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# Introduction

RAN approved a WI on further coverage enhancements for NR [1]. The WI includes the following objective:

* *Specify enhancements to support dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (RAN1)*

The WI also includes corresponding justification point:

* *DFT-S-OFDM waveform is beneficial for UL coverage limited scenario because of its lower PAPR compared with CP-OFDM waveform. Currently, UL waveform is configured via RRC and this limitation imposes a large barrier to switch over to DFT-S-OFDM waveform for cell-edge UEs practically.*

This contribution summarizes contributions submitted in RAN1#110bis-e under AI 9.14.3 – Dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM.

Here is the color code used in this summary:

* **FL observations**
* **FL proposals**
* **Questions for the inputs from companies**
* **FL summary based on the companies’ input**
* **RAN1 agreements**

A tag ([Open]/[Closed]) is indicated for each issue for each round of discussion. For a given round, input is requested for issues marked as [Open] only. In addition, a [LP]/[MP]/[HP] tag indicates envisioned priority of each issue in this meeting.

# Contact information

Please input the contact information for each company below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| InterDigital | Paul Marinier | paul.marinier at interdigital.com |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Naoya Shibaike | naoya.shibaike at nttdocomo.com |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Qiping Pi | piqp@docomolabs-beijing.com.cn |
| Panasonic | Tetsuya Yamamoto | yamamoto.tetsuya001@jp.panasonic.com |
| Vivo | Zhipeng Lin | zhipeng.lin at vivo.com |
| Spreadtrum | Zhongdan Zhang | Zhongdan.Zhang@unisoc.com |
| Transsion | Xingya Shen | xingya.shen@transsion.com |
| Sony | Sam Atungsiri | Sam.atungsiri@sony.com |
| Lenovo | Lingling Xiao | xiaoll2@lenovo.com |
| Nokia/NSB | Quang Nhan | nhat-quang.nhan at nokia.com |
| Fujitsu | Taewoo LEE | lee.taewoo@fujitsu.com |
| MediaTek | Umut Ugurlu | umut.ugurlu at mediatek.com |
| Ericsson | Ling Su | [ling.a.su@ericsson.com](mailto:ling.a.su@ericsson.com) |
| Apple | Chunhai Yao | Chunhai\_yao@apple.com |
| OPPO | Zhisong Zuo | zuozhisong@oppo.com |
| Xiaomi | Xueyuan Gao | gaoxueyuan@xiaomi.com |
| CATT | Yanping Xing | xingyanping@catt.cn |

# Collection of agreements in RAN1#110b-e

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is only applicable to PUSCH channel. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Assumption**  Support at least one of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:  Alt 1: Indication from an UL scheduling DCI   * Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI * Alt 1-B: Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI   + Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by repurposing field, e.g.     - Add one column to TDRA table     - Add one column to MCS table(s)     - Other solutions not precluded   + Alt 1-B-2: Implicit determination from condition(s) on scheduling information, e.g.     - RA type, MSB of RA     - Number of RBs (below threshold or multiple of 2,3,5)     - Location of RB allocation within carrier and the associated MPR     - MCS below threshold     - Number of PUSCH repetitions (or whether PUSCH repetition is used) and/or TBoMS     - Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data     - Precoding information and number of layers     - SRI     - Condition over multiple types of scheduling information     - Other types of scheduling information not precluded * Indicated waveform applies at least to the scheduled PUSCH transmission   + FFS: Whether it also applies to subsequent transmissions, and of which type * FFS: DCI formats can contain the indication * FFS: Indication applies only if condition(s) are satisfied (e.g. PDCCH occasion, /RNTI, /Search space of the scheduling DCI, latest PHR reported by the UE, etc.)   Alt 2: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI   * FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI) * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting power headroom related information * Other solutions are not precluded |

# Proposals

## Proposals for 1st GTW

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-1**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is only applicable to PUSCH channel. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2v2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~ |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1v2**: RAN1 to ~~consider~~ support one or more of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:  Alt 1: Indication from an UL scheduling DCI   * Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI * Alt 1-B: Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI   + Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by overloading/repurposing field, e.g.     - Add one column to TDRA table     - Add one column to MCS table(s)     - Other solutions not precluded   + Alt 1-B-2: Implicit determination from condition(s) on scheduling information, e.g.     - RA type, MSB of RA     - Number of RBs (below threshold or multiple of 2,3,5)     - Location of RB allocation within carrier and the associated MPR     - MCS below threshold     - Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data     - Precoding information and number of layers     - SRI     - Condition over multiple types of scheduling information     - Other types of scheduling information not precluded * Indicated waveform applies at least to the scheduled PUSCH transmission   + FFS: Whether it also applies to subsequent transmissions, and of which type * At least DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 can contain the indication   + FFS: DCI format 0\_0 * FFS: Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI (e.g. PDCCH occasion, RNTI, Search space, latest PHR reported by the UE)   Alt 2: Indication from MAC CE   * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable   Alt 3: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI   * FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI) * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting information on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform * Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform * Other solutions are not precluded |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-3**: For studying potential applicability of dynamic waveform switching enhancement to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, RAN1 to focus on the case that the indication is not contained in the DCI format 0\_0. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-4:** RAN1 to focus on the case of PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant for the applicability of dynamic waveform switching indication.   * Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by configured grant is considered with lower priority. |

[Note: None of these proposals were presented in the GTW of 10/13/2022.]

## Proposals for 2nd GTW

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1v3**: RAN1 to ~~consider~~ support one or more of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:  Alt 1: Indication from an UL scheduling DCI   * Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI * Alt 1-B: Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI   + Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by ~~overloading/~~repurposing field, e.g.     - Add one column to TDRA table     - Add one column to MCS table(s)     - Other solutions not precluded   + Alt 1-B-2: Implicit determination from condition(s) on scheduling information, e.g.     - RA type, MSB of RA     - Number of RBs (below threshold or multiple of 2,3,5)     - Location of RB allocation within carrier and the associated MPR     - MCS below threshold     - Number of PUSCH repetitions (or whether PUSCH repetition is used)     - Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data     - Precoding information and number of layers     - SRI     - Condition over multiple types of scheduling information     - Other types of scheduling information not precluded * Indicated waveform applies at least to the scheduled PUSCH transmission   + FFS: Whether it also applies to subsequent transmissions, and of which type * At least DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 can contain the indication   + FFS: DCI format 0\_0 * FFS: Indication applies only if condition(s) are satisfied ~~Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI~~ (e.g. PDCCH occasion~~,~~ /RNTI~~,~~ /Search space of the scheduling DCI, latest PHR reported by the UE)   Alt 2: Indication from MAC CE   * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable   Alt 3: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI   * FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI) * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1v2**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining ~~when to indicate~~ waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting power headroom related information ~~on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~ * ~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~ * Other solutions are not precluded |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2v2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~ |

[Note: only FL proposal 2-1v3 was presented and discussed in the GTW of 10/17/2022.]

## Proposals for 3rd GTW

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1v2**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining ~~when to indicate~~ waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting power headroom related information ~~on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~ * ~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~ * Other solutions are not precluded |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2v2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~ |

# Topic #1: Applicability of dynamic waveform switching

A first set of issues is related to the type of transmission concerned by dynamic waveform switching. This discussion has high priority since it may impose requirements on the dynamic signaling mechanism. The following cases are considered separately:

* PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant
* PUSCH scheduled by configured grant type 1/2
* PUSCH scheduled by RAR (msg3)
* Other cases/issues

## [Open][HP] Issue #1-1: Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 only: Spreadtrum [4], vivo [5], CATT [8], Intel [9], Panasonic [12], InterDigital [13], CMCC [21], Ericsson [22], NTT DOCOMO [26]

* Switching from format 0\_0 to other formats already enables switching [8]
* Supporting format 0\_0 has small benefit, e.g. other formats can be used [8][13][22]
* (For TC-RNTI) Supporting format 0\_0 requires early indication and have large impact [5][26]
* Format 0\_0 only supports RA type 1 [8]
* Format 0\_0 is intended for basic functions [21]
* (If DCI-based indication) Increasing payload of format 0\_0 would be undesirable or (for CSS) not feasible [9][12]

All DCI formats: ZTE (3), China Telecom [6], Mavenir [15]

* (except for TC-RNTI) Can use similar design as UL/SUL indicator to align with format 1\_0 [3]
* (for TC-RNTI) Use same as msg3 initial transmission [3]
* Desirable to maximize number of applicable use cases [6]

At least DCI format 0\_0: Nokia [29]

* Format 0\_0 has smaller payload and is more relevant for coverage enhancements [29]

**Observations on applicability to PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant**

A first observation is that no company proposes that dynamic waveform switching is applicable to a channel or signal other than PUSCH.

Furthermore, all companies’ proposals are consistent with the assumption that PUSCH dynamically scheduled is to be supported at least for some cases. A strong majority proposes that it is applicable at least to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 since such formats can support a larger range of functionalities.

Regarding applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by format 0\_0, views from contributions are more diverse. Majority of companies who expressed views on this think that there is not much motivation if one considers that RRC configurability of DCI format 0\_0 combined with dynamic indication for DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 and the possibility of selecting DCI format provides enough flexibility. Some companies also have concerns about feasibility or impact of modifying DCI format 0\_0 (if one assumed a DCI-based indication). However, several companies would prefer to support DCI format 0\_0 to maximize applicability of dynamic switching or because they see this DCI format 0\_0 as more relevant to coverage-limited scenario.

### 1st round

As a starting point, there seems to be consensus from contributions that dynamic waveform switching enhancement is applicable only to PUSCH channel (i.e. not applicable to other transmissions such as PUCCH). Given that this is not explicitly indicated in the scope of the WI description, moderator suggests agreeing on the following:

**FL proposal 1-1**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is only applicable to PUSCH channel.

Further views and comments on applicability for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by different DCI formats are requested. (Regarding DCI format 0\_0, it is suggested to exclude the case of TC-RNTI for issue #1-1 since it is closely related to issue #1-3 on applicability to msg3 PUSCH.)

Please indicate your views on the following:

1. Indicate if FL proposal 1-1 is acceptable.
2. Applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2
3. Applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 (except by TC-RNTI)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We agree with FL proposal 1-1.  We support to apply dynamic waveform switching to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.  We do NOT support to apply dynamic waveform switching to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0. Dynamic waveform switching of PUSCH is already supported by switching between fallback DCI and non-fallback DCI in current specification and is expected to be supported for PUSCH scheduled by non-fallback DCI. To motivation/benefit to additionally support dynamic switching for PUSCH scheduled by fallback DCI is unclear taking into consideration that there are many restrictions of fallback DCI, e.g. fixed RA type, fixed DMRS configuration/port etc. |
| DOCOMO | 1. We support FL proposal 1-1. 2. Yes, PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 should be considered. 3. We are open to consider DCI format 0\_0. |
| Intel | 1. We are fine with FL proposal 1-1. 2. We are fine to apply PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 3. We do not think we need to consider dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 (except by TC-RNTI). |
| Panasonic | a) We support FL proposal 1-1.  b) DG-PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0-1/0-2 should support dynamic waveform switching.  c) In order to utilize DCI format 0-0 regardless of RRC status and to keep the same payload size in common search space, no change should be applied. Therefore, our view is that dynamic waveform switching is not required for DG-PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0-0. |
| vivo | 1. Fine with FL’s proposal 1-1. 2. Applicable. 3. Not preferred.   It’s enough to follow Msg3 waveform configured by RRC for PUSCH transmissions scheduled by fallback DCI. Unified waveform determination mechanism for Msg3 retransmissions and other PUSCH transmissions scheduled by fallback DCI should be pursued. |
| QC | Proposal 1-1 is acceptable.  DWS can be applied to DG-PUSCH scheduled via 0\_1/0\_2.  For DG-PUSCH scheduled via 0\_0, ensuring robustness of fallback DCI takes precedence. Adding an explicit bit to DCI is definitely not an option here. Open to discuss further as 0\_0 may be relevant to a cell-edge UE. |
| LG | 1. We are fine with FL proposal 1-1. 2. We are fine to support dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 3. We are open to discuss supporting dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 (except by TC-RNTI) |
| China Telecom | 1. We are fine with FL’s proposal 1-1 2. Yes, fine to support the dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 3. Yes, fine to support the dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0. |
| Vodafone | a) We are fine with proposal 1-1  b) OK   1. c) Same view as QC |
| Spreadtrum | a) Support.  b) Support.  c) Not support. Fallback DCI 0\_0 has high requirement of robustness, and it should be work well during the RRC reconfiguration, which may include the waveform information and would lead to misunderstanding between gNB and UE during the configuration phase if dynamic waveform switching is supported. Besides, the fallback DCI supports basic function and has many scheduling restrictions. Therefore, we think PUSCH scheduled by fallback DCI 0\_0 cannot support dynamic waveform switching. |
| ZTE | 1. We support FL proposal 1-1. 2. Yes, PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 should be considered. 3. Yes, PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 should also be considered. The increase of DC payload is not big issue if similar design as UL/SUL indicator to align with format 1\_0 is adopted. |
| Sharp | 1. We support FL proposal 1-1. 2. Yes, PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 should support the dynamic switching. 3. We are open to consider Msg3. For the other cases, we prefer not considering DCI format 0\_0. We didn’t touch fallback DCI related behavior in Rel-17 CovEnh, and we do not see a strong need of enhancements only for the dynamic switching. |
| CMCC | 1. Support. 2. OK   We do not want to apply any change for DCI 0\_0 since this is a fallback DCI format. |
| Transsion | 1. We are fine with FL’s proposal 1-1 2. Yes, we are fine to support dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 3. We are open to discuss whether to support the dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 (except by TC-RNTI). |
| Sony | a) We agree with FL proposal 1-1  b) Support applicability for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 should support the dynamic switching.  c) Support applicability for Msg3 PUSCH |
| Lenovo | Agree with FL proposal 1-1.  We support dynamic waveform switching is appliable to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 only considering the restrictions of DCI format 0\_0. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal 1-1.  Answer to b and c would be different from which solutions are adopted. If DCI based solution is used, then further questions can be made about DCI formats or (non)scheduling DCIs, etc. If MAC CE based solution is used, then any DCI format can switch the waveform. In this stage, we prefer to support at least non-fallback DCI formats and FFS fallback DCI format. |
| Nokia/NSB | 1. We support FL’s proposal 1-1. 2. We are open to discuss DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. 3. We support dynamic WF switching using DCI format 0\_0, given that fallback DCI format is very relevant for coverage shortage scenario. This does not mean that a new field need to be added to DCI format 0\_0, but other means of explicit or implicit indications could be considered.   @CATT: Thank you for your comment! Could you please elaborate why do you think that “dynamic waveform switching of PUSCH is already supported by switching between fallback DCI and non-fallback DCI in current specification”? does it mean that in this case *msg3-transformPrecoder* and *transformPrecoder* in *pusch-Config* should always be configured with different waveform? If so, then this reduces significantly the flexibility of configuring waveform for these parameters, e.g., the gNB is always forced to configure DFT-s-OFDM for *msg3-transformPrecoder*. |
| Fujitsu | 1. We are fine with FL proposal 1-1. 2. DCI 0\_1/0\_2 is baseline for dynamic waveform switching   We are open to discuss about DCI 0\_0. |
| Samsung | 1. Yes 2. We support to apply dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. Further comments are added in Issue#1-2 for CG. 3. We don’t support to apply dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0. The main reason is scheduling restrictions, as also mentioned by other companies. Another reason is that this format has only mandatory fields, so not all options considered for signalling (e.g. new field option) are feasible. |
| MediaTek | a) We support FL’s proposal 1-1.  b) Yes for DCI format 0\_1/0\_2  c) Not preferred for fallback DCI 0\_0. |
| Ericsson | a) FL proposal 1-1 is fine to us.  b) Dynamic waveform switching is applicable for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_1/0\_2.  c) In our view, whether to support dynamic waveform switching for PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 (excluding TC-RNTI) depends on the signaling of waveform switching. For example, if explicit DCI indication is used, it changes DCI payload size, which is not desirable for DCI format 0\_0. We are open to study if MAC-CE indication of waveform switching can be applicable for PUSCH scheduled by DCI0\_0. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. We support the FL proposal 1-1. 2. We support that the waveform switching of PUSCH is dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. 3. The waveform switching of PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 should not be supported. In RRC reestablishment, C-RNTI is used instead of TC-RNTI. In this case, Msg3 retransmission is scheduled by a DCI 0\_0 scrambled by C-RNTI. |
| NEC | a) Support.  b) Support.  c) It depends on how to indicate dynamic switching, |

**Observations from first round discussion**

All companies seem OK with FL proposal 1-1.

All companies seem positive or open on applicability to PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.

Views are split on applicability to PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 (except TC-RNTI):

* 12 companies (DOCOMO, QC, LG, China Telecom, Vodafone, ZTE, Transsion, ETRI, Nokia, Fujitsu, Ericsson, NEC) are positive or open to consider this. Some companies (QC, Vodafone, ETRI, Ericsson) are open to support under condition that the payload size of DCI format 0\_0 is not increased.
* 10 companies have concerns or are not supportive. The reasons are as follows:
  + Unclear benefit (CATT, Intel, Mediatek?)
  + Prefer same behaviour for all cases of DCI format 0\_0 (vivo)
  + Assume that it would need to be indicated in the DCI itself, would be difficult (Panasonic, Samsung)
  + Prefer to not affect DCI fallback behaviour for robustness (Spreadtrum, Sharp, CMCC)
  + DCI format 0\_0 by C-RNTI for msg3 (after re-establishment) would also be an issue (HW)

In view of the situation, moderator thinks that it should be possible to agree on supporting at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 as a starting point, but at this time there is no sufficient support for DCI format 0\_0. Based on the feedback, several companies have concerns about affecting interpretation or DCI format 0\_0 itself. However, as was noted by a few companies, the indication is not necessarily contained in the scheduling DCI itself. Depending on the solution adopted for the dynamic waveform indication (topic 2), the indication could be received in a previously received MAC CE or DCI (for another PUSCH or for PDSCH). Therefore, it is suggested to continue the discussion on applicability for PUSCH dynamically scheduled by format 0\_0 and focus on the assumption that the indication is not contained in the scheduling DCI for this case.

### 2nd round

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0   **FL proposal 1-3**: For studying potential applicability of dynamic waveform switching enhancement to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, RAN1 to focus on the case that the indication is not contained in the DCI format 0\_0. |

Please indicate your views on the following:

1. Indicate if FL proposal 1-2 is acceptable.
2. Indicate if FL proposal 1-3 is acceptable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | On (a) Okay with Proposal 1-2  On (b) Proposal 1-3 may not be needed right now. I suspect that the meaning of the word “contained” will be rather controversial. We can work on 0\_1 and 0\_2, then come back and try to resolve the FFS in Proposal 1-2. |
| Panasonic | a) Support  b) We are fine with FL proposal 1-3, if the proposal means not to study affecting interpretation of DCI format 0-0 or DCI format 0-0 itself. |
| Apple | * 1. Support   2. Whether DCI format 0\_0 can indicate the waveform can be discussed later after the progress on DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| CATT | We agree proposal 1-2.  We agree with the comment from Qualcomm on proposal 1-3. |
| DOCOMO | Support (a). Ok with (b). |
| Samsung | a) Our preference is to remove the FFS.  b) FL proposal 1-3 seems not agreeable. |
| ETRI | Support both 1-2 and 1-3. |
| Lenovo | * 1. Support   2. Share same view as QC. |
| OPPO | Proposal 1-2: It seems to be reasonable to consider 0\_1/0\_2.  Proposal 1-3: We can also further discuss 0\_0 in supporting the dynamic scheduling as some companies commented that the format is to be used in the coverage limited area. The main concern is format size ambiguity during reconfiguration, however, this is not the case when it is implicitly indicated by 0\_0.  Propose to slightly change the bullet:  “RAN1 to focus on the case that the dedicated indication is not contained in the DCI format 0\_0” |
| vivo | Fine with proposal 1-2 except the FFS bullet which can be removed given “at least” is already included.  **FL proposal 1-2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~   Do not support FL proposal 1-3, see our earlier comments. |
| China Telecom | * 1. We still prefer to consider the DCI format 0\_0, but we can live with the proposal 1-2.   2. We are not clear how it works if the PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 without the indication contained, the meaning of “contained” may need further clarification. |
| Nokia/NSB | * 1. We are fine with FL’s proposal 1-2 for the sake of making progress (also fine with removing the FFS). Though it seems that this proposal is included in proposal 2-1.   2. Do not support FL’s proposal 1-3. We believe the main concern from companies is that we don’t want to change the DCI size and fields of the fallback DCI. But the DCI itself can convey indication information. This depends on the approach that we take for indication, e.g., if the UE implicitly determine waveform based on the scheduling information, then the DCI format is not impacted at all. Therefore, we would suggest modifying FL proposal 1-3 as follows, if this could help to address concern from companies on fallback DCI size and fields.   **FL proposal 1-3**: For studying potential applicability of dynamic waveform switching enhancement to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, RAN1 to focus on the case that ~~the indication is not contained in~~ the size and fields of the DCI format 0\_0 are unchanged. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with FL proposal 1-2&1-3. |
| MediaTek | a) Support proposal 1-2  b) Same view as QC. We don’t need proposal 1-3 for now. If fallback DCI is for further study, we will come back to discuss it later. |
| ZTE | * 1. Support   2. Not support. If we use similar design as UL/SUL indicator to align with format 1\_0, there is no DCI size increasing issue. So we still think it should not restrict to the case that the indication is not contained in the DCI format 0\_0. |
| Spreadtrum | a) Okay with Proposal 1-2  b) Agree with QC that proposal 1-3 may not be needed. |
| Vodafone | a) Fine with the proposal and to keep FFS  b) To avoid concerns on the “contained” description, Nokia’s updated version seems OK |
| Moderator | @All: thanks for support of FL proposal 1-2 and Nokia for willingness to compromise. I deleted FFS in FL proposal 1-2v2, given the “at least”.  @Panasonic, DOCOMO, ETRI, Xiaomi: Thanks for support of FL proposal 1-3.  @QC, CATT, Lenovo, Spreadtrum: Thanks for suggestion. Yes, maybe topic #2 discussions would be more important at this point but many companies expressed concern about changing interpretation of this DCI format so it seems appropriate to narrow down a little bit the possibilities for this format.  @China Telecom: The indication command could be from a previous DCI or MAC CE. This is related to the discussion of Topic #2 on whether indication applies to single transmission only or to subsequent transmissions.  @OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Vodafone: For FL proposal 1-3, I observe that several companies are also concerned about re-interpreting the DCI format 0\_0 (even without changing the size) because this format is useful to e.g. minimize possibility of unsync between UE and network.  @ZTE: As explained in the above, my observation is that most companies have concerns about re-interpreting this DCI and even more to change its size.  @All: Please continue providing feedback, especially on FL proposal 1-2v2. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with FL proposal 1-2v2.  One clarification: does this also imply that Type 2 CG-PUSCH which is activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 is also included?  We do not support FL proposal 1-3 |
| Moderator | @Intel: Thanks for the question. No, this proposal is only about dynamically scheduled PUSCH. |
| Sharp | Support FL proposal 1-2.  As for FL proposal 1-3, we share the view from Qualcomm. |
| LG | a) We are fine with **FL proposal 1-2v2.**  b) We cannot support FL’s proposal 1-3, but the modified version from Nokia seems to be acceptable. |
| CATT | We support FL proposal 1-2v2.  For the question from Intel, our understanding is that the proposal does not include Type 2 CG PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. It is better to clarify in the proposal to avoid the potential confusion. |
| Ericsson | a) We are fine with FL proposal 1-2v2.  b) We agree with FL that Proposal 1-3 depends on the progress of FL proposal 2-1v2. We can wait for some progress there. |
| CMCC | a)Support.  b)The spirit of this proposal is clear that we do not want to change fallback DCI, and the wording from FL and Nokia can be further discussed. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | It is unclear to us why there is concern about re-interpretation vs. minimizing possibility of unsync between UE and network. The latter is offered by the design of the format itself. Then when the content of the DCI is successfully received by the UE, i.e., when the UE and network are “synced”, then interpreting a field is just a second step and irrelevant with the unsync issue. For example, if a UE determined waveform based on the indicated MCS level (and some other conditions), how could this impact the “unsync” issue? The UE needs to receive an MCS indication anyway from the DCI format. |
| OPPO2 | We are fine for Nokia’s modification on P1-3. The original one is too restrictive. Unclear why reusing the fields have problem. We think configuration into TDRA is also a example, it means reusing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * 1. Support **FL proposal 1-2**   2. Early identification costs unnecessary standard efforts in FL proposal 1-3. Therefore, please make the study scope clearer   **FL proposal 1-3**: For studying potential applicability of dynamic waveform switching enhancement to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, RAN1 to focus on the case that ~~the indication is not contained in~~ the size and fields of the DCI format 0\_0 are unchanged.   * Note: No early identification during initial access for UE capability is presumed. |
| Fujitsu | a) We are OK with Proposal 1-2v2.  b) We prefer to defer the discussion after resolving FFS in Proposal1-2v2. |
| Samsung | FL proposal 1-2v2 in Sec. 4.1 – we propose to remove the “at least” to avoid any misunderstanding. Other cases can be discussed separately.  **FL proposal 1-2v2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to ~~at least~~ PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~   We don’t support FL proposal 1-3.  We do not agree with comments made about coverage as motivating factor to consider DCI format 0\_0. Not only the UE is not assumed to be transmitting PUSCH with repetitions (DFT-S-OFDM could then be used) but, even if it did, there is also no coverage issue for PDCCH and especially for DCI format 0\_0. Moreover, waveform switching would be an infrequent event, specification simplicity should be the goal, and there is no need for any further optimization. |
| Moderator | @Intel, Sharp, LG, CATT, Ericsson, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Fujitsu: Thanks for supporting FL proposal 1-2v2!  @Samsung: I this point I prefer to keep the “at least” given that this version seems acceptable to strong majority of companies. I hope it is still ok for you.  @Nokia/NSB2, (OPPO2): I think the concern would be that UE and gNB have different understanding on how to interpret the field. However, I see your point that this is problem may be independent of whether we use the implicit signaling. I am fine updating with your version, but anyway there does not seem to be enough support for going in the direction of FL1-3 in general so I will pause this discussion for now.  @Huawei, HiSilicon: Thanks for the suggestion. I agree that it would make sense to clarify this next time we discuss for DCI format 0\_0. |

**Observations from second round discussion**

On FL proposal 1-2/FL proposal 1-2v2:

* 24 companies (QC, Panasonic, Apple, CATT, DOCOMO, ETRI, Lenovo, OPPO, vivo, China Telecom, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, Mediatek, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Vodafone, Intel, Sharp, LG, CATT, Ericsson, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Fujitsu) are ok with at least one of the versions. (Some companies did not reconfirm for 1-2v2 after supporting original 1-2, but are hopefully still ok.).
* 1 company (Samsung) proposed to remove the “at least”.

Moderator proposes to make agreement on FL proposal 1-2v2.

On FL proposal 1-3:

* 4 companies (Panasonic DOCOMO, ETRI, Xiaomi) support the proposal.
* 5 companies (OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Vodafone, LG, CMCC, China Telecom) would like to modify it so that it could include possibility of implicit indication by DCI format 0\_0, or clarify it.
* 8 companies (QC, Apple, CATT, Lenovo, Mediatek, Spreadtrum, Sharp, Ericsson) would prefer to discuss this aspect later.
* 3 companies (Samsung, vivo, Intel) do not support the proposal.

Moderator is fine with pausing the discussion on FL proposal 1-3 for now.

### 3rd round

Based on 2nd round comments it seems that FL proposal 1-2v2 is agreeable to strong majority. Moderator would like to submit it for email approval.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2v2**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to at least PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * ~~FFS: applicability to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_0~~ |

Please indicate support or objection to FL proposal 1-2v2. Please only object if you have strong concern:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies | Sharp, Panasonic, ZTE, LG, Ericsson, Sony |
| Objecting companies |  |
| **Company** | **Reason for objection** |

Update after GTW of 10/18/2022: FL proposal 1-2v2 is not agreed. One company (Samsung) does not want to keep the words “at least”. Also, some companies would like to clarify if it applies to Type 2 CG PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. Moderator proposes to try with this formulation:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2v3**: Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2.   * Note: The above does not imply that dynamic switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to configured grant type 2 PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. * FFS: Other cases of PUSCH transmissions. |

Please indicate if FL proposal 1-2v3 is acceptable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Intel | If needed, we can modify the main bullet as “by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with CRC scrambled by CS-RNTI with NDI=1, C-RNTI, or MCS-CRNTI”. This is aligned with the current spec and we do not need to mention Note.  But we can live with the proposal. |
| ZTE | In this stage, we think it is better to keep “at least” in the main bullet.  For the Note, my interpretation is: dynamic switching enhancement in R18 is NOT applicable to configured grant type 2 PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. If my understanding is YES, I think it is premature to drop the CG Type 2 for dynamic waveform switching now. |
| Panasonic | Proposal 1-2v3 is acceptable. |
| CATT | We prefer Intel’s suggestion which is clearer.  Based on current proposal, there may be still confusion whether CG retransmissions are included or not. |
| LG | We can simply add “Regarding on Dynamic Grant PUSCH (DG-PUSCH)” in front of the main bullet.  Or, alternatively, the Note could be changed as “Initial transmission and re-transmission of Configured Grant PUSCH (CG-PUSCH) is not discussed in this proposal.” |
| Lenovo | Support |
| vivo | Fine. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view as ZTE. We still prefer keeping “at least”. In addition, although it seems that the intention for having the note is to clarify the main bullet that CG Type 2 is separately discussed, the wording may be misunderstood as if CG Type 2 is precluded (as also pointed out by ZTE). |
| Apple | Based on the online discussion, the intention of this proposal is only talking about dynamic grant scheduled PUSCH transmission and retransmission. The CG PUSCH transmission can be discussed separately. The note seems not cover the case fo configured grant PUSCH re-transmission, i.e., CS-RNTI with NDI=1.  To make the proposal clearer, the note and FFS can be merged, and updated as below:    FFS: The configured grant related PUSCH transmission and retransmission. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Intel’s modification. From our perspective, we think CG retransmissions can be include in the scope of dynamic waveform switching. |
| CMCC | Fine. |
| MediaTek | We support FL proposal 1-2v3.  We prefer to remove “FFS: Other cases of PUSCH transmissions”, although we can live with it.  We don’t think that Intel’s suggestion is needed. FL’s proposal mentions dynamical grants. Re-transmission grants for CGs are dynamic. It’s the same meaning. |
| Ericsson | Yes, Proposal 1-2v3 is acceptable.  In our view, “PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2” in Proposal 1-2v3 includes retransmission of both DG-PUSCH and CG-PUSCH.  Retransmission of CG-PUSCH can be scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, 0\_1 and 0\_2. For DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2, the scheduling DCI for retransmission of CG-PUSCH is no different from that for retransmission of DG-PUSCH. If the proposal applies to the retransmission of DG-PUSCH, it can work in the same way as retransmission of CG-PUSCH.  As to fallback DCI 0\_0, a change of its payload size with a new field is not desirable even for DG-PUSCH, and we don’t think it is robust to let UE interpret it with a repurposed way. |
| Sony | Fine.  Perhaps it is better to say in the note that “The proposal is only about dynamic grant PUSCH and does not preclude dynamic waveform switching for configured grant PUSCH”. |
| QC | This is okay. Echo E// comments on CG PUSCH retransmissions --- they are no different from regular DG-PUSCH. |

## [Closed][HP] Issue #1-2: Applicability to configured grant

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

CG type 1:

* Yes: Xiaomi [16], (Nokia [29])
  + DG and CG PUSCH have same demands for coverage enhancement [16]
* Open to discuss: China Telecom [6], ETRI [18], Ericsson [22], NTT DOCOMO [26], Qualcomm [27]
  + Benefit of dynamic switching valid for any type of scheduling, but CG type 1 may be difficult [26]
  + Prefer unified solution between DG and CG [26]
  + Would require adapting other parameters. Maybe ok if solution for DG PUSCH can be extended to CG PUSCH without further change [27]
* No: ZTE [3], Spreadtrum [4], vivo [5], CATT [8], Panasonic [12], Lenovo [14]
  + No activation DCI exists for CG type 1 [3][8][12]
  + CG type 1 transmission parameters are configured by RRC [4]

CG type 2:

* Yes: ZTE [3], vivo [5], China Telecom [6], (Sony [10]), InterDigital [13], Xiaomi [16], (Nokia [29])
  + Can reuse solution for dynamic grant [3][5][13]
  + DG and CG PUSCH have same demands for coverage enhancement [16]
  + Supported for activation by formats 0\_0/0\_1/0\_2 [16]
* Open to discuss: CATT [8], Panasonic [12], ETRI [18], NTT DOCOMO [26], Qualcomm [27]
  + Possibly for activation by format 0\_1/0\_2 only [8]
  + Maybe ok if solution for DG PUSCH can be extended to CG PUSCH without further change [12][27]
  + Prefer unified solution between type 1 and type 2 [18]
  + Benefit of dynamic switching valid for any type of scheduling [26]
  + Not critical since multiple CG configurations can be dynamically activated/released [27]
* No: Spreadtrum [4], Lenovo [14], Mediatek [20]
  + Need to change other parameters on top of waveform [4]
  + Not needed since multiple CG configurations with different waveforms can be dynamically activated/released [14][27]

**Observations on applicability to PUSCH scheduled by configured grant**

For applicability to configured grant, the situation is slightly different depending on whether it is type 1 or type 2. For type 1, about half of companies who expressed views think dynamic waveform switching is not applicable and about half are open to discuss or support this case. For type 2, majority of companies either support or are open to discuss applicability to this case. From the contributions, there does not seem to be very strong view that any of the configured grant cases absolutely needs to be supported. It was also noted that for type 2 a UE that supports multiple configurations can already support equivalent functionality by activating/deactivating different configurations. At the same time, companies envision that a solution supporting dynamic switching for the dynamic grant case can most likely support also configured grant type 2 with very little additional effort.

### 1st round

Further views and comments are requested on the following issues and, whether it is critical to support either case or if it could be considered with lower priority.

1. Applicability to configured grant type 1
2. Applicability to configured grant type 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | As summarized above, we do not support dynamic waveform switching for CG type 1.  For CG type 2, although the motivation and benefit is not clear to us yet, we are open to discuss after we have clearer picture of how dynamic switching of DG PUSCH is achieved. If it can be easily extended to CG type 2, it can be considered. |
| DOCOMO | We have identified that dynamic waveform switching for CG type 1/2 itself has a certain benefit. Yes, for e.g., CG type 2, multiple CG configuration can be configured, where some with CP-OFDM while others with DFT-S-OFDM. Selecting one of them could be considered as “dynamic” in some sense. Meanwhile, waveform change in the middle of a CG chain can be considered, where the same benefit as for DG-PUSCH can be obtained.  Having said that, we indeed agree that support for CG-PUSCH will require more specification impact.  In summary, we are open to discuss above. |
| Intel | We support b), at least for PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2.  We do not think this can apply for Type 1 CG-PUSCH, as by nature, it is not based on dynamic scheduling. |
| Panasonic | a) For Type 1 CG-PUSCH, since there is no dynamic indication in existing specification, it is not necessary to support dynamic waveform switching. To introduce dynamic indication for Type 1 CG-PUSCH would have large specification impact.  b) For Type 2 CG-PUSCH, if dynamic switching is supported for DCI format 0-1/0-2, to support dynamic waveform switching via activation DCI with the unified indication mechanism could be considered. |
| Vivo | 1. Open to discuss 2. Applicable if activated by non-fallback DCI, similar to DG PUSCH scheduled by non-fallback DCI. |
| QC | Don’t think its critical. May suffice to focus on DG-PUSCH. |
| LG | Agree with Panasonic. We think dynamic waveform switching can be available for Type-2 CG-PUSCH. |
| China Telecom | We support option b) to support the dynamic waveform switching for Type-2 CG-PUSCH only since there is no dynamic scheduling indication for Type-1 CG-PUSCH. |
| Vodafone | Fine to prioritize DG over CG |
| Spreadtrum | We think dynamic waveform switching is not suitable for CG-PUSCH initial transmission, since there is no basis for dynamically switching waveforms. For type 1 CG-PUSCH, all transmission parameters cannot be dynamically changed, so dynamic waveform switching cannot be performed. For type 2 CG-PUSCH, if the waveform needs to be changed during transmission, waveform related parameters cannot be changed during the current DCI activation. Thus, we think dynamic waveform cannot be applied to CG-PUSCH. |
| ZTE | 1. Not support. No activation DCI exists for CG type 1. Great specification efforts may be needed to support dynamic waveform switching for CG type 1. 2. Support. Can reuse solution for dynamic grant. |
| Sharp | Type 1 CG-PUSCH should not be considered, as it is not based on DCI.  Type 2 CG-PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 can be considered to support the dynamic switching. |
| CMCC | We think this “switching” may be fulfil by indicating different CG configurations. |
| Transsion | 1. Configured grant type 1 is activated/deactivated by RRC signaling, which operates in a semi-static manner. The introduction of a dynamic waveform switching mechanism will break the principle of CG type 1. 2. We are open to discuss it. |
| Sony | Type 1 CG-PUSCH – support at configuration  Type 2 CG-PUSCH – support through activation DCI |
| Lenovo | We think dynamic waveform switching for CG type 1 and CG type 2 has low priority.  For CG type 1, up to 12 CG configurations con be configured in a BWP, different CG configurations can be of different waveforms. A UE can transmit PUSCH based on different CG configuration to implicitly switch the waveform. For CG type 2, DCI can activate/deactivate a CG type 2 transmission. By activating/deactivating CG PUSCH transmissions with different waveforms, the gNB can switch the waveform for CG PUSCHs dynamically. The current standard is flexibility enough for CG PUSCH transmission. The focus of R18 should be on dynamic grant PUSCH. |
| ETRI | As commented above, Type2 CG (as well as Type1 CG) can switch waveform by using UL skipping with the existing specification.  In addition, in our understanding, Type1 CG does not require any need for resource allocations, however a UE monitors search spaces from which switching waveform can be indicated. We think dynamic indications for Type1 CG are valid solutions.  We think that we need to discuss whether the configured grant of both types would be the scope of further efforts, and we prefer supporting both type of configured grants. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support both CG types. It is worth noting that coverage shortage impacts both DG and CG PUSCH. The latter is typically used for transmitting critical data, e.g., URLLC, and the transmission can happen at any time. Therefore, it is critical to indicate waveform switching also for CG as soon as possible.  We realized that there may be different understandings from companies on the applicability of dynamic WF switching indication. It seems that there are (at least) two understandings/approaches exist:   1. UE applies the new indicated waveform for all PUSCH transmissions (including DG and CG) after the indication. 2. UE applies the new indicated waveform for only the indicated transmission.   Clarification on these approaches is needed since it impacts significantly the discussions on CG vs. DG and also the indication solution. In our view, the first understanding above is more reasonable because the following reasons:   * It could reduce the potential DCI overhead, or any scheduling limitations brought by the indication solution. * The use case for the 2nd approach above is unclear, i.e., why would the gNB need to indicate the switching continuously back and forth between two waveforms for consecutive transmissions? In any case, such fast switching can also be offered by the 1st approach. In other words, the 2nd approach can be considered as a subset of the 1st approach. * Indicating waveform for each transmission, as in the second approach, may not be friendly for UE implementation, if the UE needs to plan the processing chains beforehand. * Last but not least, if the 2nd approach is adopted, then it is straightforward that dynamic switching is applied for CG type 2 only and using the activating DCI. This however, does not help, in case CG type 2 is already activated and later gNB would like to indicate waveform switching. In other words, dynamic waveform switching is not supported with the 2nd approach, which is very unfortunate given the critical applications of CG PUSCH.   We suggest aligning on one of the above understandings/approaches first. |
| Samsung | A dynamic waveform switching is not applicable to CG-PUSCH type 1 because the transmission is configured by RRC. For CG-PUSCH type 2, it is not needed because the PUSCH transmission is activated by a DCI format and different parameters with different waveforms can already be activated. |
| MediaTek | a) We don’t see a need of dynamic switching for CG Type-1. This type-1 is in principle RRC-configured/activated CG by design. There is no need for DCI based triggering for this CG.  b) We prefer to consider dynamic switching for CG Type-2 as low-priority. Similar functionality already exists today for UEs that support multiple configured grants.   * Consider a UE that is pre-configured with two separate CGs with the same exact set of configuration parameters, except for *transformPrecoder.* Networkcan effectively already trigger a DCI-based waveform switch by activating one of these CGs and releasing/deactivating the other CG. In practice, UE behavior would be similar in the sense that the same configured grant configuration would be switched to a different waveform via DCI signaling.   With that, we don’t see a high priority reason for supporting a new mechanism in Rel-18 for dynamic waveform switching of configured grant Type-2. |
| Ericsson | From use case and performance perspective, CG-PUSCH has the same demand of coverage enhancement as DG-PUSCH. It seems to us that the concerns of companies not supporting the feature for CG-PUSCH, especially Type 1 CG-PUSCH is the possible standardization effort, because the current discussion on signaling of waveform indication mainly targets for DG-PUSCH. Nevertheless, MAC CE indication can work for DG-PUSCH and CG-PUSCH. We are fine that the support for CG-PUSCH is kept as lower priority issue.  In addition, applicability to Type 2 CG-PUSCH activated by DCI format 0\_0 can be consistent with DG-PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 in Issue #1-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Dynamic waveform switching for semi-static configured grant type ½ seems not justified yet. We prefer not to support CG-PUSCH. |
| NEC | We think both can be supported if the DCI format granted the PUSCH supports dynamic switching. |

**Observations from first round discussion**

For applicability to configured grant type 1, 8 companies (DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, Sony, ETRI, Nokia/NSN, Ericsson, NEC) are positive or open to discuss while 15 companies (CATT, Intel, Panasonic, QC, LG, China Telecom, Vodafone, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sharp, Transsion, Lenovo, Samsung, Mediatek, HW) are not supportive or think it should be deprioritized.

* Supporters are motivated by the view that the requirement should be the same for all types of grants. Nokia/NSN also pointed out that configured grant may be used for URLLC application which require high robustness.
* For most companies that are not supportive, the main motivation is to keep the principle that configured grant type 1 parameters are semi-statically configured. Several companies also have concern about complexity for the indication.

For applicability to configured grant type 2, 15 companies (CATT, DOCOMO, Intel, Panasonic, vivo, LG, China Telecom, ZTE, Sharp, Transsion, Sony, Nokia/NSB, Mediatek, Ericsson, NEC) are open or positive while 6 companies (QC, Vodafone, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Samsung, Huawei) are not supportive or think it should be deprioritized

* More companies are supportive of configured grant type 2 because they foresee that solution determined for dynamic grant could easily be applied to configured grant type 2 activation.
* Non supportive companies have the view that this case is not critical and can also be de-prioritized.

One company (Nokia/NSN) pointed out that for the dynamic waveform indication in general, one could consider two options depending on whether the indication only applies to a single transmission (e.g. scheduled in same DCI) or applies to subsequent transmissions as well. Moderator agrees. This may in fact allow us to decouple the discussion of applicability to different types of PUSCH from the discussion on the dynamic switching mechanism (topic #2) since all dynamic switching mechanism options can support configured grant (even type 1) if one follows the principle of applying an indication to subsequent transmissions. Nevertheless, in view of the situation and for progress it seems reasonable to consider the case of configured grant with lower priority for now.

### 2nd round

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-4:** RAN1 to focus on the case of PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant for the applicability of dynamic waveform switching indication.   * Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by configured grant is considered with lower priority. |

Please indicate if FL proposal 1-4 is acceptable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Apple | Support this proposal. one clarification question, the CG type 1 re-transmission is considered as dynamic scheduling, is this common understanding? |
| CATT | Support. We think retransmission of CG PUSCH is considered as PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant. |
| DOCOMO | Support. |
| Samsung | We think CG-PUSCH should be deprioritized.  As for FL proposal 1-4, it is fine to agree after removing the bullet. |
| ETRI | In our view, VoNR or some IIoT service at edge can be an important scenario, and dynamic retransmission of CG PUSCH would cause additional delay. The motivation of waveform switching may be applied to both DG and CG. |
| Lenovo | Support and we think retransmission of CG PUSCH is considered as dynamic scheduling. |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposal. We should discuss first how dynamical scheduling be supported. |
| vivo | At this first meeting, it would be good have CG Type 2 PUSCH discussed in parallel given it can be activated by non-fallback DCI as well.  For CG type 2, maybe it can be deprioritized.  We also think retransmission of CG PUSCH (if scheduled by DCI) is a DG PUSCH. |
| China Telecom | Fine. |
| Nokia/NSB | We cannot agree to this proposal at this stage. We appreciate FL’s efforts on collecting views and acknowledging our comment in previous round regarding the fact that there seem two understandings/options exist on whether  Option 1) dynamically indicating waveform for each individual PUSCH or  Option 2) switching to a new waveform for all subsequent PUSCHs based on the dynamic indication.  Please note that the WID said “dynamic switching between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM” which implies that the waveform is switched for all subsequent PUSCH (Option 2). Otherwise, it would have been written that “dynamic waveform indication” (Option 1).  Until this understanding is clarified, we warmly suggest postponing the discussion on prioritization of DG and CG. At least a proposal is not needed at this stage, as it will not block the discussion on the solution itself. |
| Xiaomi | We think for coverage enhancement, CG and DG PUSCH are both important, even CG PUSCH Type 1. It would be too early to draw a conclusion. This can be further discussed with the mechanisms to support this. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| ZTE | As 15 vs. 6 companies support dynamic waveform switching applying to configured grant type 2, at least we should add the case of configured grant type 2 in the main bullet. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Vodafone | Generally fine with the depriorization for workload management reasons, however if there’s no such concern by the majority group, we’re supportive of having the same priority as DG. |
| Moderator | @QC, Panasonic, Apple, CATT, DOCOMO, Lenovo, China Telecom, Mediatek: Thanks for support.  @Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi: Thanks for feedback. The intention of the proposal is not to decide that DWS is not applicable to CG, but rather to de-prioritize discussion on this. I tend to agree that discussion on whether switching is applicable to “single” vs “all subsequent” and related issues (e.g. if there is a minimum switching time) is more important and may drive the final discussion on this. For example, even if support of CG is not considered critical, we may still have to support it if there is a minimum switching time otherwise back-to-back DG and CG transmissions would be a problem. These discussions should take place under topic #2.  @vivo, ZTE: Thanks for suggestion. My understanding of the feedback is that majority of companies are fine with CG type 2 mostly because they foresee that it could reuse same solution as DG and that no additional effort would be needed. In this case, it makes sense to discuss it only after the DG solution is settled. |
| Intel | Similar comment as above. Does this also imply that Type 2 CG-PUSCH which is activated by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 is included?  We are fine to deprioritize Type 1 CG-PUSCH, but our understanding is that we can consider Type 2 for DWS. |
| Moderator | @Intel: Thanks for the comment. Please check my responses to Nokia/NSB and vivo/ZTE in the above. The intention is not to decide now that CG is not applicable. I don’t think we can decide until we clarify if back-to-back PUSCH with different waveforms is feasible. Therefore, I would like to get company views on this issue (questions at the end of section 6.1.2). |
| Sharp | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Ericsson | We agree with Nokia that the prioritization of CG and DG doesn't matter that much, since this FFS is added to all Alts.  **FL proposal 2-1v2**  **…**   * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable   @Nokia,  Regarding Option 2, if the signaling is indicated in a UL DCI for DG-PUSCH, what if it is mis-detected? If it is correctly received, do you mean the UE would interpret the subsequent scheduling DCIs in the legacy way rather than the repurposed way? |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | @Ericsson: Thanks for your question! The missing DCI issue is a generic issue for the entire DCI-based solution, not only for CG. Indeed, it does happen if we consider only for DG PUSCH as well and gNB may know this by e.g., looking for whether the DG PUSCH is transmitted by the UE or not. We can further discuss this, but in a separate topic. For your second question, we are thinking that this would minimize the impact by drawbacks of all solutions on legacy behavior (i.e., DCI overhead or scheduling flexibility reduction, etc.). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is unclear why additional dynamic indication is needed for semi-static configured grant Type 1 and 2. We prefer not to support CG-PUSCH. Suggest to remove the subbullet. |
| Samsung | We support the dynamic waveform switching for dynamic scheduled PUSCH. We do not identify any motivation to apply it to CG-PUSCH, it can be done by RRC as additional aspects may then need to change (e.g. MCS or resource allocation). Also, the gNB can deactivate one CG and activate another. Thus we propose the following change.  **FL proposal 1-4:** RAN1 to focus on the case of PUSCH scheduled by dynamic grant for the applicability of dynamic waveform switching indication.   * ~~Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by configured grant is considered with lower priority.~~ |
| Moderator | @All, thanks for feedback – please check observations below. |

**Observations from second round discussion**

* 13 companies (QC, Panasonic, Apple, CATT, DOCOMO, Lenovo, OPPO, China Telecom, Mediatek, Spreadtrum, Sharp, LG, CMCC) support FL proposal 1-4.
* 2 companies (Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon) think that dynamic waveform switching should not apply to CG and would like to remove the sub-bullet.
* 5 companies (ETRI, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, Vodafone, Ericsson) think that dynamic waveform switching should apply to CG and would prefer to make progress on Topic #2 discussions rather than agreeing on this proposal
* 3 companies (vivo, ZTE, Intel) would like to have CG type 2 with same priority as DG.

Although the intention of FL proposal 1-4 is not to decide now on applicability to CG type 1 or type 2, it seems difficult to agree at this stage. Moderator is fine with pausing the discussion on this topic for now.

## [Closed][LP] Issue #1-3: Applicability to msg3 PUSCH

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

* **Yes**: ZTE [3], Oppo [7], Sony [10]
  + Same motivation as for msg3 PUSCH repetition [3]. Also support msg3 retransmission.
  + Enables selection based on UE’s channel conditions instead of cell-level [7]
* **Open to discuss**: Intel [9], Panasonic [12], InterDigital [13], Apple [21], LG [25], NTT DOCOMO [26], Nokia [29]
  + Enables selection based on UE’s channel conditions instead of cell-level [9][12][13]
  + Consider with lower priority [12]
  + Useful if the UE does not support msg3 repetition [21]
  + Address possible channel degradation during RACH. Also consider retransmission. [25]
  + Benefit may not be large, need to handle indication of capability issue [26]
  + May be possible to leverage specification effort of other cases [29]
* **No**: Spreadtrum [4], CATT [8], Mediatek [20]
  + Motivation and benefit unclear [8][20]
  + Additional preamble partitioning required [8]
  + Possible impact on RAR grant and DCI format 0\_0 [8]

In addition, no company seems to propose to support dynamic indication for msgA, and one company [8] explicitly proposes to not support it.

**Observations on applicability to msg3 PUSCH**

Among contributions who addressed this case, a majority either supports or is open to discuss applicability to msg3. Supporting companies think that it should be supported for the same reason that msg3 repetition is supported in R17 and envision that some networks may utilize this feature as an alternative to msg3 repetition. On the other hand, non-supporting companies note that the benefit may not be large (e.g. network could configure DFT-S-OFDM at cell level), would also have significant specification impact and possibly entail further preamble partitioning.

### 1st round

Further views and comments are requested on whether dynamic waveform indication needs to be supported for msg3 PUSCH (initial transmission and retransmissions).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We do not agree with dynamic waveform switching for Msg 3 PUSCH transmissions. Overall, the benefit is unclear and as moderator mentioned above, network can configure DFT-S-OFDM in the first place. For Msg 3 initial transmission, to achieve dynamic switching, further Msg 1 partitioning is required which should be avoided. For Msg 3 retransmission, it is scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 and our view is that dynamic waveform switching is not applicable to PUSCHs scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 regardless of the RNTI. |
| DOCOMO | **Open to discuss as captured above;** however, we would like to hear proponents view on how much the issue could be significant for Msg3 PUSCH. In what case dynamic waveform switching for Msg3 PUSCH is so useful?  Our understanding is that this feature for dynamic waveform switching is useful for the case where e.g., dynamic “switching” is beneficial. In that sense, the main use case could be where pros/cons for both CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM are valid depending on the exact situation. In that sense, we are not quite sure if it is required for Msg3 PUSCH at least during initial access as the information for gNB to understand proper waveform would be quite limited there.  Yes, there are some cases where CBRA would be performed except initial access, like BFR. But we are not sure how larger the benefit could be even in this case. |
| Intel | We think this should be supported.  Msg3-transformPrecoder is a cell specific parameter, which does not consider UE specific channel condition. For example, we defined Msg3 PUSCH repetition in Rel-17. In this case, we do not think it is desirable to consider CP-OFDM waveform for Msg3 PUSCH repetition. |
| Panasonic | In our view, the main reason to support dynamic switching between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM is that higher rank operation in good SINR is limited when semi-static DFT-s-OFDM configuration. Therefore, the necessary functionality should be to support dynamic switch between 1-layer transmission with DFT-s-OFDM and 2 or more layers transmission with CP-OFDM. Since Msg.3 PUSCH is limited to 1-layer transmission, the motivation on the applicability to Msg.3 PUSCH is low. |
| Vivo | Do not support.  DWS in RRC idle/inactive is a new UE capability which has to be early indicated via e.g. separate PRACH resources. The gain from DWS compare to repetition and retransmissions is not obvious. Considering the large spec. impact, high complexity and the necessity from performance point of view, we do not support DWS for Msg3. |
| QC | Don’t think its necessary to support. Dynamic switching for a UE not yet in connected state, without clear capability report is a major undertaking with no clear benefits. |
| LG | Regarding on Msg3 PUSCH, if the channel quality of the UE is degraded during the RACH procedure, the gNB can dynamically change the UL waveform of Msg3 PUSCH (including the re-transmission of Msg3 PUSCH). Therefore, this issue can be further discuss later. |
| China Telecom | We don’t think it is necessary now. The mechanism for dynamic waveform switching for Msg 3 PUSCH transmissions can be quiet complex since the RACH procedure haven’t done, there is lots of work to do on how the network know whether the UE’s capability and indicate the UE switching the waveform. We may focus on the PUSCH at the point. |
| Vodafone | Similar view as LG above. |
| Spreadtrum | For normal Msg3 PUSCH, it is not necessary to use dynamic waveform switching. We think it is enough to determine the waveform according to the current configuration of high-level parameters msg3-transformPrecoder. Besides, before the RRC connection set up, gNB can only obtain partial information about the UE. So the gNB cannot do proper and timely waveform switching decision.  For Msg3 PUSCH repetition, we are open to discuss as it also has requirement for uplink enhancements, but depend on how much gain can be achieved. |
| ZTE | We support that dynamic waveform switching is supported for Msg3 PUSCH, since it has same motivation as Msg3 PUSCH repetition to enhance the coverage. The concern on DCI payload size can be solved by implicit dynamic waveform indication, for example, if the number of Msg3 PUSCH repetitions is larger than 1, UE can ignore the RRC configuration “msg3-transformPrecoder” and set waveform as “DFT-s-OFDM”. For Msg3 PUSCH retransmission, UE just simply follows the waveform of the initial Msg3 PUSCH. No any separate PRACH resource to indicate the waveform for Msg3 PUSCH is needed. |
| Sharp | Open to study. |
| CMCC | Current spec to determine msg3 waveform based on high-level parameter *msg3-transformPrecoder* seems already enough. |
| Transsion | We don’t think it is necessary. |
| Sony | We support that dynamic waveform switching is supported for Msg3 PUSCH |
| Lenovo | We do not support dynamic waveform switching for Msg 3 PUSCH, the benefit is unclear to us. There is no enough information for gNB to switch the waveform for Msg3 PUSCH dynamically. The configured waveform for this PUSCH is sufficient. |
| ETRI | We do not think it is necessary since Msg3 repetition factor would be chosen to be within the UL coverage. |
| Nokia/NSB | We see the benefits of also supporting dynamic WF switching for Msg3 PUSCH and are open to further discuss it. Indeed, after the gNB receives Msg1, the gNB may anticipate that UE is in coverage shortage and want to change waveform for Msg3 PUSCH. It is even more relevant for Msg3 retransmission. |
| Fujitsu | We don’t think this is well-motivated topic since there are already coverage enhancements methods for msg3 PUSCH in current specification such as “msg3-transformPrecoder” and Msg3 repetition. |
| Samsung | We don’t think that dynamic waveform switching should be applied to Msg3 PUSCH. With the support of Msg3 repetitions specified in Rel-17, the additional performance advantage of dynamic switch would be negligible, if any, while the specification impact would be substantial as the indication would be UE-specific. |
| MediaTek | We do not agree. We don’t see a clear benefit of dynamic switching for Msg3 PUSCH. |
| Ericsson | We don’t see a strong motivation for applying the feature to Msg3.  The benefit of waveform switching is the reduced actual power backoff for a different waveform and increased UE configured transmit power PCMAX,c,f, both of which are up to UE implementation and unknown by gNB. With some enhanced UE report, gNB may be able to get the information to decide whether waveform switching can help improve the UE’s coverage. Otherwise, it is a blind waveform switching by gNB uncertain whether it can work. It is the case for switching waveform for Msg3 transmission by a RRC\_Idle UE, where gNB changes the waveform blindly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For initial access, it should be avoided because a gNB has no sufficient channel information to dynamically determine waveform. Additionally, it requires more standard effort to indicate UE capability during initial access. |

**Observations from first round discussion**

For applicability to msg3 PUSCH, 9 companies (DOCOMO, Intel, LG, Vodafone, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sharp, Sony, Nokia/NSB) are open or see a benefit while 14 companies (CATT, Panasonic, vivo, QC, China Telecom, CMCC, Transsion, Lenovo, ETRI, Fujitsu, Samsung, Mediatek, Ericsson, Huawei) are negative.

Companies who are open to support this case think it may be beneficial to allow UE-specific waveform choice for coverage-limited UE (Intel, ZTE, Nokia/NSB), to compensate for possible channel degradation during RACH procedure (LG, Vodafone), or in case of msg3 repetition (Spreadtrum).

Companies who are not supportive think that the benefit is low or unclear (CATT, Panasonic, vivo, QC, Mediatek, Fujitsu, Samsung), that it cannot be efficiently used by the network (Ericsson, Huawei), and/or that specification impact is high (vivo, QC, China Telecom).

In view of the situation and given that it is not a critical case, it is suggested to de-prioritize discussions on supporting dynamic waveform switching for msg3 PUSCH.

## [Closed][MP] Issue #1-4: Other issues related to requirements and scenarios

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

One company [29] proposes that the dynamic switching framework between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM should be easily extensible to the scenario of switching among **more than two waveforms**.

* Considering possibility of supporting additional waveforms because of the WID objective of specifying enhancements to reduce MPR/PAR.

For the scenario of **PUSCH repetitions**:

* One company [13] is open to discuss change of waveform before the end of repetitions
  + To address possible degradation of radio conditions when duration of repetition bundle is long
* One company [22] proposes that a change of waveform does not take effect in the middle of multi-slot PUSCH transmission
  + To avoid having to drop some repetition(s) due to circuit reconfiguration

For the scenario of DCI indicating **multiple PUSCHs for different TRPs/cells**:

* One company [5] is open to discuss use of different waveforms of PUSCH targeting different TRPs/cells.

For the scenario of **uplink carrier aggregation**:

* One company [22] proposes that this scenario is assumed to be supported with dynamic waveform switching unless a technical obstacle cannot be overcome.

One company [24] suggests that dynamic waveform switching could be supported **only from CP-OFDM to DFT-S-OFDM** but not from DFT-S-OFDM to CP-OFDM.

**Observations on other issues related to requirements**

The above issues were raised by only one or a few companies. However, it would be good gather companies’ views on at least the first issues since it may potentially impact the design of the dynamic switching solution.

### 1st round

Further views and comments are requested on the following issues:

1. Is it a requirement that the dynamic switching solution can readily be extended to more than 2 waveforms (to account for possible outcome of 9.14.2)?
2. Supporting change of waveform within a set of PUSCH repetitions (for single or multiple TRP’s)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Whether to support FDSS is subject to further study/discussion. We do not think that needs to be considered for now.  We are not clear about the motivation/benefit to support change of waveform within a set of PUSCH repetitions. |
| DOCOMO | 1. This needs to see the progress in 9.14.2. 2. Open to discuss, although we would like to understand what is the issue when it is supported for PUSCH repetitions? |
| Intel | 1. It is clearly out of scope for NR as only CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM waveform are supported for PUSCH. 2. No. It is not clear to us the motivation. This depends on UE specific channel condition. |
| Panasonic | a) We are open to consider more than 2 waveforms based on the outcome of 9.14.2.  b) No, we don’t see the clear merit. |
| Vivo | 1. No. According to the WID, only DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM are considered in this work item   *•Specify enhancements to support dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDMand CP-OFDM(RAN1)*   1. For single TRP, we do not see the need to change the waveforms. But for transmissions to/in different TRPs/cells, the channel state and link qualities are different, there’s no reason to restrict them to have same waveforms and thereby independent waveform switching is preferred. |
| QC | On (a): This consideration can take a back seat for now. At this point nothing is agreed, and the situation will stay the same for the next couple of meetings.  On (b): prefer to have all repetitions carried by the same waveform type. |
| LG | 1. Agree with Intel. It is out of scope of Rel-18 CE. 2. We think dynamic waveform switching is not preferred for PUSCH repetition in single cell. But, we are open to discuss supporting dynamic waveform switching in multiple PUSCH transmissions for multiple TRPs. |
| China Telecom | 1. We prefer no to consider the situation at the point. We need to wait for the conclusions of FDSS and AI 9.14.2 to know whether the switching between more than 2 waveforms can happen, but we are open to discuss in later meetings. 2. The motivation and benefits seems unclear for us now, we prefer not to support it at the point. |
| Vodafone | 1. Same view as CATT, DCM, Panasonic and QC 2. Same view as DCM |
| Spreadtrum | a) It is out of scope.  b) Not support. |
| ZTE | 1. We are open to discuss it depending on the outcome of 9.14.2. 2. The motivation/benefit to support change of waveform within a set of PUSCH repetitions should be identified first. |
| Sharp | 1. Switching between DFT-S-OFDM with FDSS and DFT-S-OFDM without FDSS and switching between CP-OFDM with FDSS and CP-OFDM without FDSS can be left to AI9.14.2, if necessary. AI 9.14.3 should focus on switching between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM only, as described in the WID. 2. No, we do not see the clear motivation. On the contrary, it would make the repetition behaviour too complex. |
| CMCC | 1. We are open to wait progress in 9.14.2 2. Not support. |
| Transsion | 1. We think it can be discussed further. 2. For single TRP, we see no benefit in supporting dynamic waveform switch for a set of PUSCH repetition, since the channel status does not change significantly. For multiple TRPs, it is worth investigating to support change of waveform within a set of PUSCH repetitions, considering that the channel status of the different UE-TRP links are not same, |
| Sony | a) We do not think that it is currently a requirement to extend to more than two waveforms but open to discuss  b) No, we do not see merit in this |
| Lenovo | * 1. Only CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM are supported for PUSCH by current standards, and in the WID, it is saying “dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM”. We should focus on dynamic switching between these two waveforms.   2. We are open to discuss the waveform switching within a set of PUSCH repetitions if clear benefit is shown. If supported, the dynamic indication mechanism should be addressed in issue #2-1. |
| ETRI | a) We think the scope of WI is switch between two waveforms.  b) We are open to discuss. |
| Nokia/NSB | 1. We would like to clarify that our proposal is to take into account the potential extensibility of the feature to avoid repeating the work again in the future. However, we are not proposing to change the WID. 2. For a single TRP, since UE may experience different coverage conditions with different TRPs. |
| Samsung | We think that work should focus on the WID objective and the proposals summarized by FL in this session are not further discussed in this Release.  To answer FL’s specific questions:   1. The WID objective is clear and the dynamic switching to be specified is between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM. Thus, other waveforms should not be discussed.   The mTRP scenario is not in scope of this WI. As for the waveform switching for some of the repetitions for single TRP, it is not clear the feasibility of such scheme and we don’t see the benefit of it, besides the substantial specification impact. Thus, we suggest not to discuss further. |
| MediaTek | a) We do not support. In our view, introducing a new waveform is clearly beyond the WI scope. This should not be discussed.  b) Not support. In our view, no clear benefit and more complexity. |
| Ericsson | a) The waveform is associated with other configurations, such as TPMI, RI, FDRA, DMRS configuration. Actually, a change of waveform may incur the change of other configurations. The outcome of FDSS can be considered as one of the configurations if specified, rather than a new waveform.  b) As summarized above, if waveform switching takes time, it would cause PUSCH transmission cancellation. We don’t see a strong motivation to change the waveform in the middle of a multi-slot transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Out of scope. 2. The trigger seems to be conveyed by a DCI different from the DCI scheduling the PUSCH repetition. Therefore, standard efforts about DCI format and timeline seem not trivial. Therefore, we prefer no support. |

**Observations from first round discussion**

On requiring possibility to extend switching to more than 2 waveforms, majority of companies think that it does not need to be considered now or that it is out of scope given the WID. Several companies are open to reconsider based on progress in 9.14.2. One company points out that the outcome of 9.14.2 discussion may simply be to specify additional configuration for a waveform without implying definition of a new waveform.

On supporting change of waveform within a set of PUSCH repetitions, majority of companies do not see a strong need to support this, although a few companies are open to study it. 3 companies (Vivo, LG, Transsion) see potential benefit for the multi-TRP case.

Discussions on the above topics will be de-prioritized considering the above feedback.

# Topic #2: Dynamic switching mechanism

A second set of issues concern the mechanism(s) that support dynamic waveform switching for the different cases to support.

## [Open][HP] Issue #2-1: Dynamic indication options

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

Companies discussed possible options for the dynamic indication mechanism. Most of the following options were identified in a TEI proposal from R17 [30]. The definition used here for the scheduling DCI options is slightly different than in [30], i.e. “new field” or “reuse existing field” instead of “explicit” or “implicit”. With the “explicit/implicit” definition, the solution of reusing/extending TDRA field could be interpreted as an explicit indication. There are also several options identified in contributions that were not included in [30].

Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI:

* **Preferred**: ZTE [3], Spreadtrum [4], Intel [9], Mediatek [20], Apple [21], Sharp [24]
* **Open**: Vivo [5], China Telecom [6], CATT [8], Sony [10], NEC [11], Panasonic [12], InterDigital [13], Lenovo [14], Mavenir [15], Xiaomi [16], CMCC [17], ETRI [18], Fujitsu [19], Ericsson [22], Samsung [23], LG [25], CEWiT [28], Nokia [29]
* **Not preferred**: Huawei [2], Oppo [7], NTT DOCOMO [26], Qualcomm [27]

Alt 1-B: Existing field in scheduling DCI

* **Preferred**: Huawei [2], Oppo [7], NTT DOCOMO [26]
* **Open**: Vivo [5], China Telecom [6], CATT [8], Sony [10], NEC [11], Panasonic [12], InterDigital [13], Xiaomi [16], CMCC [17], ETRI [18], Fujitsu [19], Samsung [23], LG [25], Qualcomm [27], CEWiT [28], Nokia [29]
* **Not preferred**: ZTE [3], Spreadtrum [4], Intel [9], Lenovo [14], Mavenir [15], Mediatek [20], Apple [21], Ericsson [22], Sharp [24]

Existing fields suggested or mentioned include (including options already outlined in [30]):

* FDRA: [2][8][12][29]
  + RA type [2], MSB of RA type [8]
  + Number of RBs below threshold [29] or multiple of 2,3,5 [30]
  + Location of RB allocation within carrier [29]
* TDRA: [2][7][12][13][25]
  + Add one column to the table
* MCS: [12][13]
  + MCS below threshold [30]
* Antenna port(s)
  + FDMed DMRS based on Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data [30]
* Precoding information and number of layers [30]
* SRI [26]
* Number of repetitions for msg3 [3]

In addition, the following is noted:

* One contribution [29] suggests that reinterpretation of existing field could be applicable for a subset of PDCCH occasions to mitigate the issue of scheduler restriction.
* One contribution [29] suggests using a condition over a combination of existing fields to indicate the waveform.

Alt 2: MAC CE

* **Preferred**: CMCC [17]
* **Open**: Vivo [5], NEC [11], InterDigital [13], Lenovo [14], Mavenir [15], Xiaomi [16], ETRI [18], Ericsson [22], Samsung [23], Qualcomm [27], CEWiT [28]
* **Not preferred**: Huawei [2], ZTE [3], Spreadtrum [4], China Telecom [6], Oppo [7], CATT [8], Intel [9], Sony [10], Panasonic [12], Fujitsu [19], Mediatek [20], Apple [21], Sharp [24], LG [25], NTT DOCOMO [26], Nokia [29]

Other options:

* DCI without scheduled data [16] or downlink DCI [29]
* Group-common DCI ([4], not preferred), [16]
* Search space [11]
* RNTI [11]
* BWP ID ([18], not preferred)

The following Table summarizes the points made in contributions for the different options:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option | Benefits | Concerns |
| New field in scheduling DCI | -Simple, low specification effort [6][19][20][21][22][29]  -Maintains scheduler flexibility [9][11][29]  -Can change on per-PUSCH basis  -Can support CG (if indication is applicable to subsequent transmission) | -New field may add overhead and reduce coverage [2][18][19][29] and may not be warranted by frequent switching [27]  -Possible increase of DCI size for DFT-S-OFDM to align with CP-OFDM [16][17]  -May not be suitable for DCI format 0\_0 |
| Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI | -No overhead from additional field [27][29]  -Can change on per-PUSCH basis  -Can support CG (if indication is applicable to subsequent transmission) | -May introduce significant scheduler restrictions for use of CP-OFDM compared to R15 [3][9][22]  -Waveform selection may depend on factors not visible in DCI (e.g. cell load, scheduling, fading, antenna blockage) [22]  -Possible increase of DCI size for DFT-S-OFDM to align with CP-OFDM [16][17]  -Higher complexity and specification effort [29]  -Not readily extensible to >2 waveforms [29]  -Rank-based solution not forward-compatible with rank 2 DFT-S-OFDM [3]  -FDM DMRS based solution does not work for DCI format 0\_0 [3]  -May reduce flexibility of existing field  -May increase RRC signaling (e.g. for TDRA table) |
| MAC CE | -No increase of DCI overhead [4][11][22][29]  -No DCI size alignment issue [17][28]  -No scheduling restriction [22][27]  -Can support CG [16][22]  -Can change multiple BWPs [14] or serving cells [18] at the same time  -Forward compatible to >2 waveforms [29] | -Larger latency [2][3][4][9][19][20][29]  -Need to define timeline for application [18][26][27]  -Not possible to change on per-PUSCH basis [29]  -Overhead from MAC CE [24]  -Requires RAN2 involvement [26][29] |
| DL or non-scheduling DCI | -Already used for R17 beam indication [16]  -Lower latency [than MAC CE] [29]  -Can support CG with lower overhead (when no UL DCI would otherwise be transmitted) [29] | -Additional effort compared to supporting UL DCI only.  -May increase DCI size  -Need to define application time  -May be more complex than using scheduling DCI |

**Observations on dynamic indication options**

Support for the main options in submitted contributions is rather diverse. Many companies expressed openness to adopt one of several options. However, for each main option there are at least several companies that have concerns. The main concerns are the additional overhead for option 1-A, the loss of scheduler flexibility for option 1-B and the excessive latency for option 2.

### 1st round

Further views and comments are requested on the following issues:

1. Any benefit or concern to add (or remove) in the above Table?
2. Many solutions grouped under 1-B (reuse existing field) but may not have equal impact on loss scheduler flexibility. Are there some solutions that are preferable from that perspective?
3. Any other comment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | According to the WID, the objective of dynamic waveform switching does not involve RAN2.   |  | | --- | | * Specify enhancements to support dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (RAN1) |   Therefore, we think MAC CE based solution is out of scope, which clearly needs RAN2’s involvement.  For DL or non-scheduling DCI solution, we assume it is supplementary proposals for specific purpose, e.g. for dynamic switching of CG. Then clearly, it depends on the other discussions whether the target use case is supported or not. And the proposal requires additional specification efforts.  Therefore, we think scheduling DCI based solutions should be the baseline.  We agree the different solutions under 1-B have different impact on scheduling flexibility and we are open to further discuss. |
| Intel | 1. we are generally fine with the benefit or concerns listed in the table. For explicit signalling, we tend to think DCI format 0\_0 does not need to enhanced to support dynamic waveform switching so the concern for this can be removed.   In general, it would be good to first agree on a set of alternatives for down-selection in the upcoming meeting. |
| Panasonic | b) Since the main reason to support dynamic switching between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM is that higher rank operation in good SINR is limited when semi-static DFT-s-OFDM configuration, the necessary functionality should be to support dynamic switch between 1-layer transmission with DFT-s-OFDM and 2 or more layers transmission with CP-OFDM. Then, just to support the implicit indication based on number of layers would be the most straightforward design. |
| Vivo | For “New field in scheduling DCI”, following items should be included in the 3rd column as well:  -Higher complexity and specification effort  -Rank-based solution not forward-compatible with rank 2 DFT-S-OFDM  -FDM DMRS based solution does not work for DCI format 0\_0  For “DL or non-scheduling DCI”, it requires new DCI format discussions if I understand correctly. In addition, rules to avoid rank/DMRS Type/FDRA configurations not supported with some waveform are also needed. |
| LG | For the sake of progress, it may be desirable to consider the proposal listing all possible options in this meeting. |
| China Telecom | The issue is important but we think we should focus on the situation and condition for waveform dynamic switching first. The down-selection can be done later or in the next meeting. |
| Vodafone | We are supportive of a DCI-based switching mechanism due to lower latency compared to MAC-CE and also it could avoid RAN2 involvement. For the implicit signalling, perhaps more than one indicator can be used to avoid scheduling flexibility concerns |
| Spreadtrum | We think “explicit” or “implicit” instead of “new field” or “reuse existing field” may be clearer. We are open to reuse existing field, but reluctant to support implicit indication by setting some conditions, which would limit the flexibility of gNB scheduling.  From our perspective, explicit DCI-based indication is most straightforward and simplest. For explicit indication, whether to add new field or reuse existing bit can be discussed further. It is also possible to indicate waveform by TDRA field in the DCI by associating different waveforms with different rows of TDRA table.  For “DL or non-scheduling DCI solution”, we share the similar view with CATT. |
| ZTE | 1. We are fine with the summary table. 2. Number of repetitions for msg3 is an implicit indication for the waveform decision of Msg3 PUSCH transmission. This scheme is only valid for Msg3, so we suggest to discuss it in the Msg3 session. |
| Sharp | The table looks fine to us. |
| CMCC | The switching between two waveform can be divided into two directions. For switching from CP-OFDM to DFT-S-OFDM, in current spec, it can be realized by multiple DCI from non-fallback DCI to fallback DCI. For switching from DFT-S-OFDM to CP-OFDM, the latency for MAC CE based signalling is acceptable, and this changing direction is unproper in coverage limited scenario. MAC CE based signalling can also avoid matters about DCI size alignment and increase of DCI overhead. We are open to further discuss three options. |
| Transsion | We are fine with the table. |
| Sony | We are fine with summary table  Reusing fields will impact legacy behaviour |
| Lenovo | We have concern on DL or non-scheduling DCI solution. For DL scheduling DCI, the DCI size will be increased and for non-scheduling DCI, while existing field used for dynamic switching waveform also needs discussion. And the application time of the waveform switching needs to be defined. Besides, the UE’s behavior becomes more complexity. For example, if there is no PDSCH scheduling before a PUSCH transmission, in a window for example, the UE should receive a non-scheduling DCI dedicated for switching the waveform. But if the waveform switching is in scheduling DCI, a UE just needs to decode the UL-scheduling DCI only. |
| ETRI | We think that the table with pros and cons can be more complete after the Topic #1 has some outcome. |
| Nokia/NSB | The table summarized by FL is quite complete to us. Though we think that reusing existing DCI field can be further classified into whether some bits in the field will be explicitly reused, or the UE implicitly determine waveform based on the scheduling information, using the field(s).  We have concern on adding new field due to overhead increase. Similarly, reusing existing field also reduces the usage of the field (for explicit solution) or reduce scheduling flexibility (for implicit solution). Therefore, solutions to minimize the impacts should be considered. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with benefits and concerns in table, and also share same view with LG to list all possible proposals for further discussion. |
| Samsung | We think that when switching is done via MAC CE there is an overhead as well because the MAC CE is signaled via PDSCH (which requires DCI). Also the latency introduced is a drawback respect to the solution with a scheduling DCI, and the low latency is the main reason for specifying this feature. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the FL summary table.  We prefer to make some progress in applicable cases for dynamic switching first (Topic#1). After some progress is achieved in Topic#1, we can make down-selection for switching mechanism.  For the down-selection among switching mechanisms, we suggest making the first down-selection based on the type of signaling (i.e., MAC-CE vs. DCI). Then, more details can be discussed based on the decision. |
| Ericsson | * 1. Regarding the concern of reusing existing field in scheduling DCI, RRC signaling overhead may increase if the waveform is added as a new column of TDRA table.   Regarding the concerns of MAC CE, firstly, we don’t think the latency difference between DCI and MAC CE signaling is a key differentiator for a coverage enhancement feature. Also, MAC CE is clearly a possibility, otherwise the WID would say “DCI based switching” rather than “dynamic switching”. Since the use of MAC CE is to be decided, then already listing RAN2 for dynamic switching solely due to the potential support of MAC CE could be confusing. If we do decide to pursue MAC CE, we can bring in RAN2. Also, we don’t think RAN2’s involvement would be a drawback, because in our view the functionality and performance of the feature is more important than if it is done by a single WG rather than two RAN WGs.  b) No. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer the methods that reuse existing field in scheduling DCI, including TDRA and FDRA.  We want to emphasize that reusing TDRA only results in a quite minor loss of flexibility for CP-OFDM. The reason is given as follows. As discussed in Rel-17 TEI, e.g. in the proponent paper R1-2109024, CP-OFDM waveform is configured in practical network while DFT-s-OFDM is rarely used, which implies that CP-OFDM can provide sufficient UL coverage now for absolute majority of UEs and DFT-s-OFDM is useful for some UEs with extreme low SINR. Considering that DFT-s-OFDM is typically used with 12 or 14 symbol PUSCH, only a few rows need to be associated with DFT-s-OFDM and most rows can be associated with CP-OFDM.  Alternatively, reusing FDRA restricts resource allocation type 0 to CP-OFDM only, but continuous RBs can still be scheduled for CP-OFDM with proper PRG allocation. |
| NEC | We are fine with the table. |

**Observations from first round discussion**

It seems that all companies are generally fine with the pros/cons assessment in the Table, although a few companies suggested a few more points. The Table has updates accordingly. [Moderator did not understand the suggestions from vivo – e.g. “higher complexity” for new field contradicts the second column, and other bullets seem not applicable to explicit?]. In view of the discussion from previous section, also added “Can support CG if indication is applicable to subsequent transmissions” for scheduling DCI solutions.

Several companies suggested to have agreement on all possible proposals for further discussion. Moderator agrees that this could be a good way forward – see FL proposal 2-1 below which intends to capture all proposals.

One company (Spreadtrum) pointed out that TDRA may be better classified as an “explicit” solution. One company (Nokia/NSB) has suggestion related to the same issue to differentiate between “explicit” and “implicit” within the “reuse existing field”. The FL proposal 2-1 takes these suggestions into account. In addition, the proposal identifies the possibility that the indicated waveform applies to subsequent transmissions for the Alternative of indicating from scheduling DCI.

One company (China Telecom) suggested to focus on conditions for waveform dynamic switching. Understanding views on how the network could operate the switching in practice could be a good way to progress. It is also related to the Topic #3 on assistance information.

### 2nd round

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1**: RAN1 to consider following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:  Alt 1: Indication from a scheduling DCI   * Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI * Alt 1-B: Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI   + Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by overloading field, e.g.     - Add one column to TDRA table     - Add one column to MCS table(s)     - Other solutions not precluded   + Alt 1-B-2: Implicit determination from condition(s) on scheduling information, e.g.     - RA type, MSB of RA     - Number of RBs (below threshold or multiple of 2,3,5)     - Location of RB allocation within carrier     - MCS below threshold     - Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data     - Precoding information and number of layers     - SRI     - Condition over multiple types of scheduling information     - Other types of scheduling information not precluded * Indicated waveform applies at least to the scheduled PUSCH transmission   + FFS: Whether it also applies to subsequent transmissions, and of which type * At least DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 can contain the indication   + FFS: DCI format 0\_0 * FFS: Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI (e.g. PDCCH occasion, RNTI, Search space)   Alt 2: Indication from MAC CE   * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable   Alt 3: Indication from a non-scheduling DCI   * FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI) * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable |

Please indicate if FL proposal 2-1 is acceptable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | Looks good to us |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Apple | The proposal is fine in general. With this proposal, will we perform the down selection in next meeting? As the Alt3 can work together with Alt 1. |
| CATT | As we commented in the 1st round, we think MAC CE based solution is out of scope since RAN2 is not involved in the objective according to the WID.  Alt 3, if considered, to our understanding only applies to non-DG PUSCH since for DG PUSCH, it is straightforward to consider scheduling DCI. But in proposal 1-4, CG is low priority, so we do not think we should agree to consider Alt 3 now.  So our proposal is to agree Alt 1 as baseline. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Apple’s point. We understand the alternatives are actually options, as written in the very first text. |
| Samsung | We understand that the scope is to list all the proposed signalling options. Then we suggest to remove text related to which transmission type the signalling applies, or which DCI format, etc. which are under discussion in other proposals.  It is preferable to further discuss and try to reduce the options before making an agreement. |
| ETRI | We think the intention of this way forward would list all alternatives and attempt to down-select one or more alternatives. |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| OPPO | The proposal seems ok in general. But the Alt 1 should be better called as: Indication from a UL scheduling DCI. Alt 3 as: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI. |
| Vivo | Share similar view as CATT that MAC-CE based method should be deprioritized given it has RAN2 impacts not expected by the WID.  Another comment from our side is it would be good to down-select these alternatives as early as possible so that we can focus on one alternative.  E.g. in the main text we can say “RAN1 to consider following options to be down-selected by RAN1#111 for the dynamic waveform indication in R18”. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are generally fine with the intention of listing all solutions for further consideration. However, we have several comments on the proposal:   1. We would like to add also the following condition for Alt 1-B-1 which were proposed in our Tdoc:    1. Repurpose an existing DCI field 2. We would like to add also the following conditions for Alt 1-B-2 which were proposed in our Tdoc:    1. Location of RB allocation within carrier and the associated MPR    2. PHR limitation 3. We don’t think Alt. 1 and Alt. 3 are alternative to each other, they can both be used if we later agree, e.g., both UL and DL DCI can be used or both UE specific and UE-group common DCI can be used. Maybe a note or a last (main-bullet) FSS point saying that at least Alt. 1 and Alt. 3 could be both considered would help. |
| Xiaomi | Thanks FL for the good summary. We support this proposal. We agree with E/// that for MAC-CE the latency does not differ much from DCI for the targeting use cases. In our view, Alt.1 cannot avoid the overhead increase to all the scenarios (including cases no need to switch waveforms), Alt.2 or Alt.3 can all be considered. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| ZTE | We agree to collect the solutions in this stage. And companies can prepare the comparisons for next meeting. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with vivo that the options in proposal 2-1 should be down-selected. Besides, we prefer have a unified solution for all case. |
| Vodafone | Support. |
| Moderator | @QC, Panasonic, Apple, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Mediatek, Vodafone, China Telecom, Xiaomi: Thanks for support!  @Apple, DOCOMO, ETRI, Spreadtrum. The intention is to list all proposals so that we have more solid footing for next meeting. It is too early to downselect already at this meeting. Yes, the Alt are not mutually exclusive. I updated the main bullet accordingly in v2.  @CATT, vivo, Samsung: I don’t think any down-selection would be agreeable at this meeting. Not sure that the non-listing of RAN2 precludes MAC CE solution since in the past RAN1 has decided on use of MAC CE and notified RAN2. It may be better to base the decision on technical considerations.  @CATT: Alt 3 could also support PUSCH dynamically by DCI format 0\_0. Also, proposal 1-4 does not state that CG is not supported.  @OPPO: Thanks for suggestion. I updated accordingly in the v2  @Nokia/NSB: Thanks for suggestion. I added “repurpose” in main bullet of Alt 1-B-1, added the MPR in bullet of Alt 1-B-2. For the PHR limitation, since this is not a DCI field I don’t think it can be listed under Alt 1-B. I added it as one possible condition under Alt 1.  @All: Please continue providing your comments based on the v2 (section 4.1). This is a high-priority proposal and would very much like that we agree on it at this meeting. Also please provide your view on the questions below. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the updated proposal. But it is not clear to us why we need to consider one or more. Our understanding is that we need to select only one for down-selection.  For implicit indication, it is not clear to us on “Condition over multiple types of scheduling information”. Our understanding is that when PUSCH repetition type A or TBoMS is used for PUSCH transmission, DFT-s-OFDM waveform is used. Is this correct understanding? If so, it would be good to explicitly capture this. |
| LG | We are generally fine with **FL proposal 2-1v2**.  However, if one or more alternatives can be selected, for example, different alternatives can be selected for different DCI formats, which is not preferred. That is, we prefer unified solution to be applied in all cases. |
| Moderator | @Intel: The reason is that we could have e.g. Alt. 1 + Alt. 3.  @LG: Agree that having unified solution can be attractive but this would be too restrictive at this stage.  @Intel: for the “Condition over multiple types of scheduling information”: this was intended to capture possibility that DFT-S-OFDM is implicitly indicated if multiple conditions are satisfied, e.g. one related to FDRA and another one related to Rank. Please feel free to suggest another wording. I don’t understand the relationship with PUSCH repetition type A or TBoMS? Or do you mean that you would like to add these to the list? |
| CATT | From our perspective, we do not know what is precluded by the proposal since it seems to be an exhaustive list of all the possible solutions for dynamic switching. Our preference is to at least have some prioritization among the alternatives.  Having said that, if we are the only company, we can live with the proposal for now. |
| Ericsson | In general, we support FL proposal 2-1v2 and have some comments on the two sub-bullets below.   * Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by overloading/repurposing field, e.g. * FFS: Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI (e.g. PDCCH occasion, RNTI, Search space, latest PHR reported by the UE)   1. "Overloading" is not commonly used. If it has the same meaning as repurposing, it can be moved.  2. “Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI” implies there are some existing conditions for the new Rel-18 DCI. Is it the correct understanding? |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | We think we should down-select one of the options. From our perspective, we prefer have a unified solution for all cases, and reluctant to support more than one option. We prefer prioritize indication by an UL scheduling DCI, which is most straightforward and simplest option. Thus, we suggest to remove the “or more” of the main bullet of **FL proposal 2-1v2**. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | @FL: Thank you FL for taking into account our comment! We have the same question as Ericsson on the “overloading”, but fine to keep if proponent could help to clarify.  For the “latest PHR reported by the UE”, it does not seem fit in additional conditions for the scheduling DCI, should we remove “~~for the scheduling DCI~~” to make it generic?  Also, and sorry for requesting this late, could we add a final FFS as follows:  “FFS: drawbacks of the alternatives and solutions to tackle the drawbacks.”  @Spreadtrum: The point being that Alt. 1 and Alt. 3 may both be supported if we later agree, e.g., both UL and DL DCI can be used or both UE specific and UE-group common DCI can be used. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The term “overloading” seems not commonly used but it seems ok as long as its explanatory sub-bullets are kept. Repurposing seems not better wording because the only thing that are repurposed are not the field but the table it linking to, e.g., TDRA table.  We support to take Alt 1 as baseline. |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with FL proposal 2-1v2. One thing to be clarified is whether this proposal merges FL proposal 1-2v2. It seems that the Alt-1 is the only option if proposal 1-2v2 is agreed, and vice versa. |
| Moderator | @Ericsson, CMCC, Fujitsu: Thanks for support!  @Intel: added a bullet for implicit indication based on the number of PUSCH repetitions, based on your comment. (For TBoMS, my understanding is that the number of slots is RRC-configured.)  @CATT, Spreadtrum: The proposal does not intend to preclude anything since this is the first meeting and it would not fair to already downselect proposals without discussion. We first need a structure to allow companies to thoroughly analyze the pros/cons and start the downselection process in next meeting. I hope you understand.  @Ericsson, Huawei/Hisilicon: after checking definition of “repurpose” it seems that it has same meaning as what I intended for “overload” so fine to remove “overload”. I assume that “repurpose” does not mean that legacy functionality associated to the field is affected. I understand Huawei/HiSilicon’s point about the fact we could see it as only modifying the Table, but still the field expands the functionality, so this is in effect a repurposing.  @Ericsson, Nokia: Ok to clarify the FFS on conditions.  @Nokia/NSB: On the proposed additional FFS, I don’t think it adds any information since this is what we anyway do. I would prefer not to add this to an already big proposal.  @Huawei, HiSilicon: What does “baseline” mean in this context? I would prefer to not go in that direction as I am afraid we will end up in deadlock.  @Fujitsu: This proposal is independent of FL proposal 1-2v2. For example, if Alt. 2 would be adopted the waveform indicated by the MAC CE would most likely be applicable to subsequent PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2. |

**Observations from second round discussion for FL proposal 2-1v2**

* 13 companies (QC, Panasonic, Apple, Lenovo, OPPO, China Telecom, Xiaomi, Mediatek, ZTE, Vodafone, CNCC, Fujitsu, Sharp) support FL proposal 2-1v2.
* 4 companies (Nokia/NSB, Intel, LG, Ericsson) seem fine with direction of the proposal but in some cases requested to make some changes.
* 5 companies (CATT, Samsung, vivo, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon) would prefer to already downselect some options or prioritize some options that seem to have more support from contributions.

Moderator assessment is that it is too early to already make downselection or prioritization in the first meeting without giving opportunity to company to study more what other companies proposed. I doubt this would be agreeable to proponents of downselected or deprioritized solutions. It is important for progress to first agree on a proposal that lists all the options so that we have a proper structure for analysis and downselection starting in next meeting. I hope companies will be constructive and accept this small step.

Moderator also created updated **FL proposal 2-1v3** that addresses the suggestions made during round 2. Changes over v2 are shown in brown.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1v3**: RAN1 to ~~consider~~ support one or more of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:  Alt 1: Indication from an UL scheduling DCI   * Alt 1-A: New field in scheduling DCI * Alt 1-B: Reuse existing field in scheduling DCI   + Alt 1-B-1: Explicit indication by ~~overloading/~~repurposing field, e.g.     - Add one column to TDRA table     - Add one column to MCS table(s)     - Other solutions not precluded   + Alt 1-B-2: Implicit determination from condition(s) on scheduling information, e.g.     - RA type, MSB of RA     - Number of RBs (below threshold or multiple of 2,3,5)     - Location of RB allocation within carrier and the associated MPR     - MCS below threshold     - Number of PUSCH repetitions (or whether PUSCH repetition is used)     - Number of DMRS CDM group(s) without data     - Precoding information and number of layers     - SRI     - Condition over multiple types of scheduling information     - Other types of scheduling information not precluded * Indicated waveform applies at least to the scheduled PUSCH transmission   + FFS: Whether it also applies to subsequent transmissions, and of which type * At least DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 can contain the indication   + FFS: DCI format 0\_0 * FFS: Indication applies only if condition(s) are satisfied ~~Additional conditions for the scheduling DCI~~ (e.g. PDCCH occasion~~,~~ /RNTI~~,~~ /Search space of the scheduling DCI, latest PHR reported by the UE)   Alt 2: Indication from MAC CE   * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable   Alt 3: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI   * FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI) * FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable |

Moderator would like companies to provide their views on the following issue to enable more progress on the dynamic switching mechanism.

Please indicate your view on the following:

* 1. Do you think that a minimum interruption time needs to be defined when the UE switches waveform (to allow UE to e.g. reconfigure circuitry)? If so, why is such interruption time not defined in R15?
  2. Do you think waveform switching would need to occur multiple times in back-to-back transmissions?
  3. What input would the gNB would use to decide to change the waveform and how often does this input change?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | (d) don’t think a minimum interruption time is needed.  (e) No, we don’t think rapid back and forth between waveform types would be required. The channel conditions don’t change that fast. After all, for three straight releases we have been okay with waveform being configured via RRC.  However, if the gNB configures a different waveform for CG and DG PUSCH, then back and forth may be observed between waveforms. UE has no choice but to comply. Why a gNB may configure this way is not clear.  (f) gNB may want to know how much additional power a UE can deliver if the waveform is switched from CP-OFDM to DFT-S-OFDM. |
| Panasonic | d) We don’t think a minimum interruption time is needed.  e) Even from Rel.15, dynamic waveform change without interruption time was required to be supported when waveform by DCI format 0-0 and DCI format 0-1/0-2 are different. Therefore, the same behaviour should be supported even within the same DCI or other cases. From gNB perspective, waveform switching itself may not be required to be very often as our view of the reason to change waveform is based on SRS and gNB measurement.  f) Report on UE’s power and measurement at gNB (such as SRS) would be used. |
| Sharp | We are fine with FL proposal 2-1. Also, fine to capture that the listed Alternatives are not mutually exclusive.  d) We do not see the need.  e) We do not believe the network would want to switch the waveform that frequently like slot-by-slot. At the same time, from the RAN1 point of view, we may not have to prohibit that. |
| LG | d) We don’t think a minimum interruption time is needed.  e) We don’t think it's appropriate to change the waveform frequently. However, since gNB will be able to handle it, it is not necessary to specify the UE behavior. |
| ZTE | d) The minimum interruption time may not be needed as there is no such issue when waveform change due to change between DCI format 0-0 and DCI format 0-1/0-2.  e) Actually the back to back switching is very rare, but the dynamic waveform switching should not prevent this behaviour to keep the flexibility.  f) The current input is sufficient for gNB to judge the switching, the necessity to introduce new input seems little. |
| Lenovo | d) We don’t think a minimum interruption time is needed.  e) We don’t think the waveform switching occurs too frequently, but it depends on gNB’s indication as in previous releases.  f) A gNB can decide to change the waveform based on current power headroom reporting |
| CATT | 1. No. As commented by other companies, dynamic waveform switching is supported in Rel-15 between DCI formats without interruption. 2. It may not be needed in practice but should be not precluded from specification point of view. 3. The existing information seems sufficient. |
| MediaTek | d) We think that interruption time may not be needed. Similar switching is available in practice in previous releases when changing between DCI formats 0\_0 and 0\_1/0\_2.  e) We don’t see a need for dynamic switching within back-to-back transmissions.  f) Currently available information at gNB should already be sufficient for the network to trigger waveform switch (e.g., MCS value, A/N reports, PHR reports, SRS measurements, etc.) |
| Ericsson | As shown in the figure, the orange bar is lower than the required PUSCH transmission power, so the UE would still be power limited after waveform switching. The green bar is higher than the UE required PUSCH transmission power, and the UL waveform switching can improve UL coverage.  Therefore, regarding f), in order to evaluate whether UL waveform switching should be triggered, gNB needs information about the target waveform, e.g., if PCMAX,f,c of the target waveform is larger than the required PUSCH transmission power (green bar). How often the information changes depends on how quickly pathloss changes. For e), we don’t see the need to change UL waveform every slot.    Figure 1: PCMAX vs. required UE transmission power |
| DOCOMO | d) minimum interruption time is not needed. Panasonic has a point.  e) Proper waveform will change so rapidly. However, this doesn’t necessarily imply the function we specify shall not perform such back-and-forth switching. For signaling, how dynamic the signaling would be and how much specification implact would be assumed are actually not trade-off relation.  f) We think it could largely depend on how to switch waveforms. If implicit DCI manner is supported, this discussion is no longer needed at all. If explicit manner (regardless of DCI or MAC CE) is supported, this is a valid point. In the latter case, we actually see some clear need of additional information from UE side. |
| CMCC | d)In legacy spec this switch may also happen if *TransFormPrecoder* and *msg3-TransformPrecoder* is different and UE is schedule by DCI 0\_1/2 and 0\_0. So this minimum interruption time seems unnecessary.  e)We don’t think this is a typical case. |
| Spreadtrum | d) We don’t think a minimum interruption time is needed.  e) Same view as MTK. We think there is no need to dynamically switching waveform within back-to-back transmissions.  f) We think gNB can make a decision whether to switch waveform according to current measurement and reporting information, such as SRS measurement and PHR reporting. In addition, some additional assistant information may be needed if it can help gNB to select more appropriate waveforms, which can be discussed further. |
| Nokia/NSB | 1. We share similar view with Qualcomm. 2. Considering a DG PUSCH is scheduled back-to-back with a CG PUSCH. Although interrupting time may not be needed by UE, it does not make any sense in coverage shortage condition if the gNB indicates switching to DFT-s-OFDM for the DG PUSCH and then immediately after that UE need to use CP-OFDM for CG PUSCH because it is configured to do so, and because the new feature is designed such that the subsequent PUSCHs cannot take the new indicated waveform. 3. The UE coverage condition and power condition at the UE, because the gNB should not only look at the coverage condition but also make sure that UE can still boost power thanks to the MPR reduction. Both cannot be changed significantly in the unit of slots, and therefore WF indication for each individual transmission seems to be an overkill. It also has a drawback that the DCI overhead or scheduling flexibility reduction happens for every PUSCH scheduling. This question is partly related to Topic#3, for power condition, we think at least PHR of both waveforms should be reported to give gNB a clear view on whether it is beneficial to switch to a new waveform or not. |
| OPPO2 | We do not consider those are urgent questions and did not comment much in the first time. Some initial thinking is here.  1. The different between 2 wave form is not much, switching would be quickly. And, there is long preparation time for DCI decoding and PUSCH transmission.  2. At least back-to-back change for many parameters is assumed for normal DG cases.  3. PHR, UE scheduling history, Measurement and others are needed for gNB, but all those can be triggered by gNB. |
| Fujitsu | 1. We don’t think the minimum time is needed. 2. There is no need to frequently change the waveforms 3. The report related with UE transmission power from UE to gNB is helpful for scheduling. |
| Samsung | 1. There is no need – can be handled by the gNB and it would be simpler than it is currently done for RRC reconfiguration 2. No. There is no meaningful scenario where that needs to/can happen in practice. 3. No additional inputs may be needed. Up to gNB implementation (e.g. L1/L3 received signal power measurement from DM-RS or SRS, BLER statistics, etc.) |

**Observations from second round discussion for questions on dynamic switching mechanism**

On whether a minimum switching time is needed, all companies that responded on this issue think that it is unnecessary, though one company (Ericsson) mentioned in contribution [22] that it may take some time to enable the circuit to change the waveform. It was also noted that the scenario could happen already in R15 and no minimum switching time is specified in R15. Moderator concludes that this aspect will not need to be taken into consideration for the dynamic switching mechanism (unless new information emerges on this).

On whether frequent back-to-back switching of waveform, most or all companies think that the there is no practical justification for such behaviour, but that there should be no problem for the UE to handle it. One company (Nokia) noted that the frequent switching would occur is CG is excluded from the dynamic waveform switching functionality. One company (Ericsson) thinks that the rate of change may depend on the rate of change of the pathloss.

On the information that would be utilized by the network to perform switching, companies mentioned:

* PHR and proposed PHR enhancements
* SRS
* DMRS
* MCS value
* A/N reports (BLER statistics)
* UE scheduling history

### 3rd round

FL proposal 2-1v3 was presented and discussed at the GTW of 10/17/2022. The discussion led to the working assumption (copied in section 3) listing alternatives for dynamic switching mechanism.

In discussions related to issue #1-2, several companies expressed the view that supporting switching for CG type 1 is not critical since by nature this type of grant is semi-static. On the other hand, during 2nd round questions of issue #2-1 most companies also do not identify a scenario in which switching waveform back and forth in rapid succession is beneficial. Even if not intended by network, such type of back-and-forth switching seems likely to occur if the waveform for CG type 1 is not allowed to change while at the same time the network decides to switch the waveform for dynamically scheduled PUSCH. There seems to be two basic ways to handle this:

* 1. CG type 1 waveform remains semi-statically configured irrespective of DG PUSCH waveform, i.e. potential frequent back-and-forth switching is ok if the network decides to configure CG type 1;
  2. CG type 1 waveform follows waveform used for DG PUSCH to avoid back-and-forth switching (e.g. by having UL and/or DL DCI indication apply to subsequent transmission).

Please indicate your view on the best handling of CG type 1: (a) or (b), and why:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Prefer (a)/(b)? | Reasons |
| QC | (a) | We cant just switch waveform, entire set of configurations need to be switched. We will in effect be dynamically switching between two CG Type 1 configurations. |
| Sharp | (a) | Different configurations for DG and CG have been supported since R15. We see no problem on the back-and-forth switching between DG and CG. |
| Panasonic | (a) | If (b) is taken, depending on false/miss detection of DCI, the waveform of CG Type 1 is changed. This increases the complexity of gNB for blind detection. |
| DOCOMO | - | No strong preference. a) has no issue and indeed safer. But b) might achieve waveform switch for CG-PUSCH efficiently. |
| Intel | (a) | gNB may configure more than one CG-PUSCH configurations, and each CG-PUSCH configuration may have different transformPrecoder. The need of dynamic waveform switching is not clear. |
| ZTE | (a) | The switching between each CG-PUSCH configurations is sufficient for CG Type-1. |
| CATT | (a) | Same views as above. |
| LG |  | We think that each of the two methods has its own merits. Therefore, we think that it is beneficial to provide one of two ways by using higher layer parameter. |
| Lenovo | (a) | Back-and-forth switching waveform already exists in current specification by switching between different CG configurations of different waveforms. Therefore, we don’t see any issue and we support (a). |
| vivo | (a) | (a) is slightly preferred though we’re open to discuss (b) if majority would like to study this.  I assume (a) means no dynamic waveform switching is supported for PUSCH scheduled with configured grant Type 1 (excluding retransmission of CG PUSCH). |
| Nokia/NSB | (b) | From FL summary, most companies do not identify a scenario in which switching waveform back and forth in rapid succession is beneficial. Then it is unclear why keeping CG type 1 configured waveform (e.g., CP-OFDM) is beneficial in the context that the DG PUSCH has been switched to DFT-s-OFDM, noting also that CG PUSCH should be protected since it may contain URLLC data.  It seems that companies are assuming that a UE supporting Rel-18 CovEnh feature should also support Rel-16 URLLC feature for multiple active configured grant configurations. In our view, this does not necessarily to be the case, given also that Rel-16 URLLC features are optional features. |
| Spreadtrum | (a) | There is no issue with (a). For type 1 CG PUSCH, it is sufficient to determine the waveform according to the current configuration. |
| CMCC | (a) | The reason why some companies object the MAC CE signalling is latency, then back-and-forth switching should not be a big deal since this dynamicity would also happen in multiple DCI indicating different waveforms. |
| MediaTek | (a) | CG type-1 is semi-statically configured/activated/released by definition. There is no reason to consider DCI based switching. If UE is configured with multiple CG type-1 configurations, each with a different *transformPrecoder* field value, similar switching functionality already exists. |
| Ericsson |  | If a waveform is indicated by a previous UL DCI, we prefer (a). Up to now, a UE configured with Type 1 CG-PUSCH monitors DCI only for retransmission.  If a waveform is indicated by a previous MAC CE, it applies to the subsequent transmissions, namely (b). |
| Sony | (a) | We do not see any issue with (a). |

## [Open][LP] Issue #2-2: DCI size alignment between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

Many companies [3][4][6][8][11][12][14][26][28] observe that the size/presence of several fields may be different depending on whether transform precoding is enabled or disabled. Such fields include, e.g. [12][26]

* Precoding information and number of layers
* Antenna ports
* PTRS-DMRS association
* DMRS sequence initialization
* FDRA

If the indication is included in scheduling DCI (new field or existing field), the following options are identified:

* Align DCI size [3][4][6][8][11][12][14][26]
  + Based on highest payload (i.e. CP-OFDM) [3][8][11][12][14][26]
  + Based on lowest payload (i.e. DFT-S-OFDM) ([26], not preferred)
* Not align DCI size ([26], not preferred)[28]

Several companies [3][20] also discuss size alignment between DL and UL DCI in case indication in new field of scheduling DCI is supported. Contribution [3] suggests adding padding as needed to DCI format 0\_0 to match size of DCI format 1\_0. Contribution [20] also suggests using zero padding.

**Observations on DCI size alignment**

This issue can be discussed if/after it is agreed to adopt indication by scheduling DCI.

### 3rd round

Given that the alternatives identified in the working assumption for switching mechanism are based on DCI, discussions can start on the issue of DCI size alignment between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM. Moderator would like to ask the following:

Do you agree that size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with CP-OFDM is to be aligned with size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with DFT-S-OFDM, for a DCI format that contains an indication of waveform?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/no (comments) |
| QC | Yes, this is required. |
| Sharp | DCI size should be based on CP-OFDM except for the potential 1-bit switching field insertion. Our view is that DCI-based dynamic switching can be enable only when CP-OFDM is configured by the legacy RRC signalling so that the DCI size is determined based on the legacy transform precoding configuration (except for the additional configuration for 1-bit switching field, if supported). |
| Panasonic | No. The field size of some DCI fields depends on the applied waveform for PUSCH (e.g., FDRA, frequency hopping flag, precoding information and number of layers, antenna ports, PTRS-DMRS association, and DMRS sequence initialization). Our view is that the field size should be based on highest payload size, i.e., size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with DFT-s-OFDM is to be aligned with (or increased to) size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with CP-OFDM in order to cover the case of CP-OFDM. |
| DOCOMO | Which of the following is asked by the question?   * Interpretation 1) DCI size needs to be aligned between the case where CP-OFDM is actually used and where DFT-S-OFDM is actually used * Interpretation 2) DCI size when CP-OFDM is actually used needs to be the same as the one when DFT-S-OFDM is actually used   Our understanding is that, interpretation 1 means “they shall be the same size” only, while interpretation 2 means “DCI size in case of CP-OFDM shall be changed to that for DFT-S-OFDM.  We actually share the same view as Panasonic above, i.e., for DCI size determination, larger size should always be considered. So our answer is yes for interpretation 1, but no for interpretation 2. |
| Intel | DCI size alignment is needed. In general, DCI payload size with CP-OFDM waveform is larger than that with DFT-s-OFDM waveform. We share similar view as other companies that DCI size is matched with the one when CP-OFDM waveform is assumed. |
| ZTE | Agree the comments from Panasonic and DOCOMO. The question is not so clear. The alignment doesn’t mention the direction of aligning. From our point of view, we support the size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with DFT-s-OFDM is to be aligned with (or increased to) size of DCI scheduling PUSCH with CP-OFDM. |
| LG | No  First, it is necessary to discuss whether to support the explicit indication or implicit indication using DCI. After that, we can further discuss details of DCI field design due to dynamic waveform switching. |
| Lenovo | Yes, we think the DCI size should be aligned between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM. Besides, we think how to interpret a field, which may be different for CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM (e.g., PTRS-DMRS association field), also needs to be discussed. |
| vivo | Yes. In addition, for the bit fields that are associated with waveform, the bit field interpretation may have to be based on e.g. the target waveform. |
| Nokia/NSB | DCI size alignment is always needed. How to achieve such alignment should be further discussed. One option is to always assume DCI size with larger payload. This option however has a drawback on DCI overhead. Therefore, we prefer to further study this issue instead of rushing for a conclusion at this stage. |
| Apple | We have the same view that the DCI size need to be aligned to the larger one. |
| Spreadtrum | DCI size alignment is needed. Either align each of the fields associated with the waveform, or align the total DCI for different waveform configurations can be implemented. |
| CMCC | We can discuss this issue after we decide how to indicate the switching. |
| MediaTek | Yes, DCI payload size should be equal. |
| Ericsson | Yes. DCI payload size ambiguity issue should be solved, and a straightforward solution is that a UE decodes DCI by assuming the bit length of a field is in accordance with CP-OFDM, which has larger bit length than the counterpart of DFT-S-OFDM, if different. |
| Sony | We prefer to discuss this issue after we decide how to signal waveform switch. |

## [Closed][LP] Issue #2-3: Other aspects

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

Several companies [3][12][14][21][25][26] discuss aspects related to RRC configuration.

* For configuring the dynamic waveform switching feature, contributions [3][12][25][26] propose defining a new RRC parameter. Contribution [21] proposes that the configuration is UE-specific.
* Contribution [14] discusses configuration of RRC parameters specific to CP-OFDM or DFT-S-OFDM.
* Contribution [25] proposes to define a default waveform.
* Contribution [4] proposes to apply MCS table configured for indicated waveform.
* Contribution [8] proposes that DMRS configuration type 2, if configured, applies to PUSCH indicated with CP-OFDM.
* Contributions [4][8] discusses options if *resourceAllocation* IE indicates type 0 in *PUSCH-Config* (e.g. apply to CP-OFDM only or treat as error case)

**Observations on other aspects**

These issues can be discussed after more progress is made on dynamic indication solution.

# Topic #3: Assistance information for switching waveform

## [Closed][MP] Issue #3-1: Enhancements to report impact of change of waveform

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#106b-e**

Several companies (Huawei [2], InterDigital [13], Ericsson [22], Samsung [23], Nokia [29]) propose enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching.

Companies provided following justifications:

* Performance improvement from feature may be limited if the network cannot accurately estimate possible power increase after waveform switch [2][22]
* Scheduler cannot rely on MPR requirement since the actual power reduction may be smaller [2][22]
* Difference of Pcmax between waveforms function of UE implementation [2][13]
* R17 PHR has coarse granularity and does not precisely reflect actual UE power boosting capability [29]
* R17 PHR is determined using current waveform [29]
* Useful for scheduler to decide PRB allocation [2]

Companies suggested following examples of possible enhancements:

* Report information on power boosting that would result from waveform switching [2]
* Report power headroom under assumption of waveform different than waveform used for actual PUSCH [13]
* Report power information related to target waveform, e.g. Pcmax,c or PH with assumption of modulation order and RB allocation [22]
* UE requests switching to DFT-S-OFDM when experiencing worsening channel conditions [23]
* Report power headroom for both waveforms [29]
* PHR request to indicate PHR before waveform switching [2]
* Reuse waveform switching signaling to trigger PHR [2]

On the other hand, one company (Spreadtrum [4]) thinks that the scheduler can trigger waveform switching based on current measurement (SRS) and/or reporting information (PHR).

**Observations**

There seems to be significant interest in supporting this type of enhancement especially from network vendors. Since these enhancements may require involvement from other working groups and there is no strong dependency with other topics, discussions should start early. It would be good to collect views from companies that did not discuss this in their contributions.

### 1st round

Please indicate if you are supportive of enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching. If so, please indicate if you have preference for specific schemes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | For now, we do not see the need for such enhancements. More discussions are needed. |
| Intel | We tend to think this is out of scope for this AI. We do not see the need to further optimize the PHR for enhancement on dynamic waveform switching. Further discussions are needed to clarify the motivation and benefit. |
| Panasonic | We are supportive to consider PHR aspects. |
| Vivo | We’re open to study this with medium priority in coming meetings given the justifications summarized by feature leader, although in this first meeting we can focus on HP items. |
| QC | Support. Open to enhancing the PHR framework to facilitate DWS. |
| LG | We think that more discussions are needed to clarify the benefit. |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | We think gNB can trigger waveform switching based on the current measurement and/or reporting information. But we are open to consider other assistant information if such enhancement can help gNB to select more appropriate waveforms. |
| ZTE | We are open to this issue. More discussion are needed. For PHR, we think gNB has the capability to estimate the difference of PHR between DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM. |
| Sharp | Open to discuss |
| CMCC | We think current reporting can help gNB comprehend the UE condition. We can further discuss this issue. |
| Transsion | We are supportive to enhance the PHR framework. |
| Sony | Open to discuss |
| Lenovo | We are open for more discussion on this issue. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are supportive to consider further PHR enhancements to assist the scheduler. |
| Fujitsu | We support the enhancement to report power information. |
| Samsung | We support to further discuss. |
| MediaTek | We are open to study some of these enhancements in future meetings. But for now we prefer to see some progress Topics #1 and #2. |
| Ericsson | We think the enhancement is necessary for the feature to work, otherwise UL waveform switching is a blind attempt.  Like what we replied to Issue#1-3, the benefit of waveform switching is the reduced actual power backoff for a different waveform and increased UE configured transmit power PCMAX,c,f, both of which are up to UE implementation and unknown by gNB. With some enhanced UE report, gNB may be able to get the information to decide whether waveform switching can help improve the UE’s coverage. Otherwise, it is a blind waveform switching by gNB uncertain whether it can work. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support assistance information report for better performance.  We prefer follows methods:   1. PHR request to indicate PHR before waveform switching 2. Reuse waveform switching signaling to trigger PHR |

**Observations from first round discussion**

Most companies are either supportive or open to discuss these enhancements further. A few companies (Intel, vivo, Mediatek) think the discussions have somewhat lower priority compared to other topics. One company (Ericsson) thinks that the feature does not work without the reporting enhancements because the network would otherwise have to switch blindly.

In view of the feedback, moderator suggests agreeing on the following:

### 2nd round

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting information on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform * Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform * Other solutions are not precluded |

Please indicate if FL proposal 3-1 is acceptable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Apple | Ok to study further |
| CATT | We can be open to the study so we are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Ok to study |
| Lenovo | Open to study |
| OPPO | We are fine for the way out. |
| Vivo | We’re fine with the main proposal but do not support the examples, it would be enough to mention power headroom related information or remove all examples.  Therefore, we propose to either remove all the 3 bullets and let companies to study further or we have following updates:  ***FL proposal 3-1****: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching, such as:*   * *Reporting power headroom related information ~~information on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~* * *~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~* * *Other solutions are not precluded* |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| MediaTek | OK to study. |
| ZTE | Although our primitive thought is that these issues are all gNB implementation issues, but as the proposal aims to study whether to specify the above enhancement, we are open to the study. |
| Spreadtrum | OK to study. |
| Moderator | @QC, Panasonic, Apple, CATT, DOCOMO, Lenovo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Mediatek, ZTE, Spreadtrum: Thanks for support!  @vivo: not sure that all proposals are limited to power headroom reporting. These solutions have been proposed in contributions so I don’t see a problem with listing them, given that other solutions are not precluded.  @All: please continue providing your comments. This is also fairly high priority topic. |
| Intel | We can be open for study. However, we share similar view as vivo that it is too early to list all the examples in the proposal.  **FL proposal 3-1**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining when to indicate waveform switching, ~~such as:~~   * ~~Reporting information on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~ * ~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~ * ~~Other solutions are not precluded~~ |
| Sharp | Fine with FL proposal 3-1 |
| LG | Ok to study further |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| OPPO2 | The updated one looks even better, support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The motivation is not only about determining when to indicate a waveform switching but also determining the precise scheduling information for the switched-to waveform, e.g. the number of PRBs that is in line with the UE power situation of switched-to waveform. Particularly, when a UE is switched from DFT-s-OFDM to CP-OFDM, its power headroom may be reduced and a gNB is supposed not to schedule an overestimated number of PRBs.  Therefore, we suggest a change below, or explicitly including “determining more accurate scheduling information”  ***FL proposal 3-1****: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining ~~when to indicate~~ a waveform switching, such as:*   * *Reporting power headroom related information ~~information on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~* * *~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~* * *Other solutions are not precluded* |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal |
| Moderator | @Sharp, LG, Ericsson, CMCC, Fujitsu: Thanks for support!  @Huawei/HiSilicon: Yes, agree that the purpose is not limited to the timing. I am fine with your update to delete “when to indicate”.  @Intel, vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon: We can try the simpler version from Huawei/HiSilicon for the examples. |

**Observations from second round discussion**

15 companies (QC, Panasonic, Apple, CATT, DOCOMO, Lenovo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, MediaTek, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Sharp, LG, Ericsson, CMCC) support FL proposal 3-1.

3 companies (Vivo, Intel, Huawei/HiSilicon) are generally supportive but are suggesting some changes to not include many details in the example and clarify that the purpose is not only for timing but also for scheduling.

To account for these suggestions, moderator proposes to agree on v2 as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1v2**: RAN1 to study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining ~~when to indicate~~ waveform switching, such as:   * Reporting power headroom related information ~~on power headroom and/or Pcmax for a waveform~~ * ~~Reporting change on power headroom and/or Pcmax assuming change of waveform~~ * Other solutions are not precluded |

### 3rd round

Based on 2nd round comments it seems that the general direction of FL proposal 3-1 is agreeable to all although a few companies preferred to not list specific examples of enhancements in the agreement. Updated FL proposal 3-1v2 above addresses this concern. Moderator would like to submit it for email approval.

Please indicate support or objection to FL proposal 3-1v2. Please only object if you have strong concern:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies | Sharp, Panasonic, LG |
| Objecting companies |  |
| **Company** | **Reason for objection** |

Update after GTW of 10/18/2022: FL proposal 3-1v2 is agreed. Thanks to all - no need to provide further input.
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