured that UE implementation is prepared well for colliding CSI-RS (including TRS and all other uses of CSI-RS), and RAN4 test cases should include colliding CSI-RS deployments. Further note that such a test case with two TRS is currently being considered in RAN4 for multi-TRP operation in Rel.16   To summarize the situation from the previous meeting:   * **Support:** Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Softbank, Verizon and T-Mobile USA. * **Open for discussion and/or consider “smart implementation”**: vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, Qualcomm * **Support proposal in principle but prefer RAN4 solution:** Intel, Nokia * **Do not support the proposal:** MediaTek, Huawei, HiSilicon   In addition, Qualcomm provided the following late comment “*port-dependent scrambling is a safer solution from multiple viewpoints, so we are supportive of considering it further*.”, thereby indication an openness for a RAN1 solution to the issue. Questions from previous meeting, to be answered Based on the discussion previous meeting, there were some questions posed by companies in the feature lead summary, that still didn’t obtain an answer:   1. **From Qualcomm to Ericsson:** In order to alleviate possible concerns, it would be interesting to know in what scenarios the problems were observed, if such information is shareable. It appears likely that when large delay spread is assumed in CSI-RS processing, there may be more false PMI reporting issue. Therefore, it would be also interesting to know in what network topology the issues occurred. 2. **From Ericsson to MediaTek:** You mention “descrambling over neighbor cell interference,” is what you mean that UE shall average over sufficiently large bandwidth that the per RB sequence values have an effect? It may be so that some Ues doesn’t show the false PMI reporting behaviour but some other does, depending on the implementation and the bandwidth used for such descrambling. How to ensure that all Ues is behaving . 3. **From Ericsson to MediaTek:** If this new sequence is used for TRS (as you hint towards), what potential new problematic issues do you foresee that needs to be studied? 4. **From Ericsson to OPPO:** You mentioned other network vendors and that they didn’t observe the issue of false PMI reporting. Did these vendors use overlapping CSI-RS in neighbouring cells? 5. **From Ericsson to Huawei/HiSilicon:** You mentioned that you didn’t observe the issue of false PMI reporting. Did you use overlapping or non-overlapping CSI-RS in neighboring cells when performing these tests?  Reply to Question #1 (Qualcomm to Ericsson): Regarding the scenario, the problem occurred in a test network with two gNB:   * Two gNB configured with cell ID 470 and 960 respectively, same output power * Test network in Kista, Stockholm, Sweden. * The same problem was observed with chipset from two different vendors. * CSI feedback and MIMO throughput tests with both 32 and 8 port CSI-RS using Type I codebook * The frequency was 3.5 GHz. * The handover threshold was -4 dB * The delay spread was not estimated in this test network, but the measurement was made in an industrial park similar to a modern suburban village with parks and some high rise buildings (up to 8 floors).  Related RAN4 work In RAN4, there is an ongoing Rel-17 work item (Further enhancement on NR demodulation performance) that contains CQI reporting requirements under inter-cell interference scenario.  This work may possibly be extended to also include tests that ensure UE implementations that doesn’t have the false PMI reporting issue. To pursue this, RAN4 need to be made aware and their work needs to be extended:   * Their current discussions only consider CQI reporting with inter-cell interference scenario, it has the be extended to include at least PMI reporting as well to capture the false PMI reporting issue * The CSI-RS from serving and interfering cell needs to be overlapping for this test to be relevant. RAN4 has already agreed to configure the CSI-RS resources for tracking and CSI acquisition on the serving cell are overlapped with interfering cell(s) for the PDSCH demodulation requirements. RAN4 will continue the discussion if the same configuration is applied for CQI reporting test.   Our suggestion is to discuss whether this ongoing RAN4 work could be a possibility to complement or replace the TEI-17 proposal in RAN1.  Please check these references for RAN4 way forwards:   * R4-2108664 “Way Forward on general and PDSCH demodulation requirements for inter-cell interference MMSE-IRC”, Intel * R4-2108665​ “WF on CQI reporting requirements for inter-cell interference MMSE-IRC”, Ericsson. |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | We are open for discussion, however smart UE implementation can avoid the problem. | | NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. We believe this issue could happen in any of operation with more than 4 CSI-RS ports operation, and once it happens, large performance degradation is observed. Thus, we support the proposal to solve the issue | | SoftBank | We support the proposal. | | Intel | Support the TEI proposal. We have preference to address this problem in RAN4 by special performance requirement in the collided CSI-RS that would avoid problematic UE implementations | | MediaTek | We do not support this proposal. Our view is well captured by moderator. | | Huawei, HiSIlicon | We have not observed similar issues, from both practical network and UE sides. Depending on the implementation, there are some proprietary optimizations to mitigate the risk of false PMI report, by both gNB implementation and UE CSI processing. Therefore, the motivation for this TEI proposal is not yet seen. | | ZTE, Sanechips | We are open for the discussion. However, as mentioned by multiple companies, advanced UE implementation is more preferred compared with the new CSI-RS sequence design which may cause more CSI-RS overhead. It can be further discussed compared to solutions with RAN4 impact only. | | AT&T | We are supportive of the proposal to solve the false PMI reporting issue in TEI17. As mentioned by other companies, the solution presented can be used as a starting point and other solutions can be evaluated to solve the issue. | | Qualcomm | We are open to consider this proposal further. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, including other option such as advanced UE implementation with RAN4 impact only. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | Firstly, according to the commens from some companies, similar issue was not observed by other network vendors. We need to erfo confirm that whether this is due to cell planning or other reasons. Secondly, for a cell edge UE, with similar SINR for CSI-RS reception from serving cell and neighboring cell, it is not expected to measure CSI based on neighboring cell CSI-RS, assuming that different scrambling IDs are applied. If the SINR of neighboring cell CSI-RS is significantly higher than serving cell, the UE should hand over to neighboring cell. | | Nokia | A more effective solution would be to introduce a release independent RAN4 requirement and test case for Ues. | | Ericsson | **To MediaTek:**   * You mention “descrambling over neighbour cell interference,” is what you mean that UE shall average over sufficiently large bandwidth that the per RB sequence values have an effect? It may be so that some Ues doesn’t show the false PMI reporting behaviour but some other does, depending on the implementation. So I think you should be positive to resolve the issue in RAN4 with a test? This to ensure that all Ues can handle configurations with overlapping CSI-RS from all cells in a good manner (since this is the preferred deployment configuration). * If this new sequence is used for TRS (as you hint towards), what potential issues do you foresee that needs to be studied? * It is true that two separate periodic CSI-RS resources needs to be configured, but our analysis gives that this is still worth the extra overhead since the network performance benefit of having correct PMI from cell edge users is likely much larger than the extra overhead of a second periodic CSI-RS resource. It is well known that improving cell edge user performance has a large impact on network performance since these users occupy a lot of resources in time.   **To OPPO:**   * You seem to propose that operator should apply a handover threshold that is zero, i.e. handover to the neighbour cell exactly when the serving cell SINR drops is the same as the neighbour cell. That would lower the risk of false PMI reporting, but I believe this is too restrictive for operators to use such threshold and there is a large risk of handover ping pong effect. Also, there are other factors that determine the handover threshold. I think it it better to resolve the root cause of the false Pmi instead. * Yow wrote *“it is not expected to measure CSI based on neighboring cell CSI-RS, assuming that different scrambling IDs are applied.”* I think you have misunderstood the cause of the problem. The UE is still measuring on the serving cell. Different scrambling sequences in the different cell doesn’t help to resolve this problem. Please check our tdoc with the analysis. * You mentioned other network vendors and that they didn’t observe the issue of false PMI reporting. Did these vendors use overlapping CSI-RS in neighbouring cells?   **To Huawei, HiSilicion:**   * You mentioned that you didn’t observe the issue of false PMI reporting. Did you use overlapping CSI-RS in neighbouring cells when performing this tests? * The erformance solution on gNB side you mention is to use non-colliding CSI-RS resources in different cells, but this requires CSI-RS resource cell planning, which is not desirable by several operators. * For propretiary solution on UE side, wouldn’t a RAN4 test be needed to ensure that all Ues implement so that they handle colliding CSI-RS in different cells well? | | Qualcomm | A few additional remarks:  In order to alleviate possible concerns, it would be interesting to know in what scenarios the problems were observed, if such information is shareable. It appears likely that when large delay spread is assumed in CSI-RS processing, there may be more false PMI reporting issue. Therefore, it would be also interesting to know in what network topology the issues occurred.  In any case, having port-dependent scrambling is a safer solution from multiple viewpoints, so we are supportive of considering it further. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #4**

* **Correct the CSI-RS design as below to remove the false PMI reporting problem**
  + **Support a port specific multiplier sequence y^(p^’ ) (n) to the CSI-RS resource sequence**

This proposal is already supported by Ericsson, [NTT DOCOMO, Softbank, Verizon and T-Mobile USA].

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. We believe this issue could happen in any of operation with more than 4 CSI-RS ports operation, and once it happens, large performance degradation is observed. Thus, we support the proposal to solve the issue |
| SoftBank | We support the proposal. In order to make the interference coordination of CSI-RS easier, this enhancement should be introduced to the spec as soon as possible. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not see the new optional Rel-17 feature helping the issue. If some Ues are not implementing Rel-15 in such a way that they perform well in the system, what would be the incentive for them to implement a new Rel-17 specification to achieve the same? At best the specification of a new Rel-17 feature can justify not improving the Rel-15 implementation but rather wait for the new Rel-17 optional feature to become commonplace in the networks to justify the Rel-17 feature implementation in some later date.  If this is a problem, it should be fixed so that it works in legacy networks, and rolled out as soon as possible in the Ues that perform poorly. Hence we firmly believe that the issue is resolvable by improved UE implementation and can be ensured (if necessary) by testing. RAN4 requirement development would help ensure that in the future all Ues have a high-performance implementation with this regard. |
| ZTE | We prefer to let RAN4 discuss this issue instead of RAN1 as the RAN1 proposal may cause some backward compatible issue (CSI-RS sequence is different from legacy ones) and further incurease CSI-RS overhead. |
| Intel | Support the TEI proposal as RAN1 or RAN4 enahncement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | View has not changed. It seems both other network vendors and UE vendors do not observe this problem in real site, thus the issue mentioned by the proposal appears to be implementation specific. As cross-WG issue is not encouraged, RAN4 could discuss it further on their own process if the proponent is considering this approach, instead of being asked from RAN1. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since there are some companies not supporting this proposal due to another preferable approach (such as RAN4 requirement). Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
| OPPO | In our understanding, if different scrambling sequences are used for different cell, the assumption of may not be reasonable considering the SINR of the CSI-RS cannot be significantly lower than 0dB (e.g. >=-6dB). If only very few Ues may suffer from this issue, and only part of them can support this Rel-17 feature, we don’t think it can improve the system erformance from network point of view. |
| Ericsson | To OPPO; you are focusing on the network performance, and as you know, the performance of the cell edge Ues is crucial for the network performance since retranmisionson to these poor SINR Ues consumes a lot of resources in the network and lowers its performance. The factor comes from a theoretical derivation under simplified assumptions, in an attempt to explain why this happens. We should not pay too much attention to the absolute values of when there is an isse. Instead, we should look at the drive test results, which shows that there is an issue for Ues close to cell border. Here the HO threshold was -4 dB in the tests, so I don’t agree that SINR for CSI-RS cannot be much lower than 0 dB. It can be negative in practice. |

* 1. NR Positioning support for TA-based positioning in E-CID

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [9] | TA-based methods were already available in LTE for E-CID positioning, which were mainly used for meeting important regulatory requirements (e.g., localization during emergency calls). It is essential that when operators deploy NR Network and migrate from the LTE-based TA solutions, NR positioning should also be capable of providing this same important functionality, instead of a downgrading, which we have today.  Specifically, not every network element (gNBs, LMFs) or Ues may support Rel-16 UL SRS or DL-PRS based positioning – this is especially true in multi-vendor scenario environments, where network elements are coming from different vendors, and hence the possibility of interoperability issues which may lead to longer deployment period. Therefore, solutions similar to LTE which are based upon simple basic communication procedure such as TA should be made available to address such migration issue in a timely manner, and meet the same requirement for 5GS on providing UE location information during emergency calls.   1. Measurements and reporting similar to LTE TA Type2 are also needed in NR to provide positioning solutions to meet regulatory requirements and to ensure seamless positioning solutions when migrating from LTE to NR.   Besides helping to comply with regulatory requirements, TA measurements could also improve latency. Release 17 NR positioning use cases have considerably lower latency requirements compared to Release 16 and in [1] it was indeed observed that the latency could be greatly reduced if the network can report existing measurements based on timing advance, instead of using the PRS-based gNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement. Moreover, re-using already available measurement such as TA could help complementing the other measurement reports (such as PRS/SRS based reports) without introducing more RS overhead.   1. The network can report TA-based gNB RxTx time difference measurement without additional RS overhead cost or additional LPP signaling.   When looking at the LPPa/NRPPa specifications, in E-UTRA RAT the eNBs/ng-eNBs are able to report E-UTRA Angle of Arrival and Timing Advance Type 1/Type 2 in E-CID to the location server. Timing Advance Type 2, which is eNB Rx-Tx time difference measurement, is based upon PRACH (as seen in TS 36.214 extract below), which is considered a usual and required measurement to be signalled by UE to gNB in order to perform communication. Thus, it should already be supported by all networks.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 5.2.4 Timing advance (TADV)  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Definition** | Type1:  Timing advance (TADV) type 1 is defined as the time difference  TADV = (eNB Rx – Tx time difference) + (UE Rx – Tx time difference),  where the eNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to the same UE that reports the UE Rx – Tx time difference.  Type2:  Timing advance (TADV) type 2 is defined as the time difference  TADV = (eNB Rx – Tx time difference),  where the eNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE or similarly NPRACH from the respective NB-IoT UE.. | |   In this respect, Type 2 TA is only dependent on the gNB reporting and does not introduce any new measurement or reporting from the UE side, or any big system level impact. Therefore, the specification impact to support TA type 2 would be very limited, and it would not impact the UE.   1. TA type 2 does not impact the UE   Considering the important issues of interoperability and RAT migration, as well as the difficult contexts of 2020 and 2021 years – making positioning a crucial technology – we propose to focus this TEI on addressing the gap between LTE and NR by introducing the NR type-2 TA, similar to LTE definition. The specifications changes will be the timing advance definition in TS 38.215, and support of NRPPa reporting of NR TA as part of NR E-CID. For the NRPPa change, we invite the reader to check the papers submitted in RAN3 group in [3] and [4]. For the 38.215 changes, a draft CR can be found in [2].   1. Define the timing advance measurement for NR as follow:   Type2:  Timing advance (TADV) type 2 is defined as the time difference  TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference),  where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE..   1. Extend the gnodeB Rx-Tx definition to include the PRACH based measurement:  * TgNB-RX is the Transmission and Reception Point (TRP) [18] received timing of uplink subframe #*i* containing SRS or PRACH associated with UE, defined by the first detected path in time. * TgNB-TX is the TRP transmit timing of downlink subframe #*j* that is closest in time to the subframe #*i* received from the UE. * Multiple SRS resources for positioning can be used to determine the start of one subframe containing SRS.      * PRACH is used to determine the start of one subframe containing PRACH.  1. Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add Type 2 TA reporting for NR so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated. |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | We are fine with the proposal assuming it has no impact to UE. | | Intel | We support proposal. | | MediaTek | We are ok to discuss the proposal if it has little impact on UE implementation. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the motivation of the technical parts of this TEI proposal. However, it is not appropriate for a TEI to discuss changes to the WI scope, thus the 3rd main bullet should be revised or removed.  Technically, if PRACH is used, it should be based on PDCCH order, so that stage-2 specifications TS 38.300 and TS 38.305 in RAN2 should also be included. Then it appears clarification would be needed on if this can be properly handled in at least RAN2, and possibly also RAN3 depending on how their specs would be impacted, given the strong discouragement of cross-WG TEIs by RAN.  In addition, we believe NTA-offset should also be included in the respective message along with Type-2 TA or added to the gNB Rx – Tx time difference in the Type-2 TA definition, see the figure below. | | ZTE, Sanechips | We are positive for this enhancement because   * Rel-16 Multi-RTT only supports gNB Rx-Tx time difference based on SRS, so it precludes the case that PRACH can also acquire similar information. In Rel-16, UE Rx-Tx time difference can only be reported by UE through LPP, if we support this enhancement, network can still do positioning even UE can’t support LPP. * It’s natural to extend to support what we have defined in LTE. Such enhancement is beneficial for positioning latency reduction and efficiency improvement.   There is an on-going positioning WI in Rel-17. We are also fine to update the scope of Rel-17 positioning WI for this enhancement as it involves multiple WGs, the workload should be clearer for the corresponding WGs if it is done in a proper WI. | | Qualcomm | We can be open to consider the type 2 TADV under a clear common understanding that it will not have any UE impact, and it is for serving gNB only (similar to LTE).  We are not supportive of disussing Type 1 TA, nor leaving it up for further study during the rel-17 positioning enhancements. The Rel-17 Positioning work is heavy loaded, and the WID was converged after long discussions. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are many companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, including whether/how the WID scope of the Rel-17 positioning enhancement should be updated and whether this proposal fits into TEI as RAN2/3 impacts are expected.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | Ericsson | Thanks a lot to all companies providing feedback for this TEI. We would like to clarify that the revision presented for this meeting focused on type-2 TA and removed type-1 TA from the proposed scope. Thus the third bullet can be removed. We hope this would address the concern from Huawei and Qualcomm above. | | Nokia | We are supportive of the proposal | | NTT DOCOMO | Thank you for a lot feedback. Considering companies’ feedback, we are OK to remove third bullet (i.e. Type1 TA part) and supportive to focus on the only parts related to Type2 TA. | | Huawei, HiSilicon  (updated) | For Type2, we will support the proposal if the issue related to NTA,offsetreporting is addressed. As illustrated before, we prefer the following change on the fourth bullet, assuming the third bullet is removed already.   * **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add Type 2 TA and NTA,offset reporting for NR UL E-CID so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated** | |

Based on the above contribution, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#105-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #5**

* **Define the timing advance measurement for NR as below**
  + **Timing advance (TADV) type 2 is defined as the time difference TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference), where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE**
* **Extend the gnodeB Rx-Tx definition to include the PRACH based measurement**
* **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add Type 2 TA reporting for NR so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated**

This proposal is already supported by NTT DOCOMO INC., Ericsson, Polaris Wireless, Verizon, China Telecom, FirstNet, Deutsche Telekom, Intel Corporation and CATT.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Nokia, NSB | As indicated in RAN1#105, we support the proposal as well. |
| ZTE | We think such enhancement is beneficial for positioning latency reduction and efficiency improvement, so we are positive for this enhancement in TEI agenda if it can be agreed easily.  We realize that the corresponding proposal in RAN3 has been discussed in the on-going RAN3 meeting. The draft CR R3-213858 has been technically endorsed, but RAN3 still needs to check the status in RAN1.  So we suggest to get a quick consensus in RAN1, then RAN3 can finally/officially endorse the CR within this meeting.  In addition, in the RAN3 draft CR, the work item code is ‘TEI 17, NR\_POS-Core’, we think it should be TEI 17 if the proposal is agreed in this RAN1 TEI agenda.  If it is NR\_POS-Core, we need to add this scope to the WID since it is currently not in the scope. |
| CATT | Support |
| Intel | We continue support of the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are continurely supportive. Some refinement on the definition description may be needed, which can be left to other WGs for further review, as needed. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems there are more than 10 companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, and there is no clear objection/concern provided so far.  Based on the feedback from ZTE, the moderator would like to suggest companies to check RAN3 status and would like to check whether RAN1 can reach consensus to agree on the proposal. |

### **TEI proposal #5 (after first check point)**

* **Check whether RAN1 can agree to define the timing advanced measurement for NR as TEI-17**
* **Check RAN3 status on the corresponding proposal in RAN3, and discuss what is necessary RAN1 action for the TEI proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the proposal. Some questions/points:   * Why is there a need to introduce a T\_adv AND update gNB Rx\_Tx definition?  Why do we need to update gNB Rx-Tx definition in 38.215, when we can just define a new TADV measurement in 38.215? * This measurement is to enhance serving cell reporting for UL E-CID only, and not generically gNB Rx-Tx measurement based on PRACH. * Is there a need to call it “Type 2” from specification perspective? There is no “type 1” in the specification now.   If the proponents have the same understanding on the above statements, based on the above, we have the following suggestions:   * **Define a new timing advance measurement for NR as below**   + **Timing advance (TADV) is defined as the time difference TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference), where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE.**   + **~~Extend the gnodeB Rx-Tx definition to include the PRACH based measurement~~**   **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add TADV reporting for NR UL E-CID so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding the 1st bullet in FL’s proposal, we believe TA type 2 measurement for NR positioning can be acceptable as TEI-17.  Regarding the 2nd bullet in FL’s proposal, if RAN1 achieve the consensus on TEI proposal #5, we will need to prepare an LS including RAN1 agreement in order to inform RAN2/RAN3 of RAN1 status. After that, RAN1 needs to discuss the corresponding specification changes of TS 38.215 (please see the draft CR in R1-2103741).  To: Qualcomm  Thank you for the questions.  Regarding the 1st and 2nd questions, we consider that this measurement is to enhance serving cell reporting for UL E-CID only. Our intention to update gNB Rx\_Tx definition is to avoid contradiction between gNB Rx\_Tx definition and TADV definition. In our understanding, the current gNB Rx\_Tx definition in TS 38.215 focus on SRS only. If we define a new TADV (i.e. TA type 2) as TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference) in TS 38.215, we think it needs to not only capture TA type 2 definition but also update gNB Rx\_Tx definition.  Regarding the 3rd question, we are ok with either “TADV type 2” or “TADV”. |
| ZTE | Support to define the new timing advance measurement fo NR E-CID, and send an LS to RAN3 and RAN2.  For RAN1 action, we share similar view as Qualcomm. The new timing advance measurement should be specified in 38.215 but the details on how to define it in the spec can be further discussed. |
| Ericsson | The RAN3 discussion on the issue has discussed to technically endorse a CR for 38.455, but will formally agree once RAN1 has agreed to proceed with the proposal. Below is an excerpt from the RAN3 Chair’s note:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | [R3-213858](file:///D:/会议硬盘/TSGR3_113-e/Docs/R3-213858.zip) | Addition of gNB Rx-Tx measurement reporting in NR E-CID [Tatype2] (Ericsson, NTT Docomo, Polaris Wireless, Verizon, China Telecom, FirstNet, Deutsche Telekom, Intel Corporation, CATT) | CR0040r, TS 38.455 v16.4.0, Rel-17, Cat. B  **CB: # 119\_RxTxMeasureReport**  **- Check the status in RAN1**  **- CR is technically endorsed**  (E/// - moderator)  Summay of offline disc in [R3-214275](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG3_Iu/TSGR3_113-e/Inbox/R3-214275.zip) |   We agree with DOCOMO on the 3 questions raised by Qualcomm. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems there is no concern/objection to agree on the TEI proposal #5, but there are slightly different views on how to capture it in TS 38.215, especially whether the definition of gNB Rx-Tx needs to be updated or not for the Timing Advance measurement.  So, for the following updated proposal, whether second sub-bullet (and corresponding sub-sub-bullets) in the first main bullet is necessary or not can be further discussed by the 2nd check point (25th).   * **Define a new timing advance measurement for NR as below**   + **Timing advance (TADV) is defined as the time difference TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference), where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE.**   + **Extend the gnodeB Rx-Tx definition to include the PRACH based measurement:**     - **TgNB-RX is the Transmission and Reception Point (TRP) [18] received timing of uplink subframe #*i* containing SRS or PRACH associated with UE, defined by the first detected path in time**     - **TgNB-TX is the TRP transmit timing of downlink subframe #*j* that is closest in time to the subframe #*i* received from the UE**     - **Multiple SRS resources for positioning can be used to determine the start of one subframe containing SRS**     - **PRACH is used to determine the start of one subframe containing PRACH** * **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add TADV reporting for NR UL E-CID so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated**   Also, I’d like to ask the proponent (Masaya, NTT DOCOMO) to prepare draft CR and draft LS. |

### **Updated TEI proposal #5**

**Alt.1:**

* **Define a new timing advance measurement for NR as below**
  + **Timing advance (TADV) is defined as the time difference TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference), where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE.**
  + **Extend the gnodeB Rx-Tx definition to include the PRACH based measurement:**
    - **TgNB-RX is the Transmission and Reception Point (TRP) [18] received timing of uplink subframe #*i* containing SRS or PRACH associated with UE, defined by the first detected path in time**
    - **TgNB-TX is the TRP transmit timing of downlink subframe #*j* that is closest in time to the subframe #*i* received from the UE**
    - **Multiple SRS resources for positioning can be used to determine the start of one subframe containing SRS**
    - **PRACH is used to determine the start of one subframe containing PRACH**
* **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add TADV reporting for NR UL E-CID so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated**

**Alt.2:**

* **Define a new timing advance measurement for NR as below**
  + **Timing advance (TADV) is defined as the time difference TADV = (gNB Rx – Tx time difference), where the gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to a received uplink radio frame containing PRACH from the respective UE.**
* **Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN3 with the agreement to add TADV reporting for NR UL E-CID so that their corresponding specification changes can be updated**

Companies are encouraged to provide their views on above alternatives or other possible alternative if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Alt.1.  Alt. 2 definition (new definition) is not self-contained because gNB Rx – Tx time difference corresponds to the time difference between Rx and Tx, where Tx is not mentioned in the context.  Alt. 1 actually references to existing gNB Rx – Tx time difference measurement (extension to PRACH), and it should be understanding that the uplink radio frame containing PRACH is mainly focusing on gNB Rx time in the existing gNB Rx – Tx time difference definition. |
| Qualcomm | To DCM & Ericsson on some earlier comments (postingit here so that it is not missed):  Thanks for the reply and the constructive discussion. It seems that you agree with the comments #2 (i.e. include clearly UL ECID in the proposal) and comment #3 (i.e., no need to call it Type 2, rather just TADV the measurement), so the proposal will be adjusted to accommodate those.  With regards to the 1st comment, we don’t see there will be a contradiction if we add TADV measurement without updating the gNB Rx-Tx measurement. The 38.215 will just include one new measurement (example below), without having to change the 5.2.3 section (called gNB Rx-Tx time difference), and without having to refer to the 5.2.3 Section.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Definition** | Timing advance (TADV) is defined as the time difference                 TADV = TgNB-RX –TgNB-TX  Where:  TgNB-RX is the Transmission and Reception Point (TRP) [18]  received timing of uplink subframe #*i* containing PRACH from the respective UE, defined by the first detected path in time.  TgNB-TX is the TRP transmit timing of downlink subframe #*j* that is closest in time to the subframe #*i* received from the UE.  …  …  … |   We believe that each measurement should be able to stand by itself independent of the other measurement. If there are any changes/enhancements done in UL ECID, or in MRTT that uses the gNB Rx-Tx, having different measurements clearly defined will avoid misunderstandings and will help with a cleaner specification. |
|  |  |

* 1. Enhancements on the scheduling of PUSCH over multiple slots

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [1] | Following the timing order of DL/UL DCI formats, as shown in Figure 1, the first DL format in slot n schedules PDSCH\_1 with corresponding HARQ feedback in slot n+k, if there is a UL DCI format transmitted in slot n+1 scheduling a PUSCH transmission in slot n+k, thus the second DL DCI format in slot n+2 is no longer allowed to schedule PDSCH\_2 corresponding to HARQ information transmitted in slot n+k and overlaps with the scheduled PUSCH by the UL DCI format.    Figure 1. Timing restriction on UL/DL scheduling for HARQ information multiplexed on PUSCH  The same scheduling restriction, although not described explicitly in the spec, is also applied to the PUSCH with repetitions. However, due to the length of PUSCH transmissions in time, the restriction introduces more strict constrains on gNB scheduling for the case of PUSCH repetition.  Take an example for FDD system as shown in Figure 2, UL DCI in slot n schedules a PUSCH transmission over slots from n+2 to n+5, and the number of symbols for each PUSCH repetition is 14. In this case, PUCCH conveying the HARQ feedback corresponding to PDSCH in slot n+1 is not allowed to transmit in the slots of PUSCH repetition, i.e. slot n+2 ~ n+5. So the earliest opportunity for HARQ reporting is slot n+6, which results in a large k1 value and delay for HARQ feedback. The delay would become larger if more repetition times are assigned for PUSCH, and the k1 value could be as large as (K2 + number of PUSCH repetition) slots.    Figure 2. Scheduling of HARQ feedback with timing restriction in FDD system  ***Observation 1: If PUSCH repetition is configured, the timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant introduces large delay for HARQ feedback, which could be as large as (k2 + number of PUSCH repetition) slots.***  In Rel-16, the number of PUSCH repetitions are counted by configured transmissions, the canceled repetitions caused by DL/UL collision will not be deferred. However, in Rel-17, the repetitions of PUSCH would be enhanced to transmit in available UL slots only, PUSCH repetitions may keep occupying contiguous UL slots and leave no opportunity to transmit PUCCH for a long period, especially for TDD system. Illustrated in Figure 3, a DL domain frame is configured as DDDSU pattern. In the slot 0 of frame N, UL DCI triggers PUSCH to repeat 4 times and each repetition occupies 14 symbols like the example in FDD system. Consequently, for the consecutive UL slots for frame N and N+1, gNB cannot schedule PUCCH to transmit the HARQ information associate with the PDSCHs scheduled in the DL slots of both frames. In other word, due to the PUCCH scheduling restriction, the DL traffic is blocked for lots of dedicated k1 values. For example, if the value of k1 is set as 1< k1<7, PDSCHs cannot be scheduled within any slots of frame N and frame N+1.    Figure 3. Scheduling of HARQ feedback with timing restriction in FDD system  ***Observation 2: If PUSCH repetition is configured, the timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant causes PDSCH blockage for dedicated k1 values.***  As the analysis above, if repetition is enabled for PUSCH, the scheduling restriction for HARQ feedback after UL grant will introduce a large delay for HARQ reporting. The PDSCH scheduling is also blocked due to lack of PUCCH resource and the DL data rate is also slowed down in the meanwhile. Therefore, optimizations for PUSCH repetitions on the scheduling restriction should be studied to overcome the performance loss caused by the restriction.  ***Proposal 1: Optimization of timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant should be supported for the case of PUSCH repetition.*** Optimization of the scheduling restriction Based on further analysis, two alternatives can be considered for the optimization of the scheduling restriction. One alternative is to only apply the timing restriction to initial PUSCH repetition. That is, it is allowed to schedule PDSCH after UL grant with the corresponding HARQ-ACK multiplexed on non-initial PUSCH repetition(s) to avoid additional latency for HARQ feedback and blockage of DL data, as shown in Figure 4. For this alternative, the scheduling of first transmission is similar as that of the single PUSCH transmission, thus a uniform design could be applied for both cases which has less standards impact especially for TEI.  Another alternative is to release the restrictions for all the PUSCH repetitions. No matter initial or non-initial PUSCH repetitions, all of them can convey the HARQ bits for PDSCHs indicated after the UL DCI. This will bring a higher level of flexibility for gNB scheduling, but gNB has to treat single slot and multiple slots PUSCH separately. On the other hand, the removal of scheduling restriction will cause invalidation of total DAI in the UL DCI. More investigation and impact analysis on DAI mechanism are needed, which means lots of standard efforts are required as well. So considering the limited time for TEI discussion, the first alternative is more preferable due to less standards impact.  ***Proposal 2: The time restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant is only applied to the initial PUSCH repetition, and HARQ information bits corresponding to the PDSCH(s) scheduled after the UL grant which triggers the PUSCH transmission are allowed to be multiplexed on the non-initial repetitions.***    Figure 4. Apply the timing restriction to the initial PUSCH repetition only DAI enhancements The optimization of timing restriction in section 2.1 relaxes the scheduling of PUCCH and makes it possible to piggyback the HARQ information corresponding to PDSCHs scheduled later than UL DCI. However, in this case the total DAI in UL grant cannot reflect the number of scheduled PDSCH(s) after the UL grant exactly, which would have impact on the HARQ-ACK codebook size determination. Therefore, some enhancements are needed here.  As shown in Figure 5, if the scheduling restriction is maintained for initial repetition but relaxed for non-initial ones, i.e. the first alternative in Section 2.1, the total DAI in the UL DCI format can be still applied to the first PUSCH repetition. For the non-initial PUSCH repetitions, one simple way is to use the DAI in the last DL DCI, which is same as the HARQ feedback piggybacked on CG PUSCH. One potential problem raised by some companies in the last two RAN1 meetings is the impact due to last DCI missing. Considering the reliability requirement of PDCCH decoding, the probability of DCI missing is relatively low and thus the impact might not be a very serious issue.    Figure 5. Update total DAI in UL DCI by the DAI in DL DCI  Further enhancements on the DAI mechanism to address the impact from DCI missing is to still use the total DAI in the UL DCI format, but take the DL scheduling after the UL grant into account. Assuming the total DAI covers both the number of PDCCHs sent before the UL DCI and the ones would be delivered after the UL grant. Although in the PHY layer, gNB cannot anticipate how many PDSCHs will be scheduled in the future, gNB may set an upper bound of HARQ bits as the total DAI in UL grant to cover all the possible PDSCH(s) receptions, as shown in Figure 6. The challenge of this solution is the uncertainty for the future scheduling from gNB side. If the upper bound is set too large, additional resources are wasted. If the bound is set too small, it will also limit the potential PDSCH receptions so that to degrade the downlink data rate.    Figure 6. Total DAI in UL DCI cover all past and future DL grants  Another method is to update the total DAI by other signaling. For example, a new DCI can be sent to UE to update the total DAI value just before the PUSCH transmission subject to the timeline conditions, similar operation as DCI format 2\_4 which used to cancel the PUSCH transmission scheduled previously. As shown in Figure 7, UL DCI\_2 is transmitted to UE to update the total DAI value which has been notified by UL DCI\_1 in slot n+1, to incorporate the HARQ information corresponding to the PDSCH\_2 scheduled in slot n+2. The shortage of this method is also obvious, additional DAI update signaling will bring more scheduling complexity and resources waste.    Figure 7. New UL DCI delivered to update DAI value  Considering above three methods to determine the HARQ information bits on PUSCH comprehensively, it seems the first option (i.e. rely on the DAI in last DL DCI) is more appropriate for TEI from the specification impact perspective. It has been applied for HARQ codebook carried in PUCCH and multiplexing HARQ on CG PUSCH. Therefore, following proposal is made.  ***Proposal 3: When the timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant is released for the non-initial PUSCH repetitions, DAI in the last DCI is applied to determine the number of HARQ information bits multiplexed on the non-initial PUSCH repetitions.***  ***Text proposal: To capture the enhancements on scheduling restriction, following changes on the specification should be adopted.***   |  | | --- | | 9 UE procedure for reporting control information  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  A UE does not expect to detect a DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release, a DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy, or a DCI format including a One-shot HARQ-ACK request field with value 1, and indicating a resource for a PUCCH transmission with corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a slot if the UE previously detects a DCI format scheduling a PUSCH transmission with the number of repetitions *K=1* or the first PUSCH repetition with the number of repetitions *K>1* in the slot and if the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** |  |  | | --- | | **9.1.2.2 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink shared channel**  If a UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that is not scheduled by a DCI format or is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include a DAI field or other than the first repetition of a PUSCH scheduled by a DCI format includes a DAI field with the number of repetitions *K>1*, then  - if the UE has not received any PDSCH or SPS PDSCH release that the UE transmits corresponding HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH, based on a value of a respective PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in a DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception or the SPS PDSCH release or on the value of *dl-DataToUL-ACK* if the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is not present in DCI format 1\_1 or on the value of *dl-DataToUL-ACK-ForDCI-Format1-2* if the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is not present in DCI format 1\_2, in any of the occasions for candidate PDSCH receptions by a DCI format or SPS PDSCH on any serving cell , as described in clause 9.1.2.1, the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission;  - else the UE generates the HARQ-ACK codebook as described in clause 9.1.2.1, except that *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUCCH* is replaced by *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUSCH*, unless the UE receives only a SPS PDSCH release, or only SPS PDSCH reception, or only a PDSCH that is scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with a counter DAI field value of 1 on the Pcell in the occasions for candidate PDSCH receptions in which case the UE generates HARQ-ACK information only for the SPS PDSCH release or only for the PDSCH reception as described in clause 9.1.2.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** |  |  | | --- | | **9.1.3.2 Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink shared channel**  If a UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that is not scheduled by a DCI format or is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include a DAI field or other than the first repetition of a PUSCH scheduled by a DCI format includes a DAI field with the number of repetitions *K>1*, then  - if the UE has not received any PDCCH within the monitoring occasions for DCI formats scheduling PDSCH receptions, or SPS PDSCH release, or DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy on any serving cell and the UE does not have HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH reception, or in response to a detection of a DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy, to multiplex in the PUSCH, as described in clause 9.1.3.1, the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission;  - else, the UE generates the HARQ-ACK codebook as described in clause 9.1.3.1, except that *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUCCH* is replaced by *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUSCH*.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** | |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | It is one of the open issues being discussed in coverage enhancement AI 8.8.1.1, better discuss in currently open WI | | NTT DOCOMO | We understand the motivation. On the other hand, using DAI in the last DL assignment instead of UL DAI seems not good way since if the DL assignment is not decoded successfully, PUSCH performance becomes degraded or gNB needs to do blind decoding. Careful discussions are necessary for this issue, so we are slightly negative on this proposal as TEI. It seems that Coverage enh. WI is discussing this issue. | | CATT | We are ok to discuss this proposal. | | Sharp | We support the motivation of the proposal on time restriction relaxation. The proposal looks good. | | MediaTek | We share a similar view with vivo. We think it is better to discuss this in R17 coverage enhancement WI. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this proposal. Current spec has a tight restriction on DL scheduling after UL grant and the restriction will bring a large HARQ feedback delay and DL repcetion blockage when PUSCH repetition is enbled.  The proposal is going to relax the scheduling restriction for non-initial PUSCH repetition. For the initial PUSCH repetition, the restriction is still applied similar as signle PUSCH transmission. For the HARQ bits generation, the UL DAI in the UL grant is applied for the initial repetition, and DL DAI in DL grant is used instead for non-initial PUSCH repetition(s).  As the comment from others in last meeting, companies think last DCI missing causes the misalignment of HARQ information bits between gNB and UE. We think the probility of DCI missing is not too high and issue is not very severe. We should also note that for CG PUSCH multiplexing HARQ bits, DL DAI is used already.  We think the proposal has limited spec changes and reuses the existed method as much as possible, while we are also open to discuss any solutions to fix the issue. | | Panasonic | We are supportive to discuss this proposal. When the number of repetitions is larger, the repetition transmission would occupy a lot of UL slots. If there is a HARQ-ACK feedback, HARQ-ACK would have to wait until PUSCH repetition have been finished and with the restriction on PDSCH scheduling, DL spectral recodersy and/or latency will degrade. Although this issue was also raised in Rel.17 coverage enhancement WI, we think to slove this issue is beneficial even in Rel.16 functionality to improve the DL spectral efficiency. | | ZTE, Sanechips | We acknowledge that there are some scheduling restrictions for the concerned case. However, it is fully up to gNB implementation on how to perform the scheduling. There could be multiple ways to schedule a PDSCH after the UL grant scheduling a PUSCH without multiplexing the HARQ-ACK corresponding to the PDSCH on the PUSCH. Below are two examples.   1. Enable PUSCH repetition type B for PUSCH. By configuring some UL symbols/slots as invalid symbols/slots by *invalidSymbolPattern* for PUSCH repetition type B, the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH scheduled after the UL grant can be transmitted on these invalid symbols/slots. This can be applied for scheduling both eMBB and URLLC traffic, as long as the UE can support PUSCH repetition type B.  * *“The UE may be configured with the higher layer parameter invalidSymbolPattern, which provides a symbol level bitmap spanning one or two slots (higher layer parameter symbols given by invalidSymbolPattern). A bit value equal to 1 in the symbol level bitmap symbols indicates that the corresponding symbol is an invalid symbol for PUSCH repetition Type B transmission. ”*  1. Schedule 7-symbol PUSCH per slot based on PUSCH repetition type A with potentially increasing the number of repetitions if necessary. In such case, the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH scheduled after the UL grant can be transmitted on the remaining symbols, with or without enabling PUCCH repetition.   In addition, it seems the proposed optimization may introduce some specification impact which might be too big for a TEI. For instance, how to design the UL DAI, how to incorporate the case for UL skipping, and how to consider intra-UE multiplexing if PHY priority is considered as discussed in Rel-17 etc.  Overall, we think this TEI proposal can be further discussed and considered only if clear benefit is shown compared to the implementation methods based on the current spec. | | Ericsson | As we expressed in previous meeting, in our view the restrictions on scheduling PDSCH after UL grant, impacts on system performance specially in TDD deployments. The impact is more emphasized in case of PUSCH repetition or triggering A-CSI as we explained in previous meeting.  **Therefore, from our view the issue is legitimate, and we should aim for a general solution, not specific to PUSCH recoders.**  On the proposed solution for PUSCH repetition (TEI proposal #6), there are still issues that in our view leans towards the direction that focusing on a general solution is more appropriate.  In particular, the first bullet does not really solve the underlying issue that resulted to this restriction (i.e. DAI determination). In our view, timeline requirements should be respected anyway.  The second bullet aims to address the underlying issue (i.e. DAI determination). However, as other companies commented there is still issue because currently in case of PUSCH repetition, it s assumed that the t-DAI in UL grant is applicable to all repetitions. That means that eventually we would lean towards a solution that would be applied per PUSCH transmission and corresponding HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed in. And the dependency by coupling it to PUSCH repetition framework would be in principle irrelevant.  On the comments related to recode this topic should be discussed under CE or TEI Rel-17, our view is that **the enhancement is out of scope of CE WID. Then it should be discussed in TEI Rel.17.**  In summary:   * **We are supportive of solving the scheduling restrictions issue in general and not specific to PUSCH recoders under TEI Rel-17.** | | Qualcomm | We are open to discuss this with lower priority. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  It was clarified in CovEnh session that this proposal can be discussed in TEI-17 agenda instead of CovEnh agenda.  Although there are multiple companies supportive to discuss on this proposal, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor. There are some comments that we should discuss on e.g., whether there is clear benefit compared with implementation based solution and whether the proposal can be extended to general solution for solving the scheduling restriction issues rather than specific to PUSCH repetition.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | Nokia | We share the Ericsson view in general. | | Qualcomm | A few additional remarks:  As ZTE points out, its not clear how prevalent these issues are in TDD systems and how much these issues can be alleviated by appropriate scheduling decisions at the gNB. Additional clarification/justification on the need for these changes is required.  Unlike Ericsson, we prefer a more targeted solution that addresses the core issue at hand with as few changes as possible. Reusing the existing framework for CG-PUSCH repetitions would be a good starting point. | | Huawei, HiSilicon (updated) | @ Vivo @ MediaTek  According to the discussion in coverage WI in this meeting, it seems the common understanding is that it will be discussed in Rel-17 TEI here.  @ NTT DOCOMO  The reason we propose to use DAI in the last DL assignment is to minize the specification impact/effort, since we are doing TEI. However, if there is any other better way, we are open to discuss as long as it can be suitable for a TEI. Companies are encouraged to share your solution for this issue also if any.  @ ZTE  Firstly, we cannot rely on PUSCH repetition type B for all cases, and enhancements should be designed for both PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH repetition type B. In addition, for the example you provided by using invalid symbol with PUSCH repetition type B, it will have impact on PUSCH repetition transmission also, e.g. increase the delay for PUSCH transmission, especially if you configured repetition type B latency may be one of the main motivation.  Secondly, as the example you mentioned by scheduling PUSCH on part of the symbols in a slot, we think it is not efficient. Since usually when gNB schedules the PUSCH, it cannot predicate whether any/how many DL transmissions needed after the UL grant for scheduling the PUSCH, therefore it may result in additional DMRS overhead while achieve nothing because of splitting the PUSCH transmission.  Finally, as you can tell from our proposal, we are trying to minimize the specification impact by simple solutions. We don’t see the relationship with UL skipping either, if there is any issue you identify, we are happy to disucss also.  @ Ericsson @ Nokia  As we discussed before, the impact from the restriction for the case of A-CSI reporting is not that serious. And considering this is a TEI, we think may be better to focus on the most serious case (i.e. PUSCH repetition) first, to avoid too much discussion on the applicable scenario and potential more specification impact. However, we are open to consider other scenarios also as long as it can be suitable for TEI.  @ Qulacomm  As we reply to ZTE and also the analysis in our paper R1-2105536, it cannot always find a proper scheduling decision to avoid the overlapping between PUCCH and PUSCH in such case and scheduling does not resolve the issue entirely without any cost. In addition, our original intention is also to focus on some specific enhancement item to make it suitable for a TEI, and our proposal is actually the same as the existing framework for CG-PUSCH, i.e. using the DL DAI in DL assignment to generate the HARQ-ACK codebook. However, as you observed some other companies may want to extend the scenarios also, our thinking is that if still we can use some simple solution to solve the issue, we are open to extend to more cases. | |

Based on the above contribution and discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #6**

* **Support the optimization of timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant for the case of PUSCH repetition**
  + **The time restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant is only applied to initial PUSCH repetition, and HARQ information bits corresponding to the PDSCH(s) scheduled after UL grant which triggers the PUSCH transmission are allowed to be multiplexed on the non-initial repetitions**
  + **When the timing restriction on scheduling HARQ after UL grant is released for the non-initial PUSCH repetitions, DAI in the last DCI is applied to determine the number of HARQ information bits multiplexed on the non-initial PUSCH repetitions**
  + **Text proposals shown in Section 2.2 of R1-2106494 are applied**

This TEI proposal is already supported by Huawei, HiSilicon and China Unicom.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CMCC | We support this proposal to slove the DL scheduling restriction issue. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that the scheduling restriction is not good. At the same time, there is the restriction even in the case of PUSCH without repetition. If enhancement is to be discussed/agreed, we prefer a unified mechanism between non-repetition case and repetition case. |
| Noki NSB | In absence of a generic solution, we would be open to introduce at least this one as a TEI. |
| ZTE | As we commented in previous meetings, the urgency of this proposal is not very clear to us. It may trigger more discussion, e.g., whether this is applied to the Rel-17 enhanced PUSCH repetition repetition A. On the other hand, we are also ok to further discuss the potential solution if we could be more focused in terms of the applicable use cases. |
| Ericsson | Our comment is similar to previous meetings (please see above and copied below).  As we expressed in previous meeting, in our view the restrictions on scheduling PDSCH after UL grant, impacts on system performance specially in TDD deployments. The impact is more emphasized in case of PUSCH repetition or triggering A-CSI as we explained in previous meeting.  **Therefore, from our view the issue is legitimate, and we should aim for a general solution, not specific to PUSCH recoders.**  On the proposed solution for PUSCH repetition (TEI proposal #6), there are still issues that in our view leans towards the direction that focusing on a general solution is more appropriate.  In particular, the first bullet does not really solve the underlying issue that resulted to this restriction (i.e. DAI determination). In our view, timeline requirements should be respected anyway.  The second bullet aims to address the underlying issue (i.e. DAI determination). However, as other companies commented there is still issue because currently in case of PUSCH repetition, it s assumed that the t-DAI in UL grant is applicable to all repetitions. That means that eventually we would lean towards a solution that would be applied per PUSCH transmission and corresponding HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed in. And the dependency by coupling it to PUSCH repetition framework would be in principle irrelevant.  On the comments related to recode this topic should be discussed under CE or TEI Rel-17, our view is that **the enhancement is out of scope of CE WID. Then it should be discussed in TEI Rel.17.**  In summary:  **We are supportive of solving the scheduling restrictions issue in general and not specific to PUSCH recoders under TEI Rel-17**  We would like to repeat again that we used the example of A-CSI, to show another case that suffers from the scheduling restrciiton. Therefore, similarly to DCM, it is better to have a targeted , single solution to remove the scheduling restriction where different features can benefit from. |
| Intel | This issue was briefly discussed in Rel-17 coverage enhancement but did not proceed as it was out of scope for coverage enhancement.  We understand the motivation and share similar view as Ericsson from last meeting that it is not clear why we need to restrict this to PUSCH repetition only. It would be good to consider a unified solution to cover non-repetition case. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies proposed to have general solution to solve issues not only PUSCH repetition while some other company seems prefer to have more focused discussion/solution in terms of applicable use-case. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Enhancement on SSB resources for RLM

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [4] | A UE is required to monitor the downlink radio link quality of the primary cell to indicate out-of-sync/in-sync status to higher layers. The reference signals for radio link monitoring (RLM) can be SSB or CSI-RS, which are configured by *RadioLinkMonitoringRS.* Each *RadioLinkMonitoringRS* corresponds to a resource, either SSB or CSI-RS, for the radio link failure detection.  For a UE that supports the use of CSI-RS for RLM, if the UE is not provided with *RadioLinkMonitoringRS*, the UE can use the CSI-RS provided for the active TCI state for PDCCH receptions as the RLM resources. However, not all Ues have the capability to support the use of CSI-RS for RLM. For a UE that does not have the capability, the UE can only use the SSBs explicitly configured through *RadioLinkMonitoringRS* as the RLM resources.  However, a UE can only be configured with up to  SSB resources for RLM as shown in Table 1, where  is much smaller than the maximum number of SSBs from a serving cell. In this case, a UE may undesirably declare the radio link failure (RLF), if it cannot detect the SSBs configured by *RadioLinkMonitoringConfig*,even if it can receive one or more other SSBs from the serving cell properly. The issue was already identified in the real deployment scenarios even for FR1. It requires the network to very frequently re-configure the RLM SSBs for a moving UE to avoid the UE undesirably declares the RLF.  Table 1:  as a function of maximum number (TS 38.213)   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 2 | | 8 | 4 | | 64 | 8 |   A potential solution for the above issue could be that if a UE cannot receive the SSBs configured by *RadioLinkMonitoringConfig* for radio link monitoring, but it has detected the SSBs from the same serving cell, the UE will use the detected SSBs with the maximum RSRP from the same serving cell for RLM instead of declaring the RLF. With this approach, it will provide the gNB enough time to re-configure the *RadioLinkMonitoringConfig* with the SSBs reported from the UE in RRM measurements, and reduce the probability of triggering the unnecessary RLF procedure.  In our view, the proposed solution has the following advantages:   1. It does not increase the number of SSBs for RLM or other purposes at any given time because it simply uses an already detected non-RLM SSB for RLM when UE cannot detect configured RLM SSBs; 2. It has no impact on other procedures (e.g., beam management, PDCCH channel, beam failure recovery, etc.). RLM is UE’s internal operation based on the hypothetical PDCCH BLER rates derived from UE based on SINR of the monitored SSB, and it is not related to any procedures and signaling related data communication. 3. It may potentially reduce the RLM operation complexity when it is used properly, since it may allow reducing the number of SSBs configured for RLM for some scenarios without too much concern on UE to prematurely declare RLF, especially for slow-moving or stationary Ues.   ***Proposal 1: When a UE cannot detect any of the SSBs configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig for radio link monitoring for a serving cell, but it has detected one or more other SSBs from the same serving cell, the UE should use the detected SSB with the maximum RSRP as the RLM resource.*** |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meeting, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | In case the configured SSB is not detectable by the UE, the usefulness to use other SSBs for RLM is not clear, since those SSBs not configured to the UE does not reflect the link quality for PDCCH reception for the UE most likely. It is more robust to allow UE to trigger PRACH procedure so that network can reconfigure the RLM SSBs. | | CATT | Response to vivo’s comments:  The issue is caused by the limitation of the number of SSBs that can be configured for RLM. For example, in FR2 a cell can have up to 64 SSBs, but only up to 8 can be configured for RLM. Thus, the chance is very high that a UE can measure the strong RSRP from non-RLM SSBs, but not RLM SSBs. In this case, the link quality for PDCCH reception is still good. Allowing UE to continue using the non-RLM SSB with maximum RSRP for RLM will not only avoid triggering unnecessarily RLF procedure, it also gives gNB the time to reconfigure the RLM SSBs based on the UE RRM measurements to avoid the connection interruption. | | NTT DOCOMO | The current maximum number of SSBs to be monitored for RLM according to the RadioLinkMonitoringConfig was the outcome of extensive discussions and compromises in Rel-15 NR initial access and mobility sessions. Although we preferred to support larger maximum number in the discussion, this TEI proposal #7 would require some interaction between RLM procedure and other procedure which may detect “other SSBs from same serving cell” than those monitored for RLM. In addition, RLM is based on SINR measurement of the RLM-RS to derive hypothetical PDCCH BLER. Therefore, only when the “other procedure” performs SINR measurement of SSB, it may be possible to be utilized also for RLM. In that sense, applicable case of this proposal would be limited. | | CATT2 | Response to NTT DOCOMO’s comments:  We fully agree with the statement “maximum number of SSBs to be monitored for RLM according to the RadioLinkMonitoringConfig was the outcome of extensive discussions and compromises in Rel-15 NR initial access and mobility sessions.” That is the main reason that we did not propose to increase the maximum number of RLM SSBs. Instead, our proposal is that if the UE cannot detect the SSBs configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig, and it has already detected other SSBs from the same serving cell when supporting RRM measurements, the UE uses the detected SSBs as RLM SSB. The impact of the proposal to UE’s implementation is simply to treat the SSB with maximum RSRP as if it were configured for RLM. Thus, we don’t see the need to change the existing RLM procedure. | | Intel | If the UE is performing the measurement of non-configured SSBs for RLM, how does the gNB know the UE is performing this? RLM is an internal UE operation and nothing is signaled to gNB until RLF happens.  If UE is monitoring non-configured SSBs, and gNB does not know, how would gNB signal approratie PDCCH in the right CSS or update the TCI for USS? Its not clear from the TEI whether nothing else needs to be changed in order for the system to benefit from the additiona monitoring performed by the UE.  Additionally, if UE is also monitoring non-configured SSBs, this may potentially require UE to perform channel estimation and compute effective SINR from the SSB to derive the hypothetical PDCCH BLER rates. This operation is quite complex and expensive and the whole point of the RLM RS limitation was to limit the UE complexity.  If the proposed feature were to be introduced, there would need to be a corresponding UE capability for the Ues that are able to perform such complex operations. | | MediaTek | We have some questions for clarification.   1. Is this an issue identified in field? 2. Is it in FR1 or FR2 or both? 3. Why does UE not trigger beam failure recovery (BFR) before declaring RLF? | | Huawei, HiSilicon | To our knowledge, CFRA and CBRA based beam failure recovery procedures allow UE to send in RACH to report accessibility of “other SSBs” have been designed to address the observed problem. So this proposal seems not needed. However, let’s hear the clarifications from the proponenet first. | | ZTE, Sanechips | We are open to discuss this TEI proposal. In most of the cases, the network can configure appropriate RS for RLM explicitly or implicitly according to the BM/BFR result to reflect the PDCCH reception status. We understand the proposal is applied in the scenario that the network cannot re-configure the RLM-RS timely when the PDCCH beam is changed outside the RLM-RS set. In this case, the unnecessary RLF declaration can be avoided. We can first discuss under what scenario the network configuration cannot catch up with the timing before the RLF declaration. | | Ericsson | Support. This could reduce the risk for RLF. | | Qualcomm | We share the same view as NTT DOCOMO. Note that the same discussion was discussed in R15. In general, NW can properly configure RLM resources to avoid the issue e.g., based on beam management report. Further it doesn’t suffice for the UE to autonomously switch to monitoring a different SSB without letting the gNB know about this switch. | | CATT3 | To Intel’s comments:   1. In our proposal, UE is not required to measure non-configured SSBs for RLM when the UE can still measure the configured SSBs for RLM, and not required to measure extra non-RLM SSBs either. What we propose is when UE cannot detect configured RLM SSBs, the UE uses (already detected) non-RLM SSBs with maximum RSRP for RLM. In the proposed enhancement, there is no need for UE to inform gNB that UE has started to use other SSBs for RLM. gNB may find out it needs to reconfigure the RLM SSBs from other information, e.g., from the RRM measurement report. 2. As also mentioned in Intel’s comment, RLM is UE’s internal operation based on the *hypothetical* PDCCH BLER rates derived from UE based on SINR, the proposed enhancement has no impact on PDCCH signal. 3. We share the similar view as Intel that RLM operation is quite complex and expensive and the RLM RS limitation was to limit the UE complexity. In our proposal, UE only start monitoring the non-RLM SSB when the UE cannot detect RLM SSB. There is no increase of the number of RLM RS for the UE to monitor at any given time. 4. As explained above, we don’t see there is any significant increase in the complexity to support the proposed operation. *We would argue the proposed enhancement has the potential to reduce the RLM operation complexity if it is used properly*, since it may allow the reduce of the number of SSBs configured for some scenarios, e.g., for slow moving or stationary Ues. But, we are open to the discussion of UE capability for supporting it.   To MTK’s comments:   * The issue was identified in the field in FR1. It requires the gNB to very frequently re-configure the RLM SSBs for a moving UE. * The problem is expected to be much worse for FR2 because the DL beam width of FR2 is much narrower. A cell can have 64 SSBs, but the maximum RLM SSBs can only be only 8. * Our understanding for beam failure recovery is more related to support MIMO operation for data service, while RLM is used to determine whether the connection is reliable. They are separate procedures. RLM needs to work properly even there is no data service.   To Huawei’s comments:   * RLM is a procedure different from beam failure recovery procedures. RLM is based on UE’s evaluation of the *hypothetical* PDCCH BLER rates. In another word, UE performs the RLM operation regardless of whether there is a data service or PDCCH signaling for the UE. Thus, the UE may declare RLF for RLM even if there is no data service/no declaration of the beam failure. In addition, our understanding of CFRA and CBRA based beam failure recovery procedures are optional UE features (or mandatory with capability recoders). Even a new SSB is identified during the BFR procedure, RRC reconfiguration is still needed to reconfigure RLM RS which is not desirable.   To ZTE’s comments:   * Yes, the proposal is a remedy the scenario that the network cannot re-configure the RLM-RS timely. The proposal intends to avoid the unnecessary RLF declaration of RLM. Again, we would like to point out the RLM procedure uses the *hypothetical* PDCCH BLER rate that is estimated by the UE based on monitor the RLM RS. But, it is not based on the real PDCCH signaling and PDCCH beam state.   To Qualcomm’s comments:   * As we explained about, beam management and RLM are two separate procedures. We may not expect NW to depend on beam management procedure to resolve the issue of RLM. Also, as our response to Intel’s email, for simplicity we do not propose UE to inform gNB about of the switch. gNB may find out it needs to reconfigure the RLM SSBs from other information, e.g., from the RRM measurement report. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  Although the proponent tried to address concerns from companies, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal, as there may still be question/concern from companies e.g., regarding applicable scenario and UE impact of this proposal. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | The configured RLM-RS shall be able to reflect the channel condition for PDCCH reception. Please note that limited TCI-states can be activated at a time and if configured SSB for RLM is not detectable by the UE, it is very likely that the UE is with poor channel for the configured PDCCH. Therefore, it is meaningless to use other detected SSB for RLM, which doesn’t reflect channel condition for PDCCH reception. | | Qualcomm | A few additional remarks:  We are definitely not in favor of increasing the maximum number of beams in RLM configuration.  We are concerned that this proposal seems to go against the purpose of configuring RLM resources i.e., what is the point in configuring resources if the UE is expected to ignore the configuration anyway? If the network chose to use multiple beams and expects the UE to perform beam management, then the onus is on the network to properly configure and update the appropriate resources. Since the gNB has to reconfigure TRS upon beam change in response to a UE report indicting a new best serving beam, the gNB has no reason not to reconfigure the RLM resources as well, if needed, which simply avoids the issue that the proposal itended to address. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #7**

* **When a UE cannot detect any of the SSBs configured in RadioLinkMonitoringConfig for radio link monitoring for a serving cell, but it has detected one or more other SSBs from the same serving cell, the UE should use the detected SSB with the maximum RSRP as the RLM resource**

This proposal is already supported by CATT.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | Based on the email discussion at the last e-meeting, we could understand better on the intention of this TEI proposal. However, we are still wondering how much this TEI proposal is beneficial/essential in practical cases. As other companies commented at the last e-meeting, basically RLM-RS can be appropriately set explicitly or implicitly based on BM/BFR results.  In addition, even if SSB other than SSBs configured as RLM-RS is detected in other procedure (e.g., RRM), performing IS/OOS evaluation for the additional SSB outside RLM-RS is equivalent to the increase of the number of RLM-RSs since anyway UE needs to perform IS/OOS evaluation for all configured RLM-RSs (i.e., cannot omit any of them). It would be actually the change of RLM procedure although the proponent mentioned that “we don’t see the need to change the existing RLM procedure”. |
| Ericsson | Support. This could reduce the risk for RLF. |
| CATT | Support.  Our understanding for supporting the proposed enhancement has very minimum impact on the UE’s implementation. Also, our understanding is that some of legacy Ues already supports the proposed enhancement in the implemention. Those Ues show significantly lower rates of disconnection/re-connection than others when the RSRP level is in the range of around -95~-105dBm during our field tests. |
| QC | We not not entirely convinced of the merits of this proposal. Same concerns as shared in last meeting. |
| Intel | We understand the proposal bit better now.  It seems like the proposal is for the UE to monitor the best RSRP SSB when the SSB configured for RLM is OOS. No further changes to how PDCCH is monitored from this.  Some follow up questions.  Q1) Is there any extra time allowed for UE to switch to a new best RSRP SSB to start making measurement? Or is the UE expected to continue to report OOS to upper layers while UE tries to find the best RSRP SSB and start making measurements? If OOS is continuously reported to higher layer during the new search process, how would this stop early RLF declaration? We would like to understand the how the interaction between physical and upper layer is handled and whether this would require changes to RAN4 RLM measurement requirements, especially timing aspects.  Q2) Does the UE switch to measure the best RSRP SSB after a single OOS measurement from the configured set of SSB(s)? What is the criteria for the UE to switch back to configured SSB from non-configured SSB? Basically what is the criteria for switching to new non-configured SSB and what is the criteria for the UE to switch back from non-configured to configured SSB?  Q3) if the UE needs to switch back and forth between configured and non-configured SSB depending on measurements, isn’t this the same as increasing the measurement RS? I assume the only way to switch back and forther between configured and non-configured is to perform measurement of both at the same time. How we make sure UE complexity is necessarily overburdened by this operation? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open to hear more clarification while we see several other companies have raised similar questions on the practical usefulness of this proposal, e.g. how gNB would know that the UE is performing measurement on the non-configured SSB for RLM. Although the proponent has clarified that there is no need for UE to inform gNB, but relying on gNB to guess whether the UE has “internally” performed differently than gNB expects may not guarantee the performance. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies still wonder the benefit of the proposal. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Periodic SRS transmission outside DRX active time

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [3] | According to NR Rel-15, when a UE is configured with DRX operation, the UE is not required to measure and report periodic and semi-persistent CSI outside the DRX active time. In Rel-16 UE power saving WI, as an enhancement for the DRX operation, a PDCCH-based wake-up signal (WUS), i.e., DCI format 2-6, has been introduced, based on which, the network can indicat the UE whether to start or skip a *drx-onDurationTimer* for a DRX cycle. In the later stage of Rel-16 discussion, an issue was identified with the periodic and semi-persistent CSI recoders when both DRX and DCI format 2\_6 are configured: if the UE is not indicated to wake-up by the network for a long time, e.g., due to DL traffic inactivity, the UE needs to stay outside DRX active time during at least a few DRX cycles, and cannot get a chace to measure and report CSI during that time. Thus, when a new DL traffic arrives later and the UE is woken-up by the network, even the most recent CSI report from the UE is a few DRX cycles ago and may already be stale. This may result in an increased decoding error rate of earlier data packets, until the CSI at the network is updated by a new CSI report from the UE.  To address this issue, in Rel-16, when both DRX and DCI format 2\_6 are configured, it was agreed to allow measurement and reporting for periodic CSI during the time duration indicated by drx-onDurationTimer outside DRX active time. Two new higher layer parameters, *ps-TransmitPeriodicL1-RSRP-r16* and *ps-TransmitOtherPeriodicCSI-r16*, are introduced for separately enabling CSI reporting for L1-RSRP (i.e., cri-RSRP and ssb-Index-RSRP) and other report quantities, respectively, outside DRX active time.  Like periodic and semi-persistent CSI reporting, in Rel-15, the UE is not required to transmit periodic SRS and semi-persistent SRS outside the DRX active time. Thus, when the UE is configured with DRX and DCI format 2\_6, the same issue aforementioned for CSI reporting persists for SRS transmission; the UE may not get an opportunity to transmit SRS for a very long time outside DRX active time. When SRS is used for either DL or UL channel sounding, this may impact the overall system performance. In Rel-16, nevertheless, only the issue of CSI reporting outside DRX active time was addressed, while the issue with SRS transmission was overlooked due to lack of time.  Although periodic CSI reporting outside active time can help keep the CSI updated, it may not be sufficient in some case. For example, without channel reciprocity, the network should rely on SRS to assess UL channels. With channel reciprocity, relying on SRS for DL channel sounding may be more power efficient from the UE perspective, since the UE is not required to measure CSI-RS and compute the CSI report. Also, for SUL, SRS may be the only resource that the network can assess the UL channel. Therefore, it seems necessary to allow a UE to transmit SRS outside DRX active time, when the UE is configured to monitor DCI format 2\_6.  Proposal 4: When UE is configured with DRX and to monitor DCI format 2\_6, it can also be configured to transmit at least periodic SRS outside DRX active time during the time duration indicated by *drx-onDurationTimer*. |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | NTT DOCOMO | We are open to discuss this issue. For DRX, WUS and Scell dormancy, there are many descriptions in RAN2 spec, and it should be clarified whether/what is RAN2 spec impact. | | CATT | We discussed in Rel-16 power saving whether to support SRS transmission when UE is not indicated to wake up by DCI format 2\_6 at next DRX ON. However, very few companies considered it is useful since UL channel and interference change quite fast between DRX cycle. The SRS information measured at this DRX cycle is not useful for next DRX cycle. | | MediaTek | In principle, we are fine with the proposal. But for clarity, we would like provide some editorial revision in the following.  **Proposal:** When UE is configured with DRX and to monitor DCI format 2\_6, it can be configured to transmit ~~at least~~ periodic SRS ~~outside DRX active time~~ during the time duration indicated *by drx-onDurationtimer* regardless of the detection of DCI 2\_6. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | The same proposal was discussed in Rel-16, and finally it was agreed only CSI measurement/reporting supported outside DRX active time during the time duration indicated by *drx-onDurationTimer*. There may be no need to repeat the discussion, considering that this functionality can be supported by gNB implementation. For example, if gNB wants to trigger SRS transmission, gNB can indicate UE to wake up by DCI recod 2\_6. And during the OnDuration, UE can transmit SRS by legacy procedure. There is no need to introduce the enhancement in TEI. | | ZTE, Sanechips | We do see the benefits of allowing UE to transmitting periodic SRS outside DRX active. And we think the scope can be limited to periodic SRS only. | | Ericsson | From our perspective, this is not critical enhancement. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are some companies supportive for this proposal, it seems this is similar situation as Rel-16 power saving where other companies did not see the need of this proposal. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | The SRS enhancement outside of DRX could have some benefits, but whether it worth the enhancement needs further evaluation. In Rel-15, it actually can be achieved by SRS after DRX on, with small latency increased. | | Qualcomm | We support this proposal. It is well understood why it was decided that supporting periodic CSI outside of active time is beneficial. Periodic SRS serves the exact same purpose in TDD when the network relies on reciprocity-based CSI. Therefore, in our view the justification of applying the same conclusion to periodic SRS is straightforward.  As some companies have pointed out, in the Rel-16 UE power saving WI, we have discussed both periodic SRS and periodic/semi-persistent CSI measurement and reporting as being impacted by DCI format 2\_6. Since the discussion arose in RAN1#99 near the end of the Rel-16 WI, we didn’t have enough time, and compromised to agree on only allowing periodic CSI/L1-RSRP measurement and reporting outside active time. Thus, we think the discussion should be continued in TEI. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #8**

* **When UE is configured with DRX and to monitor DCI format 2\_6, it can also be configured to transmit at least periodic SRS outside DRX active time during the time duration indicated by *drx-onDurationTimer*.**

This proposal is already supported by Qualcomm.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open to discuss this proposal. It seems more justification which shows this enhancement is critical is needed. |
| Ericsson | From our perspective, this is not critical enhancement. |
| CATT | The proposal was discussed in Rel-16 with the conclusion of no support. There is no power saving benefit of the proposal. |
| Intel | This does not seem to be a critical enhancement. If needed, network can send DCI format 2\_6 to wake up the UE so that SRS can be transmitted during *drx-onDurationTimer.* The latency caused is minimal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view has not changed. Similar to others that the criticalness of the proposal is not well justified, and to some extent the issue can be avoided by proper gNB implementation/scheduling. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since more justificatioin is requested by multiple companies. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Joint configuration of DRX groups and Rel-16 power saving features

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [7] | The feature of DRX groups was discussed under TEI16 in RAN2 as a solution to reduce power consumption when UE is configured with FR1+FR2 CA, and agreed in RAN#88-e. During the discussion, RAN4 confirmed that there is minimal impact on their specs [4]. On the other hand, RAN1 could not reach a consensus [5] on whether it may have any impact on other Rel-16 power saving features. As a way-forward, it was agreed that in Rel-16 DRX groups cannot be jointly configured with WUS or Scell dormancy.  Later, in RAN #90-e, it was further discussed whether to continue the discussion on the enhancement of DRX groups in Rel-17 UE power saving WI, focusing on the joint configuration with WUS or Scell dormancy. However, due to the concern on the limited TU for Rel-17 UE power saving WI, no consensus was made in RAN #90-e.  In our view, the discussion on the enhancement of DRX groups should be continued due to the evident power saving benefits, and Rel-17 TEI should handle it. Although the discussion was initiated in RAN2, we do not think this is a cross-WG issue, since there is no RAN2 or RAN4 impact with the joint configuration and can solely be handled by RAN1. More in-depth discussion follows below.  **Joint configuration of DRX group and WUS**  It is easily expected that additional power can be saved if DRX group and WUS can be configured together. For example, suppose WUS configured on SpCell indicates to UE whether it should wake up for next on duration or not. Then skipping on durations when there is no data can help UE save extra power on top of savings enabled by DRX groups, in the same way as how WUS saves UE power if there is only single DRX group. In Appendix A.2 of [6], we provide a quantitative analysis on the power savings that can be achieved by joint configuration, compared with the baseline in which WUS is not configured. The analysis shows that ~82% more power can be saved per DRX cycle than the baseline when there is no data and ~18% when there is data.  Observation 1: If WUS and DRX groups are jointly configured, UE can save extra ~82% power per DRX cycle when there is no data and ~18% when there is data.  If we have to minimize the impact of joint configuration of DRX group and WUS in RAN1, then the existing UE behaviors need to be reused as much as possible. More specifically,   * WUS should be configured only on SpCell, as in legacy; * Conditions for WUS monitoring is completely determined by DRX state of SpCell and independent from DRX state of the secondary DRX group. For example, UE monitors WUS if SpCell is not in DRX active time, even if secondary DRX group is in DRX active time at the same time. This requirement avoids changes to the RAN1 spec; * If WUS is not received or does not indicate wakeup, none of UE’s carriers should wake up, as in legacy; * If a WUS occasion is not monitored (e.g., SpCell is already in DRX active time) or WUS indicates wakeup, UE should start DRX on duration timers of both DRX groups at their respective next occurrence. This recoders can be captured in RAN2 MAC specification. Note that this recoders works even in the corner case where FR1 (SpCell) is outside DRX active time but FR2 is within DRX active time.   As one may see from the above, no new PHY-layer behaviors need to be defined. We only need to add the following clarifications to the RAN1 standards:   * Clarify that, if secondary DRX group is configured, DRX active time for a serving cell refers to DRX active time of its associated DRX group; * Clarify that DRX on-duration timer refers to those of all DRX groups in the text on WUS procedure.   Text proposal for the above clarifications can be found in [7].  Observation 2: Joint configuration between WUS and DRX groups can be supported with minimal change to RAN1 specs.  **Joint configuration with Scell dormancy**  In legacy, there are two scenarios in which Scell dormancy indication can be sent:   * Case 1. In a WUS occasion outside UE’s DRX active time, it can be sent together with WUS to indicate which Scell dormancy group(s) should switch to dormant BWP; * Case 2. When UE is in DRX active time, it can be sent in a non-fallback DCI to indicate which Scell dormancy group(s) should switch to dormant BWP.   Case 1 requires joint configuration with WUS. In case secondary DRX group is configured, it effectively overrides DRX state of a Scell. For example, if a FR2 carrier is in a Scell dormancy group and receives dormancy indication, then it does not need to monitor PDCCH until the next DRX cycle, i.e., before receiving the next WUS. Therefore, network can take advantage of this property and use Scell dormancy indication to selectively wakeup secondary DRX group. In Appendix A.2.2 of [6], we provide a quantitative analysis on the power saving gains that can be achieved in this scenario. Our analysis shows that ~18% more power can be saved than the baseline.  In this case, because Scell dormancy indication is sent together with WUS, we do not expect much changes to RAN1/2 standards other than those described above for WUS.  Observation 3: If Scell dormancy is jointly configured with DRX groups, dormancy indication sent outside DRX active time can help save ~18% power.  In Case 2, if secondary DRX group is also configured, we think Scell dormancy operation and DRX operation can be independent from each other. More specifically,   * If both DRX groups are in DRX active time, Scell dormancy procedure can be performed exactly the same as in legacy (i.e. only a single DRX group is configured); * If the secondary DRX group is outside DRX active time, UE can still switch active BWPs of any carriers in that DRX group according to the received indication (i.e. either from dormant to non-dormant BWP or from non-dormant to dormant BWP). It is only an implementation matter that UE first stores the new active BWP indication for a carrier and then uses it after the carrier starts the next DRX active time.   It is straightforward to see that this case also requires no spec changes. Even though joint configuration in this case may not enable extra power savings, we think it is still beneficial for operators if the two features can co-exist. Otherwise, it would not be desirable if operators are forced to choose one feature over the other. For example, DRX groups may be deployed earlier than other power saving features, including Scell dormancy, because operators typically have more field experience with DRX. Then the artificial exclusivity imposed by the current Rel-16 agreement could delay the deployment of Scell dormancy, which clearly is not desirable for both operators and Ues.  Observation 4: Joint configuration between Scell dormancy and DRX groups can be supported without any change to RAN1 specs.  Based on the above analysis, we propose to discuss the following proposal in Rel-17 TEI:  Proposal 5: Support joint configuration between DRX groups and WUS, Scell dormancy, or both, without changes to their PHY-layer configurations and procedures. |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | vivo | We are open to discuss this proposal | | CATT | It was heavily discussed in RAN#89, and RAN#90 without consensus. The benefit of UE power saving with configuration of secondary DRX group and WUS is very small. However, the specification impact might not be small. A TEI is not able to accommodate the work. | | MediaTek | As pointed out by Qualcomm’s contribution, this is a cross-WG (R1/R2/R4) issue. Hence, we don’t think it is fit for TEI. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | The same proposal was discussed in RAN plenary and there was no consensus on the power saving benefit compared with Rel-16 power saving features, e.g. the dormancy adaptation in Rel-16.  Also, two DRX groups are defined in RAN2 MAC specification. It would be a cross-WG work to support joint configuration between two DRX groups and WUS, Scell dormancy.  We don’t think this should be discussed in Rel-17 TEI. | | ZTE, Sanechips | Configuring dual DRX groups with WUS/Scell dormancy simulatenously would increase the implementation complexity for both gNB and UE, hence attractive power saving should be provided by the joint configuration on the top of the supported power saving features in Rel-15/Rel-16.  However, regarding the power saving gain observed in the referred Tdoc in RAN#90, we think similar power saving gain can be obtained with the configuration of single DRX + WUS/Scell dormancy. According to our understanding, the additional power saving gain from the joint configuration is limited. | | Ericsson | We are OK to discuss this | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are some companies supportive for discussing this proposal, there is a concern from multiple companies that whether the specification impact of this proposal can fit into TEI as well as whether there is a sufficient gain. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | We are open to this issue and would also assume no RAN1 impact expected. | | Qualcomm | We support this proposal. Based on numerical evaluation results that we provided in our contribution, the additional power saving gain of joint configuration of DRX groups and WUS/Scell dormancy is significant. In particular, the additional gain by WUS is significant, which goes up to ~80% in sparse traffic scenarios.  With all the power saving gain, we also think the joint configuration is beneficial for operators. For example, DRX groups may be deployed earlier than Rel-16 power saving features (WUS/Scell dormancy), because the operators may be more experienced with DRX. Thus, joint configuration allows cost-efficient and phased introduction of other Rel-16 power saving features in later stages. Otherwise, if the joint configuration is not allowed, it could further delay the introduction of Rel-16 power saving features.  Regarding the concern that this is a cross-WG issue, in our view, there is no RAN2 or RAN4 impact with the joint configuration. If any, it would be just editorial issues, such as revising the field description of *drx-ConfigSecondaryGroup* in TS 38.331. In our proposed TP presented in our contribution, we showed that RAN1 spec change is also limited, i.e.,   * Clarify that, if secondary DRX group is configured, DRX active time for a serving cell refers to DRX active time of its associated DRX group;   Clarify that DRX on-duration timer refers to those of all DRX groups in the text on WUS procedure. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #9**

* **Support joint configuration between DRX groups and WUS, Scell dormancy, or both, without changes to their PHY-layer configurations and procedures.**

This proposal is already supported by Qualcomm.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open to discuss this proposal. We are still wondering if this issue can be discussed in RAN1 only as TEI. For DRX, WUS and Scell dormancy, there are many descriptions at least in RAN2 spec, and the impact on RAN2/RAN4 spec needs to be further discussed. |
| Nokia, NSB | We’d be OK to consider this, but it doesn’t seem appropriate to address a topic that did not make it to a WI description under a TEI in a WG. Also as pointed out by several companies, RAN2/RAN4 appear to be the impacted WGs. |
| Ericsson | We are OK to discuss this |
| CATT | The proposal was discussed in Rel-16 with the conclusion of no support. There is no power saving benefit of the proposal. The complexity of feature interaction for joint configuration had been discussed. The complexity is over the power saving benefit. |
| Intel | This has been discussed heavily before. First of all, this is a cross WG issue and hence, we are not sure whether this can be a good fit for TEI. Second, significant specification work is expected if this feature is supported and TEI may not accommodate that. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still think it is a cross-WG issue and continuation of a leftover should not be the motivation of TEI. If needed, RAN2 may start to verify this proposal by their own. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies being open to consider/discuss this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies mentioned there would be other impacted WGs and concern on the complexity increase. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Mitigating half-duplex issue in NR V2X groupcast NACK-only case

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [8] | In V2X sidelink resource allocation Mode-1 and Mode-2, Ues can use groupcast transmissions with NACK only feedback. In this mode of operation, receivers within target communication range from the transmitter provide NACK feedback in case of unsuccessful reception and do not provide ACK in case of successful reception. The susceptibility to half-duplex collisions can be illustrated by the following simple example:   1. UE1, UE2, and UE3 operate with groupcast NACK only feedback and are group members (i.e., within target communication range from each other). 2. UE1 and UE2 selected/were granted with resources in the same slot and transmitted in slot ‘*n*’. 3. UE3 has successfully received UE1 and UE2 transmissions and thus has not provided HARQ feedback. 4. UE1 and UE2 were not able to receive each other transmissions. 5. Due to lack of NACK feedback UE1 and UE2 assume successful reception by Ues within target communication range.    1. In Mode-1, the UE reports ACK to gNB, and gNB considers successful transmission on SL, thus do not grant retransmissions    2. In Mode-2, the UE reports ACK to higher layer, and the higher layer does not grant retransmissions 6. UE1 and UE2 stop transmissions of TBs without receiving each other transmissions.   The above problem was also confirmed by system level evaluations [1][3][4]. Figure 1 shows comparative analysis of the current Rel.16 design vs scenario when two blind retransmissions are used for groupcast communication with NACK only feedback according assumptions listed in Annex. As it can be seen, the Rel.16 solution does not achieve PRR equal to 1 even at short communication distances.    Figure 1: Illustration of the Rel.16 groupcast communication with NACK only feedback  Since the half-duplex collision is a fundamental issue in distributed communication systems, it may not be possible to completely avoid it. But it is possible to apply a simple enhancement which reduces the issue dramatically. Such an enhancement is to allow a UE to transmit at least two TB (re-)transmissions without considering the feedback, thus increasing the chances that at least one of the two control channels were successfully received, as illustrated in the analysis above.  **Observation 1**   * **Rel-16 groupcast sidelink communication with NACK-only is susceptible to half-duplex issue which could limit the achievable reliability even at very high SNR links**   To mitigate the illustrated half-duplex problem for groupcast NACK only sidelink communication, there could be different solutions with difference spec impact, as was analyzed in the previous submission [5]. The following options were considered in descending order of spec impact / generalization:   * Option 1: Introduce a configurable minimum number of blind retransmissions N and support of mixing blind retransmissions and feedback-based retransmissions for a TB in MAC procedures * Option 2: Introduce a configurable minimum number of retransmissions *N* performed w/o considering the feedback from receivers * Option 3: Introduce a fixed number of minimum two retransmissions and support of mixing blind retransmissions and feedback-based retransmissions for a TB in MAC procedures * Option 4: Introduce a fixed number of minimum two retransmissions performed w/o considering the feedback from receivers   All the above options are backward compatible with Release-16 receivers in the same resource pool. However, options 1 and 3 require potentially substantial MAC specification changes to introduce the behavior of mixed blind and feedback-based transmission for the same TB.  At the same time, options 2 and 4 completely avoid MAC spec impact, and only require new RRC fields to enable and disable the new behavior. Additionally, option 2 provides more control and flexibility by introducing the number of blind (re-)transmission a UE can start its TB transfer. A simple sketch of option 2/4 is illustrated in Figure 2. Note, we don’t consider this kind of RRC changes as a cross-WG impact violating TEI conditions, since any new TEI work should have the RRC signaling of enabling/disabling the feature.    Figure 2: Illustration of Option 2 and 4 for mitigation of half-duplex for NACK-only feedback regime  The following observation is highlighted regarding option 1 and 3:  **Observation 2**   * **The most flexible way to mitigate the half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback regime is to introduce an explicit mix of blind and feedback-based HARQ retransmissions, that however has a substantial cross-WG impact to MAC specification**   **Observation 3**   * **Options 2 and 4 do not have MAC specification impact and provide similar result as Option 1 and 3, thus may be recommended for further work in R17 TEI**   Considering the above observations, it is suggested to focus on Option 2 or 4 for further work in this TEI. The example text proposals can be found in section 4:  **Proposal**   * **Agree on Release 17 TEI work to introduce mitigation of half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback regime by introducing a minimum number of retransmissions performed without considering the feedback from receivers**   + **This functionality is enabled/disabled by (pre-)configuration**   Except RRC enabling / disabling of the feature, there are potentially two places that require changes, and both are in TS 38.213 section 16. The first change is to introduce the behaviour of ignoring the feedback contents when needed in Mode-2 operation, and the second change is to modify the reported feedback to gNB in Mode-1. The text proposal is based on Option 4, but it can be easily extended to Option 2 if needed.   |  | | --- | | 16.3.1 UE procedure for receiving HARQ-ACK on sidelink  A UE that transmitted a PSSCH scheduled by a SCI format 2-A or a SCI format 2-B that indicates HARQ feedback enabled, attempts to receive associated PSFCHs according to PSFCH resources determined as described in clause 16.3. The UE determines an ACK or a NACK value for HARQ-ACK information provided in each PSFCH resource as described in [10, TS 38.133]. The UE does not determine both an ACK value and a NACK value at a same time for a PSFCH resource.  For each PSFCH reception occasion, from a number of PSFCH reception occasions, the UE generates HARQ-ACK information to report to higher layers. For generating the HARQ-ACK information, the UE can be indicated by a SCI format to perform one of the following  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “10”  - report to higher layers HARQ-ACK information with same value as a value of HARQ-ACK information that the UE determines from the PSFCH reception  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “01”  - report an ACK value to higher layers if the UE determines an ACK value from at least one PSFCH reception occasion from the number of PSFCH reception occasions in PSFCH resources corresponding to every identity of Ues that the UE expects to receive corresponding PSSCHs as described in Clause 16.3; otherwise, report a NACK value to higher layers  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-B or a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “11”  - if the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is not the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is larger than one or the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is equal to one, report to higher layers an ACK value if the UE determines absence of PSFCH reception for the PSFCH reception occasion; otherwise, report a NACK value to higher layers  - if the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is larger than one, report to higher layers a NACK value |  |  | | --- | | 16.5 UE procedure for reporting HARQ-ACK on uplink  A UE can be provided PUCCH resources or PUSCH resources [12, TS 38.331] to report HARQ-ACK information that the UE generates based on HARQ-ACK information that the UE obtains from PSFCH receptions, or from absence of PSFCH receptions. The UE reports HARQ-ACK information on the primary cell of the PUCCH group, as described in clause 9, of the cell where the UE monitors PDCCH for detection of DCI format 3\_0.  For SL configured grant Type 1 or Type 2 PSSCH transmissions by a UE within a time period provided by *sl-PeriodCG*, the UE generates one HARQ-ACK information bit in response to the PSFCH receptions to multiplex in a PUCCH transmission occasion that is after a last time resource, in a set of time resources.  For PSSCH transmissions scheduled by a DCI format 3\_0, a UE generates HARQ-ACK information in response to PSFCH receptions to multiplex in a PUCCH transmission occasion that is after a last time resource in a set of time resources provided by the DCI format 3\_0.  For each PSFCH reception occasion, from a number of PSFCH reception occasions, the UE generates HARQ-ACK information to report in a PUCCH or PUSCH transmission. The UE can be indicated by a SCI format to perform one of the following and the UE constructs a HARQ-ACK codeword with HARQ-ACK information, when applicable  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “10”  - generate HARQ-ACK information with same value as a value of HARQ-ACK information the UE determines from a PSFCH reception in the PSFCH reception occasion and, if the UE determines that a PSFCH is not received at the PSFCH reception occasion, generate NACK  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “01”  - generate ACK if the UE determines ACK from at least one PSFCH reception occasion, from the number of PSFCH reception occasions, in PSFCH resources corresponding to every identity of the Ues that the UE expects to receive the PSSCH, as described in Clause 16.3; otherwise, generate NACK  - if the UE receives a PSFCH associated with a SCI format 2-B or a SCI format 2-A with Cast type indicator field value of “11”  - if the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is not the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is larger than one or the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is equal to one, generate ACK when the UE determines absence of PSFCH reception for each PSFCH reception occasion from the number of PSFCH reception occasions; otherwise, generate NACK  - if the transmitted PSSCH scheduled by the SCI format 2-A or SCI format 2-B is the initial transmission and the maximum number of retransmissions for the TB provided by higher layers is larger than one, generate a NACK value | |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal with following two comments.   * Option 2/4 seem MAC spec update so that TX UE does not flush the corresponding HARQ buffer and the retransmission is possible. But the impact would be not so large.   Our preference is Option 1/3 for any cast types with HARQ feedback, i.e. unicast/groupcast-1/groupcast-2. The reason is that mixed mechanism improves latency performance as well as reliability performance of groupcast-1. Without this feature, TX-UE shall wait PSFCH reception to do retransmission or HARQ-feedback is not applied. For better latency and reliability, two consecutive blind retransmissions + HARQ feedback + HARQ-based retransmissions will be a useful way. | | CATT | We agree that groupcast sidelink communication in Rel-16 with NACK-only has to half-duplex issues, which could limit the achievable reliability even at very high SNR links. The proposed is the solution for this problem. We support this TEI. | | Bosch | We understand that half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X groupcast (NACK-only) is a critical one. We also believe that this problem will be more sever in case of periodic reservation, which may lead to consecutive collisions.  Therefore, we support this TEI. In general, at least for this groupcast option, we recommend having a solution that avoids half-duplex problem even if inter-UE coordination is not configured (depending on possible conditions for having inter-UE coordination in Rel-17 SL Enh WI outcome).  Among the listed options, Option 1 is our preferred solution. However, we are also fine with Option 2/4 for simplecity. We also agree with NTT DOCOMO that the solution in Option 2/4 will be simply postponing flushing the HARQ buffer for N transmissions. In our opinion, this a manageable modification in the MAC.  Note: we suggest generalizing the proposal at this stage to have a minimum configurable number of retransmissions N (i.e., 2 or 3 as in blind transmission) w/o considering feedbacks. | | Intel | We support the TEI proposal. In our view mitigation of half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback is important to address for mission critical V2X applications.  We are open to discuss further the specific solution during TEI work. The proposal made in submitted contribution is based on consideration of performance benefits and minimum specification efforts/changes. | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support this, and it does not fit to TEI.  This kind of half-duplex issue is currently being discussed at WI level in R17 sidelink enhancement (AI 8.11.1.2). However, so far, there is no consensus whether this issue needs to be addressed or not. Some companies, including us, point out that such kind of half-duplex issue only happens in very rare case since it requires all the following conditions are met:   * Condition#1: within a group, two Ues (UE-B and UE-C) choose to transmit on the same slot * Condition#2: all the other group members have successfully decoded the packet   We also had simulation results (see R1-2104237 section 4.3) to prove that there is no obvious performance gain by solving this kind of half-duplex issue.  Meanwhile, the current TEI proposal#12 introduce a fixed number of minimum two retransmissions, which have the drawbacks of unnecessary transmission in some cases, resulting in waste of resources and increased latency.  In addition, given that sensing procedure is performed in PHY layer and resource for transmission is selected in MAC layer, cross-WGs have to be involved in updating their specs. Furthermore, both blind (re-)transmissions and HARQ-based (re-)transmissions would require same HARQ RTT timing restrictions as long as the resource pool is configured with PSFCH resource. This means there is no latency improvement at all for mixed blind and HARQ-based (re-)transmissions and no point to have this proposal, unless there are structural changes in MAC layer to remove this HARQ RTT timing restriction. Note that this issue is being discussed in [105-e-NR-5G\_V2X-07]. Consequently, this proposal would produce workload on both RAN1 and RAN2 for PHY and MAC, putting it beyond the scope of TEI.  In summary, the benefits of this TEI proposal#12 is unclear and requires workload cross WGs, thus we do not support it. | | ZTE, Sanechips | In Rel-16, for groupcast transmissions, three types of HARQ feedback for sidelink are supported: blind retransmission, HARQ with NACK only, HARQ with ACK and NACK. The purpose of supporting the three feedback types is to deal with different communication requirement, i.e., in some cases, UE can determine one proper HARQ feeback type for current TB transmission, e.g. in the case of the half-duplex issue above, HARQ with ACK/NACK seems more suitable.  Besides, to complete the TEI, more spec work of RAN2 is desired.  In addition, considering the performance issue in some cases(e.g. at very low SNR links ), the type of blind retransmission has more serious problem than the type of HARQ with NACK only. Obviously a TEI for blind retransmission is not necessary.  In conclusion, we don’t think this TEI is necessary. | | Ericsson | We are supportive of this TEI work but it seems that the proposal is to specify option 4 directly. Our view is that RAN1 should specify a flexible solution that fits within the TEI framework. Along the lines of DCM’s comments, we think it is necessary to carefully consider the impact to the specifications of the different options.  We think it is reasonable to limit the scope of the TEI by limiting the scope to GC Option 1. The applicability to other cast modes or options and the gains are not clear.  Our suggestion would be to make the following modifications. **TEI proposal #12**  * **Introduce mitigation of half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback regime by introducing a minimum ~~fixed~~ number of ~~minimum two~~ retransmissions performed without considering the feedback from receivers.** | | Qualcomm | We’d like to note that the TEI (e.g. Option 4) could be implemented without any impact on MAC spec if PHY reports NACK for the initial transmission to MAC. The TP in R1-2104890 is an example of this approach. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  Based on the comments from companies, although the proposal is supported by multiple companies including operator, infra vendor and UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal including which option is preferred and whether there is any impact to other WGs (other than signaling/capability introduction).  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | OPPO | We are unsure that this TEI in RAN1 is necessary for two reasons. In R16 V2X, NACK-only feedback was introduced based on extensive evaluation that it works and provides benefits and gains over the ACK/NACK based feedback for connection-less based groupcast. And hence it was introduced and designed in such way with PSFCH. At that time, there was no PRR performance issue due to half-duplex because Tx Ues are sufficiently randomized. Secondly, from the proposed solution options, it is foreseen that all the spec impacts are related to the MAC spec in RAN2, from making the decision on whether to ignore the HARQ feedback, changing the logical channel definition and attributes to enable mixed blind and HARQ-based retransmission, whether or not to support resource (re)selection based on SL HARQ feedback of a MAC PDU or PSFCH resources, to deciding the minimum number of retransmissions. The currently RAN1/L1 design in R16 can already support all of these functions. It should be up to RAN2 to judge and decide whether this TEI proposal is feasible and beneficial. | | Intel2 | Thanks to all for the comments. Considering the comments from companies, we suggest to not stick to the specific design option and thus agree with the formulation provided by Ericsson: **“TEI proposal #12**  * Introduce solution for mitigation of half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback regime by introducing a minimum number of retransmissions performed without considering the feedback from receivers.”   + The procedure in the TS 38.213 is updated to ignore by TX UE the feedback for the first retransmission(s) in NACK only mode.   We also have additional comments:  To Huawei:  Regarding the comment on Rel.17 TEI vs Rel.17 WI, we do not see the topic being proposed by FL for discussion at this meeting. We can be open to consider it as a part of Rel.17, if the Rel.17 WI objectives are upated. At the same time, we observe that sidelink work in Rel.17 has already quite big scope and we are not sure that RAN1 will have enough time to discuss it. Therefore, we consider TEI as a more reasonable approach to handle it.  Regarding evaluations in R1-2104237 section 4.3, in our understanding results eventually confirm half-duplex issue of the Rel.16 design. We are bit confused why 97% PRR at short range is not a concern for V2X mission critical applications.  Regarding proposal of the fixed number of minimum two retransmission, our intention was to minimize work and impact on specification. We are open to look into other options and therefore hope the modification from Ericsson can address this point.  Regarding HARQ RTT timing, in our view it is a separate topic for discussion, and we prefer to not mix those. In our view, there are design options e.g. Options 2 and 4 that can be resolved by RAN1.  Comments to ZTE:  Regarding RAN2 impact, we see that option 2 and 4 have only RRC impact to enable/disable the feature and provide parameters with no MAC spec impact.  For the performance argument, it can be easily shown that NACK-only feedback mode could not improve the short-range performance with any number of maximum retransmissions configured, while the blind regime can provide 100% PRR at short distances. Overall, we would like to fix the situation when communication mode with blind retransmission can operate better than HARQ with NACK only feedback especially for short ranges. Hope it is considered as a convincing argument to initiate the work.  Comments to OPPO:  For the first point, it was shown even in Rel.16 that the issue exists (R1-1910650), but there was no further consideration due to prioritization of a more general framework completion. Note, the PRR performance shown in Huawei/HiSilicon tdoc R1-2104237 actually confirms that the issue exists since even at 20 m distance, the error probability is 3%, that is high.  For the second point, the recommended option 2 or 4 do not have MAC spec impact, since the feedback state passed from PHY layer to MAC layer is descrbied in L1 TS 38.213. The example TP is available in R1-2103766. | | Qualcomm | We’d like to reiterate that the proposal as written (to use Option 4) does not require any work or specification change outside of RAN1. The CR submitted by Intel in R1-2104890 provides the necessary text to implement the TEI fully in 38.213. There are no changes necessary to buffer flushing because PHY will report NACK for the initial transmission and the buffer will not be flush per the existing procedure.  Results from both Qualcomm (e.g. R1-2006829) and Intel submitted to Rel-16 and Rel-17 show that half-duplex occurs frequently enough for the TEI proposal to significantly improve performance.  The proposed TEI directly improves the reliability of NACK-only with very limited procedure changes that are contained within RAN1 specifications. The performance gains of this TEI have been demonstrated by different companies and NR sidelink would benefit from its adoption. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #12**

* **Introduce mitigation of half-duplex issue for sidelink V2X communication in groupcast NACK-only feedback regime by introducing a minimum number of retransmissions performed without considering the feedback from receivers**
  + **This functionality is enabled/disabled by (pre-)configuration**
  + **Text proposals shown in Section 4 of R1-2107569 are applied**

This proposal is already supported by Intel, Qualcomm. NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Bosch

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. The option 4 in the tdoc is a good approach to minimize spec impact.  Regarding the TP, PSFCH part is OK. PUCCH part needs further discussions for the case that a DCI format 3\_0 provides more than one SL resources. The text of *‘generate ACK when the UE determines absence of PSFCH reception for each PSFCH reception occasion from the number of PSFCH reception occasions; otherwise, generate NACK’* covers this situation, so just the same structure as PSFCH case (i.e. 16.3.1) would not be OK. |
| Bosch | We support this proposal and would like to be added to the supporting companies (edited in red). We are happy to discuss the TP (e.g., related to PUCCH part as stated by DCM). |
| ZTE | Considering in Rel-16, for groupcast transmissions, three types of HARQ feedback for sidelink are supported: blind retransmission, HARQ with NACK only, HARQ with ACK and NACK, UE is likely to meet the reliability requirement through implementation. If the TEI proposal is agreed as an additional enhanced solution, we think it should not limit the UE’s flexibility to implement GC option 1(NACK only feedback). So we don’t think the second sub-bullet should be applied, and we suggest that for the minimum number of retransmissions, either ACK or NACK can be generated by UE implementation, i.e. at least the original GC option 1 should be supported. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the proposal although our preference would be to introduce a configurable number of retransmissions.  We agree with the views shared by others that only changes to RAN1 specifications are required, as illustrated by some of the examples in the proposing contribution.  We note that according to the chairman’s notes from Rel-16, this was not discussed. |
| Intel | Support. Proposal aims to improve performance for sidelink groupcast communication with NACK only HARQ feedback. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal including at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies have different preferences of the solution.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Support of 2 Tx codebook configuration to 4Tx capable UE in UL

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [3] | Rel-15 NR specified 4Tx UL MIMO transmission while supporting various UE implementations. Depending on hardware implementation, UE Tx chains could be fully-coherent, partially-coherent or non-coherent and hence corresponding codebook subsets are specified. Rel-15 also supports coherent or non-coherent codebook subsets for 2Tx UL MIMO corresponding to coherent or non-coherent Tx chains capability. If an UE is capable of coherent 4Tx chains supporting coherent codebook subset for 4Tx UL MIMO, it can be straight forward to assume that the same UE can support coherent codebook subset for 2Tx UL MIMO from 2 out of 4 antennas; similarly UE supporting non-coherent 4Tx codebook subset can support non-coherent 2Tx codebook subset. However, for an UE capable of partial-coherent 4 Tx chains, it could support either coherent 2Tx codebook subset with 2 coherent Tx chains or non-coherent 2Tx codebook subset with 2 non-coherent Tx chains.  In 38.214, following is specified,  “A UE reporting its UE capability of ‘partialAndNonCoherent’ transmission shall not expect to be configured by either *codebookSubset* or *codebookSubsetForDCI-Format0-2* with ‘fullyAndPartialAndNonCoherent*’*.”  The intention of the above statement is to prevent gNB configuring 4Tx full-coherent codebook subset to an UE capable of 4Tx partial-coherent chains. It is not clear from the current spec whether 2Tx coherent codebook subset can be configured for an UE supporting 4Tx partial codebook subset.  Furthermore, NR Rel-16 specified UL full power transmission schemes with mode0, mode1 and mode2. UL full power transmission is mainly introduced for non-coherent and partial-coherent Ues. 4Tx partial-coherent UE supporting UL full power transmission mode0 can support 2Tx coherent or non-coherent and UL full power transmission mode0 since power scaling s=1 is specified in 38.213. Similarly, 4Tx partial-coherent UE supporting UL full power transmission mode2 can support 2Tx non-coherent UL full power mode2 with antenna virtualization or full power TPMI indication. Following is specified in 38.214  “When higher layer parameter ul-FullPowerTransmission is set to ‘fullpowerMode2’and the higher layer parameter codebookSubset or the higher layer parameter codebookSubsetForDCI-Format0-2 is set to ‘partialAndNonCoherent’, and when the SRS-resourceSet with usage set to “codebook” includes at least one SRS resource with 4 ports and one SRS resource with 2 ports, the codebookSubset associated with the 2-port SRS resource is ‘nonCoherent’.”  And, power scaling s=1 for full power TPMIs or scaled by the ratio of number of non-zero PUSCH ports to number SRS ports corresponding SRS resource.  In current spec, when 2-port SRS is configured for an UE supporting 4Tx in UL, no matter the codebook subset is coherent or non-coherent, the UE cannot deliver full power with mode1 since the power is scaled by the ratio of non-zero PUSCH ports number to maximum number of SRS ports supported by the UE in one SRS resource, for non-coherent rank=1 transmission the output power is scaled either by 1/4 or 2/4 depending on indicated TPMI.  gNB may configure 2-port SRS for an UE supporting 4Tx in UL for different reasons; it could be for UE power saving purpose, gNB may configure fewer number of SRS ports than max number of ports UE supported in different BWPs, or it could be due to overall SRS overhead in the cell.  For 4Tx partial-coherent UE not supporting Rel-16 UL full power transmission, if configured with 2-port SRS, maximum deliverable output power could be different with coherent codebook subset and non-coherent codebook subset. Let’s assume PC3 UE, 2Tx non-coherent codebook subset contains only antenna selection TPMIs, that means the maximum output power for rank=1 transmission is scaled by 1/4, if 2Tx coherent codebook subset can be configured then the maximum output power for rank=1 transmission with non-antenna selection TPMIs is scaled by 2/4 since there are 2 non-zero PUSCH ports, which means 3dB more power.  For example, as shown in figure 1 below, for 4Tx partial-coherent UE (with 17dBm Pas), by virtualizing 2 antennas it can operate as 2Tx coherent or non-coherent UE. If it is assumed 2Tx non-coherent UE after virtualization, due to power scaling mechanism, for rank=1 transmission the maximum output power is 1/4 of Pc\_max, i.e. 17dBm for PC3 UE and if assuming 2Tx coherent UE after virtualization, the non-antenna selection TPMIs can deliver 1/2 of Pc\_max, i.e. 20dBm for PC3 UE. On the other hand, if such an UE chooses two coherent antenna pair without antenna virtualization for 2Tx operation, the non-antenna selection TPMIs can also deliver 1/2 of Pc\_max.    Figure 1, 4Tx partial-coherent UE operating as 2Tx UE  Hence, following proposal is made.  Proposal 1:   * For 4Tx partial-coherent capable UE, 2Tx coherent codebook subset is supported when the network configures 2-port SRS (for codebook) and SRS resource set includes 1 SRS resource or configured with same number of ports for all resources.   For 4Tx Ues with architecture as shown in Figure 2, it is also possible to support full power transmission through antenna selection. For example, for 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE supporting only Rel-16 UL full power transmission mode1, UE may select Tx chains to operate as 2Tx non-coherent UE (as shown in figure 2), to deliver full power with rank=1 and 2. Power scaling can be enhanced accordingly.    Figure 2, 4Tx partial-coherent UE operating as 2Tx non-coherent UE  Proposal 2:   * For 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE supporting UL full power transmission mode1, UL full power mode1 can be supported with 2-port SRS configured.   + New UE capability is introduced |

This TEI proposal has been proposed and discussed in the previous meetings, and the discussion at the RAN1#105-e meeting is shown below [10].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | NTT DOCOMO | Support. We believe it is benefitial for gNB to understand UE can support coherent codebook with less number of antenna ports. | | CATT | We are fine with the first bullet. Regarding the second bullet, in our view, current spec does prevent such configuration. That is, UL full power mode1 and 2-port SRS can be configured simultaneously for a 4Tx partial or non-coherent UE. | | Vivo | @CATT  Yes, it is possible to configure UL full mode1 and 2-ports SRS simultaneously for 4Tx UE, however max output power will be 1/2 for new rank 1 TPMI and rank2 as the power scaling mechanism is same as in Rel-15, text in 38.213 section 7.1 is copied below for reference, where “maximum number of SRS ports supported by the UE in one SRS resource” is 4 for 4Tx UE. Hence, power scaling mechism needs to be revised to deliver max output power in such case.  if *ul-FullPowerTransmission* in *PUSCH-Config* is set to *fullpowerMode1*, and each SRS resource in the *SRS-ResourceSet* with *usage* set to ‘codebook’ has more than one SRS port, is the ratio of a number of antenna ports with non-zero PUSCH transmission power over the maximum number of SRS ports supported by the UE in one SRS resource  ----- | | Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open to further discussion, e.g. for the first bullet. However, for the second bullet, we don’t see a clear motivation of enhancement by introducing new UE capability to mix antenna selection and full power transmission since it may complicate existing Rel-16 MIMO UE capability discussion/ design. | | Vivo2 | @Huawei, HiSilicon, one of the motivations is power saving by turning off Pas, and since current spec already allows gNB to configure 2-port SRS to 4Tx UE, then from network perspective if the UE can deliver max ouput power is always better from coverage perspective. | | Ericsson | Presuming that TEIs should address a product driven need, we do not find optimizations for partial coherent Ues to be particularly urgent, however we would appreciate UE vendors comment on this.  Supporting a coherent codebook subset for a partially coherent UE configured for 2 Tx is a simple fix to an ongoing design bug, and may have some performance benefit.  However, we would like to further discuss the need for enhancing 2 port SRS for mode 1, since mode 2 already solves most of the problems. If SRS overhead optimization is the concern, that can be addressed separately.  So overall, while we would not prioritize it highly, support for a coherent codebook subset for a partially coherent UE configured for 2 ports is a reasonable TEI-17 candidate, but we do not support the mode 1 enhancement at this time. | | Intel2 | For the 1st bullet:   1. Regarding Figure 1, how does the virtualization to 20+20 case work? After virtulizatoin, the two ports are still non-coherent, in this case how to configure 2-port full coherent codebook subset? 2. As explained in the tdoc, the 4-Tx UE could be configured with 2-port SRS for power saving purpose. In this case, why do we need to configure the UE with full coherent codebook subset to deliver more power? 3. Does the 1st bullet apply to UE supporting full power or not?   For the 2nd bullet:   1. Since the UE can deliver full power with 4-Tx, why do we need to enable full power operation for 2-port case? | | Qualcomm | We first make a quick note that a separate capability will be required for the first proposal as well since UE antenna virtualization in fallback mode may depend on UE implementation.  In general, although we see the potential benefit, we see no urgency to make this change. | | Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and discussion!  Although the proposal is supported by multiple companies including operator, infra vendor and UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal including whether the second bullet proposal is necessary/acceptable and also more clarification on the first bullt proposal.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. | | Vivo3 | @Ericssson, one of the motivations of enhancing 2 port SRS for mode1 SRS configuration, 2 SRS resources has to be configured for mode2 in Rel-16. Turning off antennas can save power too.  @Intel, current spec allows configuration of 2Tx non-coherent codebook subset, figure1 is showing that even after virtualization the output is power scaled by 1/4 for rank=1 non-coherent TPMI which is not a good configuration. With full-coherent codebook subset UE can achieve 2/4 of output power for coherent TPMIs. Power is save by turning off Pas, which saves more than transmitting larger power on few antennas. 1st bullet is ~~not~~ non-full power.  With second bullet turning OFF antennas can save power.  @Qualcomm, regarding comment on first proposal, whether 2Tx codebook is configured as coherent or non-coherent fallback mode operation for 4Tx partial coherent UE should be same as there is no power scaling when schedculed by DCI 0\_0 | | OPPO | Further clarifications on the motivation and recodersy. For 4Tx partial-coherent capable UE, if 2Tx coherent codebook subset is configured, UE would be assmed to transmit SRS and PUSCH using two coherent TXs. However, in some case, for example when one of the transmit antennae is blocked, UE may switch the antenna to a non-coherent antenna which is not blocked. In this case, gNB may still schedule coherent transmission, resulting in bad performace. One more example is that when UE is at cell edge, UE is likely to virtualize two antennas for each SRS port in order to achieve more transmit power and diversity gain. But if 4 ports SRS is transmitted, there is no such issue since the cohecence between antennae/ports would not chage.  For 4Tx partial-coherent and non-coherent UE, UL full power can already be supported by mode 2 if we understand correctly. | | Vivo4 | @OPPO, coherent codebook subset also includes antenna selection TPMIs, in the case of blocking based on SRS measurement gNB can indicate antenna selection TPMI. Considering blockage, coherent codebook subset and non-coherent codebook subset performs similar. With non-coherent codebook subset as explained above there are only antenna selection TPMIs for rank=1, then it is power scaling is always 1/4 for these TPMI. As depicted in the figure1, although antenna vertulization is equivalent to larger PA however the power scaling of 1/4 for rank=1 will not lead to more output power.  Regarding second bullet on UL full power for 2Tx, yes mode2 can support full power however more SRS resources are required. | | Qualcomm | @Vivo, regarding our comment on UE capability, when a UE needs to switch from 4tx to 2tx mode, it could downsize to 2tx in more than one way. For example, it could choose to use two antennas within the coherent pair or choose one antenna from each pair of coherent antennas.  This choice could depend on UE implementation and the set of Pas used by a UE.  This is the reason we think a capability may be needed for the first proposal as well.  In general, we think that’s its best for a UE to report two copies of its capability for full power tx in uplink --- one assuming 4 tx operation and another assuming 2 tx operation. This should then make it clear what the UE is capable of in each mode and subsequent choice of codebooks and scale factors could be derived in a straightforward manner. This may be a more holistic approach to addressing the issue you raise. | |

Based on the above contribution and the discussion so far, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #13**

* **For 4Tx partial-coherent capable UE, 2Tx coherent codebook subset is supported when the network configures 2-port SRS (for codebook) and SRS resource set includes 1 SRS resource or configured with same number of ports for all resources.**
* **For 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE supporting UL full power transmission mode1, UL full power mode1 can be supported with 2-port SRS configured.**
  + **New UE capability is introduced**

This proposal is already supported by vivo, ZTE, CMCC, Samsung.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. We believe it is benefitial for gNB to understand UE can support coherent codebook with less number of antenna ports |
| Ericsson | Considering the further discussion, our view remains that while we would not prioritize it highly, support for a coherent codebook subset for a partially coherent UE configured for 2 ports is a reasonable TEI-17 candidate, but we do not support the mode 1 enhancement at this time. If the main benefit of the mode 1 enhancement is that SRS resource can be saved, we think that should be addressed for the general case of multiple SRS resource configurations. |
| CATT | We are fine with the first proposal.  The second proposal is not needed. Firstly, current spec allows UL full power mode1 and 2-port SRS to be configured simultaneously for a 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE. Secondly, we don’t see the necessity of revising power scaling mechanism to deliver maximum output power for 2-port coherent recoders for a 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE supporting mode1. If the first proposal is approved, for a 4Tx partial-coherent or non-coherent UE supporting mode 1 and 2-port SRS with full power for coherent precoders, it can report that it supports mode 2 with value p1-2, then full power for 2-port SRS can be realized by configuring mode 2 and coherent codebook subset. |
| Qualcomm | Repeating a few remarks we made in the last meeting:  We think that’s its best for a UE to report two copies of its capability for full power tx in uplink --- one assuming 4 tx operation and another assuming 2 tx operation. This should then make it clear what the UE is capable of in each mode and subsequent choice of codebooks and scale factors could be derived in a straightforward manner. This may be a more holistic approach to addressing the issue you raise. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar to last time, we will continually consider the first bullet but not for the second proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal including at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies have different preferences of the solution.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
| OPPO | One question for further clarification: For the 4Tx partial-coherent UE, why network doesn’t configure a 4 port partial-coherent codebook, which can achieve the same power and precoding gain as 2 port full-coherent codebook, but chooses to configure a 2-port SRS/codebook with power/performance loss?  If network makes a poor choice and the result can be expected, we are not sure optimization for this case is justified. |
| vivo | @Qualcomm, “UE to report two copies of its capability for full power tx in uplink” is fine.  @OPPO, there are many cases when the network choses to configure with 2 Tx codebook for 4Tx capable UE, one of the purposes could be UE power saving. |
|  |  |

* 1. Support for dynamic switching of waveform in UL

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [3] | NR supports two waveforms in UL, DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM. DFT-s-OFDM supports single layer transmission while CP-OFDM can support multi-layer UL transmission. However, network semi-statically configures waveform for UL transmission, that means even though a UE supports multiple Tx antennas, if configured with DFT-s-OFDM waveform, only supports single layer transmission. For this reason, network configures CP-OFDM waveform for UL transmission to exploit UL MIMO transmission. When the UE is at cell edge, DFT-s-OFDM waveform provides better coverage due to power efficiency. Although current specification supports RRC (re) configuration of waveform, which is not only slow but it was noticed from logs in real network that DFT-s-OFDM waveform is never configured.  In current specification (38.214 section 6.1.3), following is specified:  For PUSCH transmission scheduled by a PDCCH with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI with NDI=1, C-RNTI, or MCS-C-RNTI or SP-CSI-RNTI:  - If the DCI with the scheduling grant was received with DCI format 0\_0, the UE shall, for this PUSCH transmission, consider the transform precoding either enabled or disabled according to the higher layer configured parameter *msg3-transformPrecoder*.  In the case of *msg3-transformPrecoder* is enabled and *transformPrecoder* in PUSCH-config is disabled, dynamic waveform switching is supported when different DCI formats are used to schedule UL transmission, i.e. DCI format 0\_0 or 0\_1. Although dynamic waveform switching is supported in some sense, there is much more restriction on scheduling with fallback DCI (DCI format 0\_0). In order to reap benefit of both UL MIMO transmission with CP-OFDM and power efficiency with DFT-s-OFDM, it is beneficial to support dynamic switching of waveform in UL transmission.  To support dynamic switching of UL waveform, few alternatives can be considered.  Alt1: DCI signaling based dynamic UL waveform switching, it could be implicit or explicit  Alt1-1: Explicit signaling, e.g. by introducing 1 bit in DCI to indicate CP-OFDM or DFT-s-OFDM waveform to be used for PUSCH  Alt1-2: Implicit signaling, e.g. CP-OFDM or DFT-s-OFDM waveform to be used for PUSCH is identified by certain condition on the scheduling information in the DCI without changing DCI format.  Alt2: MAC CE signaling based dynamic UL waveform switching  An example of implicit signaling of UL waveform switching without changing DCI format is discussed below. When a UE, which supports multiple Tx antennas, is configured with *transformPrecoder* in PUSCH-config “disabled”, the UE applies CP-OFDM waveform or DFT-s-OFDM waveform depending on scheduling information in the DCI. For example, if the FDRA in the DCI scheduling PUSCH transmission indicates contiguous resource blocks and satisfies    where is a set of non-negative integers, the UE applies DFT-s-OFDM waveform otherwise CP-OFDM waveform is applied according to RRC configuration. Another condition, for example, could be modulation and coding scheme field in the DCI, since DFT-s-OFDM is beneficial at the cell edge, which means lower MCS will be used. When the indicated MCS in the scheduling DCI is lower than certain value, or certain modulation order (e.g. QPSK), then the UE applies DFT-s-OFDM waveform otherwise CP-OFDM waveform is applied according to RRC configuration. Other conditions such as indicated DMRS, transmission rank etc can also be used for implicit indication of UL waveform switching. Following options can be considered.  Opt.1: waveform is DFT-S-OFDM if contiguous PRB allocation and multiple value of 2, 3, 5, else CP-OFDM.  Opt.2: waveform is DFT-S-OFDM if MCS is lower than threshold, else CP-OFDM.  Opt.3: waveform is CP-OFDM if PUSCH and DMRS is FDMed (based on ‘Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data’), else DFT-S-OFDM.  Opt.4: waveform is CP-OFDM if more than one layer/rank are indicated, else DFT-S-OFDM.  One or multiple conditions can be used to determine whether the UE applies DFT-s-OFDM waveform in UL transmission.  Various fields in the DCI are determined based on RRC configurations, and the size doesn’t change while dynamically indicating DFT-s-OFDM or CP-OFDM waveforms UL transmission. Some of the fields may require different interpretation when the UL waveform is indicated as DFT-s-OFDM.  It is proposed to support dynamic switching of UL waveform to reap benefits of both UL MIMO and UE power efficiency for enhanced coverage. Implicit signaling could be a simple solution, when the UE is configured with *transformPrecoder* in PUSCH-config “disabled”, the UE applies DFT-s-OFDM waveform for UL transmission based on certain information fields in the scheduling DCI, e.g. FDRA, MCS, DMRS, transmission rank etc. |

Based on the above contribution, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #14**

* **Support for dynamic switching of waveform in UL**

This proposal is already supported by vivo, Spreadtrum Communications, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | * We support DCI/MAC CE based dynamic switching between CP-OFDM and SFT-S-OFDM. Since some UEs are suitable for CP-OFDM and the others are suitable for DFT-S-OFDM, we think both waveforms can be configured for different Ues in the same cell. Then, when NW wants to update the waveform for some Ues, dynamic switching can avoid RRC re-configuration.   + For high SNR Ues: CP-OFDM is better (Because, freq. resource allocation can be more flexible. DMRS and PUSCH can be FDMed)   + For low SNR Ues: DFT-S-OFDM is better (Because of low PAPR) * Between Alt.1-1, Alt.1-2, Alt.2, we prefer Alt.1-2 (implicit DCI) in the most. The reason is that we don’t have any issue on implicit DCI, while Alt.1-1 (explicit DCI) has DCI overhead and Alt.2 (MAC CE) needs RAN2 efforts. * For the detail of the implicit DCI, we think Opt.3 or 4 is most useful, but we are open to discuss. |
| SoftBank | We are interested in this proposal because it can benefit from both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM. However, we have no strong view if this should be done under TEI. We are open and want to hear other companies opinion. |
| Nokia, NSB | “It is proposed to support dynamic switching of UL waveform to reap benefits of both UL MIMO and UE power efficiency for enhanced coverage.”  We have MIMO w/ CP-OFDM for high data rates and DFT-S-OFDM for best coverage in Rel-15 exactly due to this reason.  We don’t see in the same UE location both a narrow band, low modulation full Tx power allocations (where DFT-S beats CP-OFDM) and a UL MIMO high data rate allocations. Due to this the change between the two modes with RRC in Rel-15 seems quite suitable and dynamically switching between the two using DCI or MAC-CE does not appear useful.  Even though this can be done quite some spec impacts maybe there as many functions are conditioned to transform precoding being enabled/disabled, the overall benefit is unclear. Further, even though desirable, it is not evident that the Ues can switch between the two Tx modes without any transients. |
| ZTE | In last RAN Rel-18 workshop, some other solutions were proposed, e.g. support multiple layers for DFT-S-OFDM waveform. It can be similar to the above proposal somehow. So we slightly prefer to do the comparison in Rel-18. |
| Ericsson | Our preference would be to have a little more comprehensive improvement from DFT-S-OFDM. Fast switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM will allow better PA efficiency and/or coverage, but the coverage gains are limited to rank 1 operation for DFT-S-OFDM. We find (e.g. in R1-2108087) that rank 2 is extremely common over a cell, and so would like to improve the PA efficiency and/or coverage of higher ranks as well as rank 1. Therefore, we would like to support both fast switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM as well as rank 2+ DFT-S-OFDM. Since rank 2+ DFT-S-OFDM is already supported in LTE with a codebook design that does not increase PAPR, we think both it and fast waveform switching can be specified within the time limits of a TEI. |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal. Requiring an RRC reconfig. For waveform switching is a bit tedious and a more dynamic mechanism would be desirable. |
| Intel | If dynamic switching should be supported, it should be based on explicit signaling. Implicit signal methods such as based on MCS or RB allocation has implication on how the gNB scheduler handles transport block size segmentation and MCS allocation.  The performance for DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM is not exactly the same, especially under high frequency selectivity. gNB scheduler needs to account for this during scheduling MCS and RB allocation. To impose additional constraints on top of this would uncessarily complicate the gNB scheduler. Also because of maximum power reduction (MPR) difference between CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM, in some cases it is possible to use higher MCS for DFT-s-OFDM while CP-OFDM cannot be supported. Similar comment for DMRS base method as well. DMRS impacts how channel estimation is performed and ultimately impacts scheduling decisions. Putting arbitrary constraints on this would be counter productive.  While we think there could be some value in the support switching between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM, it should be ONLY based on explicit signaling which in our opinion will have less standardization effort as no need to discuss the impact for implicit signaling and is more aligned with TEI scope. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open for further discussion and for now a bit more interested in DCI based solution with minimized spec impact. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal including at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies have different preferences of the solution and some companies have a concern due to unclearness of the benefit.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
| OPPO | This issue had beed discussed in the early stage of NR, and RAN1 chose RRC signaling rather than dynamic switching finally. we are open to discuss it, but maybe it is more proper to discuss it Rel-18 together with other proposals, e.g. supporting multiple layers for DFT-S-OFDM. |
| vivo | @Nokia, the motivation of this proposal is coming from real life deployment, the waveform can be configured by RRC and we noticed that it is seldom (never) used to reconfigure DFT-s-OFDM. For some reason (we don’t know!) the network always configures CP-OFDM(may not be true for all networks/network vendors).  @Ericsson, we understand the comment, however we can address rank=1 for DFT waveform in Rel-17 TEI. |
|  |  |

* 1. HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements for TDD-FDD CA

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [4] | In this section, we discuss HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements for TDD-FDD CA with TDD UL-DL configuration and SCS configurations shown in Figure 1, which is the real deployment with 2.6GHz+700MHz carrier frequencies.    Figure 1: Target TDD-FDD CA configuration  In Rel-15/16, the slot offset between dynamic PDSCH and PUCCH is indicated by PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in scheduling DCI. For DCI format 1\_0, the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field values map to {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8}. For DCI format 1\_1, if present, the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field values map to up to eight values provided by *dl-DataToUL-ACK* ranging from 0 to 15.  In addition, the following working assumption was agreed in RAN1#105-e meeting for HARQ-ACK timing in case UL SCS>DL SCS in Rel-16.  **Working Assumption**  For HARQ-ACK timing in Rel-16 with slot-based HARQ-ACK feedback, in case UL SCS is larger than DL SCS, k = 0 corresponds to the last UL slot that overlaps with the DL slot for the PDSCH.   * Further discuss the HARQ-ACK timing for sub-slot-based HARQ-ACK feedback * FFS specification impact   For the target DL dominate TDD configuration shown in Figure 1, a relatively large number of K1 values needs to be configured to cover the potential PDSCH transmissions in all the slots on PCell and SCell. Assuming the above working assumption is confirmed, if the HARQ-ACKs for all the PDSCH transmissions are transmitted only in one UL slot in an UL-DL configuration periodicity, nine K1 values are required as shown in Figure 2, which exceed the maximum number of K1 values that can be configured in Rel-15/16.    Figure 2: Required K1 values for the target TDD-FDD CA configuration if HARQ-ACK feedback only in one slot between the two UL slots in an UL-DL configuration periodicity  Otherwise, if HARQ-ACK for all the PDSCH transmissions can be transmitted in both UL slots in an UL-DL configuration periodicity, up to eight K1 values are sufficient. For example, a set of eight K1 values of {2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9} can be configured as shown in Figure 3.    Figure 3: Example of K1 configurations for the target TDD-FDD CA with HARQ-ACK feedback in both UL slots in an UL-DL configuration periodicity  However, according to the restriction defined in TS38.213 clause 9, a UE does not expect to transmit PUCCHs with HARQ-ACK in the two consecutive UL slots on PCell and a PUSCH on SCell overlapping in time with the two PUCCH transmissions. Therefore, either gNB avoids scheduling PUSCH on SCell overlapping with two PUCCH transmissions on PCell which results in scheduling restriction and UE uplink throughput reduction, or gNB avoids scheduling two PUCCH transmissions via scheduling PDSCH in a subset of the DL slots which would also result in scheduling restriction and UE DL throughput reduction.   |  | | --- | | A UE does not expect to multiplex in a PUSCH transmission in one slot with SCS configuration UCI of same type that the UE would transmit in PUCCHs in different slots with SCS configuration if . |   In addition, if the above working assumption cannot be confirmed, one more additional K1 is required for the PDSCHs ending in the first UL slot within an UL-DL configuration periodicity with reference to the UL numerology. Therefore, even if HARQ-ACK for all the PDSCH transmissions can be transmitted in both UL slots in an UL-DL configuration periodicity, more than eight K1 values are required to cover the PDSCH transmissions in all the slots.  It is proposed to enhance HARQ-ACK feedback for TDD-FDD CA with configurations shown in Figure 1 without scheduling restriction or DL/UL UE data rate restriction.  ***Proposal 2: Enhance HARQ-ACK feedback for TDD-FDD CA with DL:S:UL=7:1:2 and 30kHz/15kHz SCS configurations for PCell/SCell without scheduling restriction or DL/UL UE data rate restriction.***  At least two alternatives can be considered to solve the issue.   * Alt. 1: support 4-bit PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator in DCI format 1\_1 * Alt. 2: support multiplex in a PUSCH transmission in one slot with SCS configuration UCI of same type that the UE would transmit in PUCCHs in different slots with SCS configuration if   Alt. 1 is a simple extension and has minimal specification impact. It is noted that the similar proposal is under discussion in Rel-17 NTN WI but the views are quite divergent from companies [2]. In addition, even if it is supported in NTN, it is not clear whether it is applicable to non-NTN scenario.  Alt. 2 has relatively larger specification efforts since new UCI multiplexing rules need to be defined to multiplex UCI of same type in a PUSCH.  Comparing the two alternatives, Alt. 1 is preferred considering less specification impact.  ***Proposal 3: Support 4-bit PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator in DCI format 1\_1 with up to 16 values configured by dl-DataToUL-ACK in Rel-17 for NR terrestrial networks.*** |

Based on the above contribution, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #15**

* **Enhance HARQ-ACK feedback for TDD-FDD CA with DL:S:UL=7:1:2 and 30kHz/15kHz SCS configurations for PCell/SCell without scheduling restriction or DL/UL UE data rate restriction**
  + **Support 4-bit PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator in DCI format 1\_1 with up to 16 values configured by dl-DataToUL-ACK in Rel-17 for NR terrestrial networks**

This proposal is already supported by CATT.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CMCC | We support this proposal, it is a simple way to guarantee both DL throughput in TDD CC and UL throughput in FDD CC with little spec impact. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We understand the motivation. But at the same time, there is another solution for this case, which is that 1\_1 is used in PCell and 1\_2 is used in SCell for example. In that sense, whether this enhancement is really necessary should be discussed/clarified further. |
| ZTE | We agree that there is scheduling restriction for the concerned deployment scenario. However, there could be other solutions, e.g., re-defining K1=0 is the first available UL slot. So, it may need more discussion about which solution we should be chosen. |
| Ericsson | We fully support Proposal#15.   * We suggest to remove the main bullet in TEI proposal#15 since it serves as a motivation and keep the sub-bullet (as in Proposal 3 in CATT contribution). |
| Intel | We are not convinced by the proposal. It is not preferred to change DCI format just for single special combination of TDD/FDD cells. There are typically multiple active UEs in the cellular network, therefore, it is not necessary to schedule all time resources to a single UE. As shown in Figure 3, there is still a way to support PDSCH scheduling in all DL slots. it could be up to gNB implementation to handle PUCCH and PUSCH multiplexing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The motivation and targering scenario is clear and we are open to further consider the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting (or being supportive) this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies prefer to discuss other solutions as well. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |

* 1. Support of default power control parameter per TRP

Following proposal is made in the contribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [6] | According to current 38.213[1], if *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided by RRC or SRI is not included in a DCI, only single close loop index  can be assumed by UE for the PUSCH, .and the UE determines P0 and alpha from the value of the first P0-PUSCH-AlphaSet in p0-AlphaSets. Furthermore, a default pathloss RS, the pathloss RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* configured by RRC, will be used for pathloss measurement of the PUSCH. In this case, for PUSCHs scheduled for different TRPs, e.g. PUSCHs associated with different values of *CORESETPoolindex*, the same default P0, alpha, pathloss RS and closed loop index will be applied. Similar issues exist for PUCCH when the UE is not provided *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo*, e.g. for FR1.  *Observation 1: The default power control parameters (e.g. P0, alpha and close loop index) are the same for PUSCH/PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex (e.g. for different TRPs).*  *Observation 2: The same downlink signal (from one TRP) is used as default pathloss RS of PUSCH/PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex (e.g. for different TRPs) when spatial relation information is not configured.*  In Rel-17, for enhancements on Multi-TRP for PUSCH, default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index was agreed to be defined per TRP as agreed in RAN1#105 meeting below:  ***Agreement***  *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), default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index is defined per TRP. Select one from the following in RAN1 #106-e meeting,*   * *Alt.1*   + *The first P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId, and sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex mapped to the first sri-PUSCH-PowerControl associated with the first SRS resource set.*   + *The second P0/alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index are determined by sri-PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id, sri-P0-PUSCH-AlphaSetId, and sri-PUSCH-ClosedLoopIndex mapped to the first sri-PUSCH-PowerControl associated with the second SRS resource set.*   + *Note: How to design the signaling link sri-PUSCH-PowerControl with two SRS resource sets is up to RAN2.* * *Alt.2*   + *The first set of values {the first value in P0-AlphaSet, the PL-RS corresponded to 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 corresponded to 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.* * *Alt.3*   + *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-PowerControlassociated 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.*   Similar enhancement should also be considered for multiple DCI based M-TRP for PUSCH transmission. Default close loop index for different *CORESETPoolIndex* The UE features list for Rel-16 NR [2] includes a feature group 16-2a-3 to support of out-of-order operation for PDCCH to PUSCH for multi-DCI based M-TRP transmission. To reduce the UE complexity for close loop power control, a note was added as below to introduce the restriction that same closed loop index for PUSCHs associated with different *CORESETPoolIndex* is not supported by a UE supporting UL out-of-order. That is, for a UE supporting this FG, different close loop indexes should be configured for PUSCHs associated with different *CORESETPoolIndex*.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 16-2a-3 | Out-of-order operation for UL | 1. Support out-of-order operation for PDCCH to PUSCH | 16-2a | Yes | N/A |  | Per band | No | No |  | Note: “Same closed loop index for power control across PUSCHs associated with different CORESETPoolIndex values is not supported by a UE indicating the support of this feature” | Optional with capability signalling |   For a UE indicating support of FG 16-2a-3, additional scheduling restriction will be introduced for the following cases:   * Once DCI format 0\_0 is scheduled for *CORESETPoolIndex*=0 (*l*=0), the DCI format can’t be scheduled by *CORESETPoolIndex*=1, and only close loop index *l*=1 can be configured for PUSCH associated with *CORESETPoolIndex*=1. * If UE reports capability of single SRS resource in the SRS resource set for codebook (*maxNumberSRS-ResourcePerSet* equal to 1), SRI will not be included in any UL grant. In this case, only PUSCH associated with one value of *CORESETPoolIndex* can be scheduled, which means multi-DCI based M-TRP transmission can’t be supported for uplink. * In FR1, gNB is not likely to configure *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* or multiple SRS resources for beam selection in the SRS resource set for codebook. Without SRI in DCI or *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl*, only PUSCH associated with one value of *CORESETPoolIndex* can be scheduled by gNB.   In a summary, for a UE supporting out-of-order operation for uplink, PUSCHs scheduled by different *CORESETPoolIndex* can hardly be supported especially in FR1, since the same default close loop index is defined for different *CORESETPoolIndex*. There is not such restriction for UEs not supporting this FG. The restriction makes the FG 16-2a-3 meaningless and support of it becomes a block to support PUSCH scheduled with different *CORESETPoolIndex*. To avoid such unreasonable restriction on scheduling, different default close loop indexes should be defined for different *CORESETPoolIndex*. That is, if *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided or SRI is not included in a DCI, close loop index *l*=0 and *l*=1 should be respectively applied to PUSCHs associated with *CORESETPoolIndex*=0 *and CORESETPoolIndex*=1.It also avoids the same close loop index for PUSCHs targeting different TRPs and allows TRP specific closed loop power control. The mechanism can be directly extended to PUCCH to avoid similar issue considering *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* is optional.  ***Proposal 1: Support TRP specific default close loop index for PUSCH and PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex.***   * ***If the PUSCH is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or if an SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided to the UE, close loop index l = 0 and 1 are respectively applied to PUSCHs scheduled by PDCCHs associated with CORESETPoolIndex=0 and CORESETPoolIndex=1.*** * ***If the UE is not provided PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, close loop index l = 0 and 1 are respectively applied to PUCCHs scheduled by PDCCHs associated with CORESETPoolIndex=0 and CORESETPoolIndex=1.***   1. **Default pathloss RS, P0 and alpha for different *CORESETPoolIndex***   Based on 38.213 [1], if *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* is not provided to a UE or SRI is not included in a DCI, a default pathloss RS, the pathloss RS with *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id=0* configured by RRC, will be used for pathloss measurement of PUSCH. If multiple values of *CORESETPoolIndex* are configured, PUSCHs targeting different TRPs will share the same pathloss RS, which would lead to mismatched pathloss estimation for PUSCH. Similar issue should also be considered for PUCCH associated with different *CORESETPoolIndex* when *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* is not configured and for open loop power control parameters {P0, alpha}. Considering that a PUSCH without indication of *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* or SRI and a PUCCH without *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* are common cases in FR1, we propose to support TRP specific pathloss RS, P0 and alpha for PUSCH/PUCCH, e.g. apply two pathloss RS with different *PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS-Id* for different TRPs (*CORESETPoolIndex*), as shown in Fig.1.    Fig.1: Default pathloss RS for different TRPs  ***Proposal 2:*** ***Support TRP specific default pathloss RS, P0 and alpha for PUSCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex.***  ***Proposal 3: Support TRP specific default pathloss RS and P0 for PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex.*** |

Based on the above contribution, following TEI proposal can be discussed in RAN1#106-e meeting.

### **TEI proposal #16**

* **Support TRP specific default close loop index for PUSCH and PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex**
  + **If the PUSCH is scheduled by a DCI format that does not include an SRI field, or if an SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl is not provided to the UE, close loop index l = 0 and 1 are respectively applied to PUSCHs scheduled by PDCCHs associated with CORESETPoolIndex=0 and CORESETPoolIndex=1**
  + **If the UE is not provided PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, close loop index l = 0 and 1 are respectively applied to PUCCHs scheduled by PDCCHs associated with CORESETPoolIndex=0 and CORESETPoolIndex=1**
* **Support TRP specific default pathloss RS, P0 and alpha for PUSCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex**
* **Support TRP specific default pathloss RS and P0 for PUCCH associated with different values of CORESETPoolIndex**

This proposal is already supported by OPPO, ZTE.

Companies are encouraged to check above TEI proposal and to provide feedback if any in below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | TEI proposal#16 discusses the case with CORESETPoolIndex configured.  For PUSCH, based on Rel-16 spec., if CORESETPoolIndex is configured, a DCI can schedule a normal S-TRP PUSCH. Without the support of FG 16-2a-3, there is no restriction/association on TRP (e.g., CORESETPoolIndex) of the DCI and its scheduled PUSCH. Hence, there is no need to enhance two sets of TPC parameters for PUSCH. On the other hand, with the support of FG 16-2a-3, it implies the restriction/association on TRP of the DCI and its scheduled PUSCH, since different close loop index for TPC should be configured. Therefore, with FG 16-2a-3 as prerequisite feature, we’re open to introduce new UE feature to support two sets of default TPC related parameters and two default close loop indexes.  For PUCCH, we think it is too early to discuss such enhancement. Because in current spec., there is no association configuration between a PUCCH resource and a CORESETPoolIndex. In addition, if joint ACK/NACK feedback mode is configured for mDCI based MTRP, it is possible that the PUCCH is intended for 1st TRP only and two sets of TPC parameters are not needed. Therefore, we do not support the enhancement for PUCCH for now. We may further discuss it after there is progress on association configuration between a PUCCH resource and a CORESETPoolIndex in Rel-17. |
| Nokia, NSB | We would like to understand why this proposal is not discussed in the mTRP enhancements? |
| Ericsson | We note that this issue was discussed in Rel-16, but was not agreed due to lack of time. Given ‘per TRP default P0, alpha, PL-RS, and closed loop index’ are still being discussed for single-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH in Rel-17, we think this issue for Multi-DCI based M-TRP PUSCH can be revisited later. |
| CATT | We are open to discuss default pathloss RS, P0, alpha and clode loop index for PUSCH and PUCCH under M-TRP scenarios. Current specification can support closed-loop for M-TRP scenarios since closed-loop power control would have same SIR target for single TRP and M-TRP. However, the scope may be too broad to be accommodated in TEI discussion. |
| QC | The issue has been discussed extensively during the Rel. 16 eMIMO maintenance. The described issue is for a very corner case in our understanding:   * For FR2, two SRS resources are needed for multi-TRP for beam indication through SRI field. * For FR1 NCB-based PUSCH, two SRS resources are needed for multi-TRP for precoding. * For FR1 CB-based, gNB can configure 2 SRS resources for the purpose of PUSCH power control (to avoid the issue). * Even in the case of one SRS resource and when UE supports “Out-of-order operation for UL”, the restriction mentioned above is relaxed in 38.306: “Same closed loop index for power control across PUSCHs associated with different CORESETPoolIndex values is not supported by a UE indicating the support of this feature when TPC accumulation is enabled.”. Hence, TPC accumulation can be disabled and out-of-order operation for PUSCH would still work.   Based on the above, while this proposal can allow for more flexibility, we do not believe it is high priority or critical. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar to others, given the design may be closely related to Rel-17 PUSCH/PUCCH Multi-TRP enhancement, which has agreed with default P0/alpha/PL-RS/closed loop index per TRP, it is preferred to revisit the proposal until Rel-17 UL Multi-TRP design has fully decided. This helps strive some consistency for UL MTRP design in Rel-17, and mitigate spec changes and NW implementation complexity. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are multiple companies supporting this proposal, it seems we should continue discussion on this proposal since some companies have concern due to too large scope and/or unclearness of urgency/essentiality. Also, it seems this proposal has not yet met the criteria that the proposal is supported by at least 1 operator, 1 infra vendor and 1 UE vendor.  So, as moderator, I recommend continuing discussion on this proposal in this quarter (if the proponent can address concerns from companies) and do not recommend trying to make agreement on this proposal in this quarter. |
| OPPO | @DOCOMO:  For PUSCH, even without the support of FG 16-2a-3, seprate default close loop index for different TRPs could be also beneficial, which can support independence close loop power control per TRP. It was supported by S-DCI based m-TRP in Rel-17.  For PUCCH, based on the following description in 38.213, it can be associated with a *CORESETPoolindex* via the PDCCH scheduling/triggering the PUCCH. And even if joint ACK/NACK feedback mode is configured, a PUCCH can only be triggered by single PDCCH, and then associated with single value of *CORESETPooindex*.  *A UE that*  *- is not provided coresetPoolIndex or is provided coresetPoolIndex with a value of 0 for first CORESETs on active DL BWPs of serving cells, and*  *- is provided coresetPoolIndex with a value of 1 for second CORESETs on active DL BWPs of the serving cells, and*  *- is provided ackNackFeedbackMode = separate*  *does not expect a PUCCH or a PUSCH transmission triggered by a detection of a DCI format in a PDCCH received in a CORESET from the first CORESETs to overlap in time with a PUCCH or a PUSCH transmission triggered by a detection of a DCI format in a PDCCH received in a CORESET from the second CORESETs.*  @Nokia: As pointed out by Ericsson, this issue was discussed in Rel-16, but was not agreed due to lack of time. We propose to recondiser it in Rel-17 TEI considering similar enhancement has been agreed for S-DCI based mTRP.  @QC: This issue maybe solved by gNB via always configuring two SRS resources and *SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl* to UE. However, it may be a waste of resource to configure SRS resources just for power control purpose, which makes default power control parameter meaningless. It is better to solve it via minor specification impact. |

1. Conclusion

TBD
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Appendix: TEI guidance in [12]

**A. TEI Work Item codes shall only be used for small technical enhancements and improvements.**

This is how TEI was and is defined and it means that bigger topics should be done in an own WI.

**B. A TEI CR set shall be fully completed within one TSG cycle/quarter in all affected WGs.**

This requirement from TR 21.900 was never challenged. It also clarifies that only complete sets can be approved.

**C. TEI Work Item codes shall not be used where another appropriate Work Item code exists.**

This repeats the rule from TR 21.900 and it means that TEI cat.F CRs shall be an exception. Note: The CR author is supposed to find out which former CR introduced an error in the spec and the cat.F correction should then use the same WI code. So in theory, cat.F TEI CRs should only be needed to correct cat.B/C TEI CRs of the past.

D. Inter-TSG aspect:

**D1. Normally, for TSG SA/CT work that requires cat.B/C CRs from RAN WGs a RAN WI is required..**

This is what RAN applied in the last decade (if not longer). This also covers the strong discouragement of cross TSG TEI CRs expressed in RP-191602 slide 3.

**D2. In case the RAN work triggered via a TSG SA/CT WI\* is small and it affects only one RAN WG, then the RAN WG CR(s) shall use the WI code\* of the TSG SA/CT WI that triggered this work.   
NOTE: \*: provisional WI codes, companion WIDs/"mini-WIDs" are not meant here but already TSG approved proper WIs.**

This is what RAN applied in the last decade. Note: As TSG RAN has no agenda items for all SA/CT WIs, this sort of CRs were usually submitted under a TEI agenda item but for traceability we shall not use a TEI WI code on such a CR.  
(Note: D2. could work also in the other direction, i.e. if there is a RAN WI for which is turns out that only a small change would be needed in one SA WG or one CT WG. But you better consult TSG SA/CT before trying this approach.)

**D3. It is not possible to trigger work in RAN WGs via TEI CRs coming from TSG SA/CT or SA/CT WGs. The same applies for the reverse direction.**

Otherwise "small" (TEI) but affecting multiple TSGs would contradict each other. (Apart from this, inter-TSG TEI CRs would also not work well together for cat.B/C CRs if SA/CT use a companion WID but RAN does not.).

E. Inter-RAN WG aspects:

Section E. is addressing the problem that multiple RAN WGs work on the same feature but it is still intended to not have an own WI for this but to cover this feature under cat.B/C TEIxx (this is challenging time-wise and coordination-wise and therefore not a recommended approach but it is not forbidden). As RAN5 has introduced specific rules regarding the testing of TEI CRs, see RP-200931 [5] and since they use a different WI code (TEIxx\_Test) and testing work is usually coming at a later stage, this section E. is considering linked TEI CRs of RAN1/2/3/4.

In a similar way: RAN1/2/3/4 Core part work happens usually in the same time interval while RAN4 Perf. part work usually happens at the end of or after the RAN4 Core part work. In other words, having a TEI CR package that combines Core and Perf. part work requires a very careful timing to not violate requirement B.

RP-191602 [2] provided some guidance on Cross-WG TEI CRs in RAN WGs:

- Cross WG TEI CRs are strongly discouraged

- RAN1/2 TEI proposals with RAN4 impact to core requirements are strongly discouraged

- **RAN2 impact of RAN1/4-led TEI CRs shall be limited to RRC signalling of configuration parameters and UE capabilities (no MAC impact, no RRC procedural impact, etc.)**

Note: Ideally one RAN WG would take the decision about whether a TEI feature should be introduced or not and other RAN WGs then accept this decision and contribute their TEI CRs.

But as this guidance was not forbidding Cross-WG TEI CRs in RAN WGs some more requirements had to be defined how to guarantee traceability, consistency and visibility of this sort of CRs.

The basic requirements discussed in section E. were endorsed by TSG RAN in RP-202867 [7] but further clarification/guidance is provided here.

**E.1 It is mandatory to fill out the "other specs affected" for all CRs, i.e. either Yes or No shall be ticked and  
 if Yes is ticked at least the TS/TR shall be indicated and this for the present WG and all other WGs that have CRs linked to the present CR.  
 TEI CRs missing this information or having wrong information shall not be approved.**

These requirements were always there. But some clarification is required.

- "other specs affected" is used to link CRs that belong together which is essential for cat.F CRs and for cat.B/C TEI CRs to guarantee that a complete set of CRs is approved. Note: For cat.B CRs of other WIs, we have an extra RAN agenda item for each of them and we usually approve all stage 3 CRs together. But for closed WIs or TEI CRs we have normally just one agenda item collecting a larger number of CRs and then the relation of the CRs becomes unclear if "other specs affected" is not filled out properly.  
 NOTE: Other specs affected should also list inter-TSG related CRs if it is clear that these CRs can only be applied together. This usually involves a conditional approval at TSG level

- "Other core specifications" under "Other specs affected" on the CR cover: Going back to RAN #46 of Dec.2009 where TSG RAN decided to have separate Core part WIs and Perf. part WIs (in RP-091374) you can see from comparing with CR form v9.6 that the term "Other core specifications" is only intended to distinguish those specs from "Test specifications" and "O&M specifications" but not to exclude Perf. part related specs from "Other specs affected": This means as long as CR form is not updated "Other core specifications" should cover Core part specifications AND Perf. part specifications as defined in TSG RAN.

- "Test specifications" under "Other specs affected" on the CR cover: Testing under TSG RAN is either done in RAN4 or in RAN5. Since RAN5 has separate WIs for testing that usually are also just started after RAN4 work is completed, it would not make much sense to reference RAN5 specs on a RAN4 CR as it is clear that the RAN5 CR will just follow later (here it is more appropriate to review the corresponding RAN5 WI when it becomes available).  
 Examples where it could make sense to fill out this field: For RAN4 CRs to a WI that involve BS testing for the same WI/a linked CR. For CRs to SI TRs to which RAN4 and RAN5 contribute together with CRs. For a cat.B/C TEI CR of RAN1/2/3/4 that has a corresponding CR in RAN5 under TEIx\_Test.

- "O&M Specifications" under "Other specs affected" on the CR cover: O&M specifications are handled by SA5. SA5 has usually separate WIs for their changes and RAN CRs are not submitted to TSG SA or SA5, therefore the benefit of this field is higher within TSG SA. Nevertheless, there may be cases of tighter cooperation of RAN WGs with SA5 (like Minimization of drive tests) where it will be beneficial to indicate a related SA5 change coming to the same TSG meeting.

- What needs to be done if WGx is assuming that TS/TR ab.cde of WGy is affected but they are not sure?  
 WGx should list under "other comments" on the CR cover: "WGx thinks that also TS/TR ab.cde of WGy could be impacted by this CR." Depending on the probability WGx would tick Yes (and mention the spec) or No.  
 CR proponents shall check this with WGy (e.g. by sending an LS from WGx to WGy, submitting a Tdoc in WGy, talking to the chairman of WGy) so that at the TSG meeting where WGx submits this CR for approval it is either clear that there is no impact or that the WGy CR is available as well for approval.  
 NOTE: MCC has the possibility to correct CR covers before RAN submission (e.g. remove a potential impact comment if it turned out that there is no impact). But CR proponents need to inform MCC about this.  
 Incomplete CR sets (i.e. WGx CR there but linked WGy CR not available) can not be approved at TSG level and since cat.B/C TEI CRs have to be completed within one quarter, this is time critical.   
 Therefore very good preparation of cat.B/C TEI CRs which affect multiple WGs is essential.

**E.2 Each TEI cat.B/C CR and each TEI cat.F/A CR that corrects functionality related to an earlier TEI cat.B/C CR shall have a unique TEI identifier in square brackets [ ] at the end of the CR title on the CR cover sheet.  
 TEI cat.B/C CRs without such a unique TEI identifier cannot be approved at RAN.**

This principle was endorsed in RP-202867 [7] and further guidance for this approach is provided here:

- The TEI identifier should be short (4 to 18 characters using letters and/or digits or using \_ or - but avoiding blanks or other special characters which will complicate searches) and characterize the CR.

- The originating company takes care that related CRs in other WGs use the same TEI identifier.

- Unique identifiers are not added retroactively: Cat.F/A CRs for TEIs which did not have a unique identifier by RAN #91e will not get a unique identifier.

- Apart from plain TEI CRs, the unique TEI identifiers shall also be applied to NR\_newRAT-Core, TEIxx CRs because NR\_newRAT-Core was the huge WI for 5G.

- As the unique idendifiers are part of the CR title, they will be automatically stored in the CR database. Therefore CR authors have to make sure that the complete CR title in 3GU is in line with the title on the CR cover.

- For cases where it is not 100% clear whether a linked CR was agreed in another WG, it is the task of the CR author to double-check the situation in the week after the WG meeting and to inform MCC in case any updates of CR titles are required otherwise they risk that not properly linked CRs are rejected at RAN level.

**E.3 WG chairman reports report to TSG RAN about all agreed and technically endorsed cat.B/C TEI CRs of the last quarter. For each unique TEI identifier all related CRs of the considered WG are listed plus the corresponding CRs in the other WGs (if there are any) or the potential impacts on other WGs.**

How this is done is up to the chairman (e.g. it can be a slide with a table like the examples below, it can be an extra Excel table included in the zip file of the WG status report). The WG chairman could request inputs from MCC (Tdoc list filtered for agreed/endorsed TEI CRs) and all CR authors of the WG who had agreed/endorsed TEI CRs (to clarify whether there were related CRs in other WGs) and this could be condensed in such an overview.

Examples:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **unique TEI identifier** | **feature** | **Rel** | **CRs in own WG** | **CRs in/impacts on other WGs** |
| [HDUPLEX\_unpaired] | Modification to half duplex in unpaired spectrum | Rel-16 | R1-211234 (38.213, cat.C) | R2-2112345 (38.331 cat.C) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **unique TEI identifier** | **feature** | **Rel** | **CRs in own WG** | **CRs in/impacts on other WGs** |
| [intRAT\_HO\_NR\_ENDC] | Introduction of inter-RAT handover NR to ENDC | Rel-16 | R2-2123456 (38.306, cat.B)  R2-2123457 (38.331, cat.B) | potential impact on 38.133 for .... ? |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **unique TEI identifier** | **feature** | **Rel** | **CRs in own WG** | **CRs in/impacts on other WGs** |
| [E2E\_delay\_meas] | E2E delay measurement for QoS monitoring for URLLC | Rel-16 | R3-211234 (38.413, cat.B)  R3-211235 (38.423, cat.B)  R3-211236 (38.463, cat.B) | none |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **unique TEI identifier** | **feature** | **Rel** | **CRs in own WG** | **CRs in/impacts on other WGs** |
| [DRX\_coord] | Introduction of DRX coordination | Rel-16 | R4-2123456 (38.133, cat.B) | R2-2112345 (38.331, cat.B) |

- what's the main goal of this activity? To have a checkpoint in each WG (RAN1/2/3/4) where after the WG meeting it is checked whether a complete CR set is available for all cat.B/C TEI features for TSG RAN; by comparing the tables of different WGs a cross-check is possible.

- should this activity be limited to cat.B/C TEI CRs only? It would be useful to also list cat.F/A TEI CRs to correct formerly as cat.B/C TEI introduced features (corresponding CRs will have [ ] at the end of the Tdoc title and CR proponents will inform the WG chairman if there were any agreed/endorsed CRs lile this)

- what about CRs for WI code combinations like "<WI code>, TEIxx"?  
 These CRs appear when <WI code> was a WI of a Rel-yy with yy<xx.  
 These CRs are usually well identified via <WI code> and would therefore not need any more tracking.  
 But one exception should be made for <WI code> = NR\_newRAT-Core as this was the generic NR WI that introduced the whole 5G and if we do not track "NR\_newRAT-Core, TEIxx" as well, it could be used as a way to bypass this tracking activity.

- How big is the expected effort: Double-checking TEI16 CRs of 2020, we had about 110 cat.B/C CRs from RAN1/2/3/4 together with ~50% TEI16, ~25% "NR\_newRAT-Core, TEIxx" and ~25% other WI code, TEI16 CRs. So this means ~20 CRs per TSG RAN meeting plus a few cat.F/A corrections to former cat.B/C TEIxx CRs.

- What is TSG RAN supposed to do with the tables of TEI CRs from the WG chairmen? The impacts on other WGs have to be carefully reviewed (the earlier the tables from the WG chairmen are available the better, ideally at latest 1 week after the WG meeting): If WGx expected a CR from WGy but WGy did not provide such a CR, then there are 2 possibilities: The CR from WGy was not needed (then this will be documented e.g. in the RAN minutes or in a revised WG chairman's report) or WGy did not manage to conclude on a CR which means we have an incomplete CR set that cannot be approved. It is then up to TSG RAN to discard the incomplete CR set or to request a company CR for the WGy spec (if it is easy to solve) or to consider the start of a new WI (if the problem is more complex).

**E.4 MCC will support this tracking activity with a list of TEI CRs for a considered release that were handled at RAN and that have the unique TEI identifier.**

- The resulting Tdoc list of each RAN meeting includes already a complete list of all CRs handled in this meeting. An additional list will be added after RAN #92e listing the TEI CRs with unique TEI identifiers in [ ].  
 After RAN #93e, a further list will be appended to the TEI CR list so that in the end a list for all TEI cat.B/C CRs (and their corresponding cat.F/A corrections) will develop that allows easy search and filtering for new TEI features.

- Such a list could be generated per release and will allow an improved visibility and tracing of new TEI features.  
 Note: Due to the unique TEI identifiers and the proper documentation as outcome of the RAN meetings, also 3GU will allow to search for TEI CR sets.