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1. Introduction

This contribution summarizes the following email discussion in AI 9.9.2 regarding the multi-carrier UL Tx switching scheme.

|  |
| --- |
| [110bis-e-R18-MC\_Enh-02] Email discussion on multi-carrier UL TX switching scheme by October 19 – Hiroki (NTT DOCOMO)   * Check points: October 14, October 19 |
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1. Discussions on complexity reduction options for Rel-18 multi-carrier UL Tx switching

At the last RAN1 meeting, following working assumption was made, and companies are encouraged to investigate the complexity reduction options with striving for down-selection at this RAN1 meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Assumption**   * If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, following switching mechanism is considered as baseline for the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands   + Alt.1: Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission * RAN1 will support one or more of following complexity reduction options, considering at least the potential additional preparation time, additional interruption time, and RF complexity for certain switching cases/patterns, if Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported based on Alt.1, and companies are encouraged to investigate options with striving for down-selection at RAN1#110bis-e.   + Option 1: UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases (band pairs)     - FFS: at least one band pair should be supported as in Rel-17     - FFS: for both 3 and 4 bands cases or only for 4 bands case     - FFS: potential capability/RRC signaling   + Option 2: UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on some of bands out of configured bands for UL Tx switching     - FFS: at least two bands should support up to 2 Tx as in Rel-17     - FFS: for both 3 and 4 bands cases or only for 4 bands case     - FFS: for both switched UL and dual UL cases or only for dual UL case     - FFS: whether/how to reuse or extend existing capability/RRC signaling   + Option 3: UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time (or interruption time) only for some specific switching cases/patterns     - FFS: specific switching cases/patterns where more preparation procedure time (or interruption time) is necessary, e.g., switching patterns not existed in Rel-17     - FFS: how long preparation procedure time and/or interruption time is necessary, and whether RAN4 involvement is necessary     - FFS: whether/how to report/indicate the specific switching cases/patterns and/or value(s) of preparation procedure time (or interruption time)     - FFS: what is the definition of preparation procedure time or interruption time, including whether interruption happens during the preparation procedure time and whether it includes switching period     - FFS: whether/how long minimum interval between two succeeding UL Tx switching is necessary   + Option 4: UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for tx switching     - FFS: at least one band pair should be supported as in Rel-17     - FFS: for both 3 and 4 bands cases or only for 4 bands case     - FFS: for switched UL and/or dual UL     - FFS: potential capability/RRC signaling   + Other options are not precluded |

## 3.1 Option 1: UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases (band pairs)

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding complexity reduction option 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 5:*** *Both* ***complexity reduction*** *Option 1 and Option 4 are dedicated only to UL-CA Option 2.*  ***Observation 6:*** *For dynamic UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands,*   * *Option 1 can alleviate UE memory management for UL-CA Option2.* * *Option 4 cannot solve the UE memory issue and is unreasonable because the size of UE memory is not related to the number of band pair.* * *Option 2 has been supported by existing UE capability reporting.* |
| [3] | ***Observation 2****: For complexity reduction Option 4, UE can achieve the same reporting flexibility as complexity reduction Option 1 by indicating different band pairs for switchedUL and dualUL. Meanwhile, the switchedUL/dual UL indication remains as per BC (band combination) report.*  ***Proposal******6****: If one of complexity reduction Option 1 and complexity reduction Option 4 is to be adopted, then Option 4 is supported.* |
| [4] | 1. ***RAN1 can support Option 1: UE is allowed to report the supportive only some of concurrent UL cases (band pairs) for both 3 and 4 bands.*** |
| [5] | Observation 1: Option 1 and option 2 allow flexible UE implementation and reduce UE complexity.  **Proposal 1: If Option 1 and option 2 are supported, they can be applied for TX switching with 3 bands and TX switching with 4 bands. Moreover, option 2 can be applied for both switched UL and dual UL cases.** |
| [6] | **Proposal 11: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, to reduce UE complexity,**   * **UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases on 2 (out of 3 or 4) bands.** * **UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on at least 1 band out of configured bands.** * **UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time only for some specific switching cases/patterns.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Option 1 -4 are benefit for complexity reduction and can be considered to be specified.*** |
| [8] | **Proposal 1：UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases (band pairs)**   * **For 3 bands operation, up to one band pair can be supported.** * **For 4 bands operation, up to two band par(s) can be supported, and there is no intersection band between two band pairs(s)**   **Proposal 19: All UL Tx switching cases are supported in R18 specification, and gNB can configure sub-set of switching cases according to reported UE capability.** |
| [9] | **Proposal 4**   * For Rel-18 multi-carrier Tx switching, at least Option 1 and Option 2 can be supported for complexity reduction.   + For Option 1, at least one band pairs need to support concurrent uplink transmission.   + For Option 2, at least two bands should support up to 2 Tx.   + UE capability is introduced UE to report concurrent uplink cases or 2 ports transmission on some of the bands that are supported for Tx switching |
| [11] | **Proposal 2. For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, concurrent transmission on any two bands among 3 or 4 bands can be supported based on UE CA capability reporting.** |
| [12] | **Proposal #1: Complexity reduction options for UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands can be supported as a UE capability.**  **Proposal #2: Revise the WA as follows.**   * **Remove Option 4** * **Add the following Notes and remove FFSs which is related to the Note**   + **Note: Rel-18 UL Tx switching should cover all switching cases which are supported in Rel-17.**   + **Note: Above option(s) can be applied for both 3 and 4 bands cases, if supported.**   **Proposal #5: Discuss how to configure one of options between {‘switchedUL’, ‘dualUL’} when UL Tx switching is configured for a set of bands belonging to multiple different band combinations.** |
| [13] | ***Proposal 2: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, limiting/removing certain switching cases for certain bands/band combinations should be avoided:***   * ***Option 1, 2 and 4 from the WA should be considered with lower priority*** |
| [14] | **Proposal 2:** *Rel-18 UL Tx Switching for 3 or 4 bands supports UE complexity reduction Options 1, 2 and 4*  **Proposal 3:** *For Options 1, 2 and 4, at least one band pair should be supported as in Rel-17 and UE capability indication is provided separately for 3 and 4 bands cases* |
| [15] | 1. ***For UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands:***  * ***Support Option#1 and Option#2.*** * ***Do not support Option#4.*** * ***Consider Option#3 with the following modification: “UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time ~~(or interruption time) only~~ for ~~some specific~~ all switching cases/patterns”.*** |
| [16] | 1. Dynamic UL TX switching across 3 or 4 bands for UL CA should include concurrent transmission on any two bands among 3 or 4 bands. |
| [17] | **Observation 1: The complexity reduction Option 1 is applicable to Inter-band UL CA dual UL scenario where a UE is capable of at least one band pair among 3 or 4 bands for concurrent UL transmission. For UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands, there would be some implementations where a Tx chain is applicable to only some of 3 or 4 bands but not all bands so that concurrent UL transmission for some band pair(s) cannot be performed.**  **Proposal 2: To ensure the clear performance gain of Rel-18 dual UL with complexity reduction Option 1 over Rel-17 dual UL or Rel-18 switched UL, it is preferable to consider complexity reduction Option 1 with some condition, e.g., for both 3 and 4 bands cases, at least two band pairs should be supported for the concurrent transmission if the UE indicates the support of dual UL.**  **Proposal 3: For complexity reduction Option 1, whether the number of supported switching cases is reduced or not should be discussed.**  **Proposal 8: At least following UE capability and RRC signaling should be considered for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands with potential complexity reduction options.**   * **UE capability regarding the supported option (switched UL and/or dual UL) for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands**   + **Corresponding RRC signaling to configure either switched UL or dual UL**     - **If the complexity reduction Option 1 is supported, UE may support concurrent transmission only on some of band pairs, and hence UE/gNB needs to report/configure specific band pairs where concurrent transmission is possible/expected. Existing parameter such as *up-linkTxSwitchingOption* in *CellGroupConfig* cannot be reused in such case and new parame-ter would be necessary.** |
| [19] | **Observation 1: Option 1 can be satisfied by introducing a new UL Tx switching band pair capability for 1T-1T case (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*-r18 and *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18*).**  **Proposal 1: UE should support Option 1, 2 and 3 by introducing new band pair UE capability for 1T-1T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-1T-r18), 1T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-2T-r18), and 2T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*2T-2T-r18) Tx states, each band pair parameter includes**   * **a uplink Tx switching option indication (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18*), and** * **a Tx switching period (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod1T1T-r18*)** |
| [20] | **Proposal 3: Complexity reduction Option 1 is not supported:**   * **A DualUL capable UE is required to be able to transmit simultaneously two 1-port transmissions on any band pair out of the band combination** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support complexity reduction option 1 for dual UL [2], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [11], [12], [14], [15], [17], [19]   + Regarding the restriction on number of band pairs to be supported for concurrent transmission:     - No restriction for both 3 bands and 4 bands [4], [12]     - At least one band pair for both 3 bands and 4 bands if dual UL support is reported [6], [7], [9], [14]     - Up to one band pair for 3 bands and up to two band pairs for 4 bands [8]     - At least two band pairs for both 3 bands and 4 bands if dual UL support is reported [17]   + UE capability to report the supported band pairs [4], [5], [6], [7], [9], [12], [14], [17], [19]     - Just depend on UE CA capability and band type [11]     - The supported band pairs for concurrent transmission require support of UL CA [5], [6]   + RRC signaling to indicate the possible band pairs [4], [12], [17]   + The switching case associated with not supported concurrent transmission band pair(s) is unnecessary [9]     - gNB can configure subset of switching cases according to reported capability [8]     - Whether such switching case is removed or not can be discussed [17] * Between complexity reduction option 1 and 4, option 4 is preferred [3] * Complexity reduction option 1 should be considered with lower priority [13] * The design should not impose restriction on concurrent transmission, but the complexity can be addressed by capability [16] * Dual UL capable UE is required to support concurrent transmission on any band pair [20] |

It seems that majority is ok to support the complexity reduction option 1 based on the UE capability. In addition, although [3] argued that Option 4 can achieve same flexibility and is more preferred, it is just details on UE capability reporting mechanism which should be discussed in RAN2. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 3.1**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission based on UE capability**
  + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as how to report the support of dual UL and the supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed [in RAN2]**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as how to indicate the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed [in RAN2]**
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all band pairs for concurrent transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL does not impose any restriction**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the FL proposal, but we slightly prefer to discuss & agree on the basic principle of UE capability in RAN1 based on whole agreements of complexity reduction methods. |
| ZTE | As we commented in our contribution [3], the main difference between complexity reduction 1 vs 4 can be summarized as following.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Complexity reduction Option1 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Report supported band pairs and switched/dual UL:  A+B (switched UL, dual UL),  A+C (switched UL, dual UL),  B+C (switched UL) | | Complexity reduction Option4 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Switched UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C, B+C  Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Dual UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C |   Complexity reduction option1 will introduce mixed switchedUL and dualUL, which is not supporeted via Rel-16/17. Do companies want to support the scenario where both switchedUL and dualUL are configured for the same band combination and network dynamically switches between switchedUL and dualUL? This will introduce additional RAN1 spec impacts and implementation complexity, e.g., how to indicate the dynamic switching between switchedUL and dualUL and how to determine the switching period for this case. It is not just UE capability reporting issue if such dynamic switching is supported. If the motivation is not to introduce dynamic switching between switchedUL and dualUL, it should be clarified in the proposal. Thus, we are not supportive for complexity reduction option1 which requires dynamic switching between switchedUL and dualUL from our understanding. Evaluation should be done for this mixed mode to justify introducing this new scenario. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 3.1.  Regarding ZTE’s comment, as complexity reduction Option 4 in their consideration also achieves same flexibility such as in BC A+B+C, Dual UL is supported only for A+B and A+C but not for B+C, we think their concern is just on how to report the UE capability and such detailed UE capability design should be discussed in RAN2. In terms of functionality, they should be fine with this proposal as they supports Option 4 which achieves exact same flexibility. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | In principle, we are fine to discuss restricting certain band pairs, but our first preference is to agree on some of the principles that allow reduced UE complexity by considering additional time for at least the new switching cases (compared to Rel-16/17) |
| CATT | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal. And we also prefer to discuss on the basic principle of UE capability in RAN1 if time permitted. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Support  In RAN4 LS: “**For concurrent UL transmission on 2 bands:**  For UL Tx switching across 3 and 4 bands, the support of concurrent UL transmission on 2 (out of 3 or 4) bands at least requires UL CA support on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE.”  To make it clearer and better align with RAN4 wording ,we suggest the following text   * + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA** on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE   We also share similar view as QualComm that at least some basic principle of UE capability can be discussed in RAN1. [in RAN2] can be removed. |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 3.1 |
| Xiaomi | We would like to understand what kind of UE complexity can be reduced via proposal 3.1. According to the reply LS from RAN4, there is no technical difficulty for UE to prevent realizing Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. In the other words, RAN4 doesn’t identify any additional UE complexity on RF aspect.  Furthermore, RAN4 recommend RAN1 to study UE memory sharing issue if necessary. Clearly proposal 3.1 doesn’t resolve any issue related to sharing UE memory.  On the other hand, proposal 3.1 bascially put some restrictions on the UL switching cases, with precluding set of band pairs. It certainly prevent network harvesting full benefits from supporting UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. |
| Ericsson | Support in principle.  We think vivo’s suggestion improves the proposal. Also, share the same view as QC. However, this proposal is valuable to be agreed, emphasizing on the need for introducing a capability. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Google | Support the proposal. Regarding the example of Option 4 addressed by ZTE, we think the intension is similar to Option 1, which can be discussed in UE capability. However it is still not clear to us that whether the UE can support these two UL switching band combanitions simultaneously or only one of them. |
| China Telecom | Support and agree Vivo’s modification. |
| Nokia, NSB | In principle we don’t like the proposal, but it seems inevitable that the UE’s TX chains may not all support transmission on all the bands. So if e.g. Tx2 can’t reach bands 3 and band 4, then the UE can only transit 1Tx either on band 3 or on band 4, but never both at the same time, or 2Tx transmission on either of band 3 or band 4. So we can accept the basic intent. Agree with vivo’s wording suggestion. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority supports this proposal, and following small modification is possible based on the feedbacks. **Updated Proposed agreement 3.1**  * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission based on UE capability**   + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA** **on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE**   + **Details on the UE capability such as how to report the support of dual UL and the supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed ~~[in RAN2]~~**   + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as how to indicate the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed ~~[in RAN2]~~**   + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all band pairs for concurrent transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL does not impose any restriction** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 3.1**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission based on UE capability**
  + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA** **on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as how to report the support of dual UL and the supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as how to indicate the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all band pairs for concurrent transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL does not impose any restriction**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | As we commented in the 1st round of discussion, scenario where both switchedUL and dualUL are configured for the same band combination and network dynamically switches between switchedUL and dualUL increases the implementation compleixity a lot. It should be clearly ruled out in the proposal.  E.g.., *UE is not expected to be configured with switchedUL and dualUL simultaneously for the same band combination.*  If companies agree the above aspect can be discussed separately, we can compromise to support this proposal for progress.  In addition, it would be better if we can look at the whole picture of UE complexity reduction first before agreeing on each proposal. For example, if UE complexity reduction option 2 is adopted, then most of the complexity can be addressed already. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal. Also fine with vivo’s suggestion. |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the updated FL proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine to support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and flexibility for the progress!  The proposal will be provided in the GTW session as stable one. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following proposal was agreed at the GTW session.  Proposed agreement 3.1  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission based on UE capability**   * + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA** **on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE**   + **Details on the UE capability such as how to report the support of dual UL and the supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**   + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as how to indicate the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**   + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all band pairs for concurrent transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL does not impose any restriction**   Based on the agreement, we can further discuss details (or at least some high-level principles) on the UE capability and the gNB configuration/indication. So, companies are encouraged to provide their views on the UE capability and the gNB configuration/indication regarding supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission e.g., based on examples provided ZTE.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Complexity reduction Option1 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Report supported band pairs and switched/dual UL:  A+B (switched UL, dual UL),  A+C (switched UL, dual UL),  B+C (switched UL) | | Complexity reduction Option4 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Switched UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C, B+C  Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Dual UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C | |

#### 3rd round Feedback form for 3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | In our view, the essential aspect related to this complexity reduction technique is UE reporting of band pairs for which dualUL is supporting. On the gNB configuration, not sure, if we need additional signaling. Basically, once the gNB is aware about the reported band pairs for which UE supported dualUL, then gNB scheduling should take that into account and UL Tx switching with dualUL is triggered accordingly only for those band pairs |
| New H3C | We are open to duschss about complexity reduction on Option 1 and Option 4. I wonder whether this complexity reduction is th额scopeof RAN2 or not. |
| Xiaomi | Simila views as Apple. The per band pair reported transmission option, i.e. switchedUL/DualUL, has the best flexibility from UE perspective. On the other hand, we don’t see issues from gNB perspective as gNB should always take into the reported uplink transmission option reported by UE.  Furthermore, if UE reports the supported band pairs and the relevant uplink transmission option, there is no need to additionally report the supported band combination. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding UE capability reporting, we think both of options provided by ZTE will work, and there may be some other possibilities. RAN1 can list up such possible alternatives based on a principle of flexibility RAN1 would like to achieve, and then RAN1 should ask RAN2 to work on details.  We think similar consideration can be applied to gNB configuration/indication. We think UE reporting and actual gNB configuration can be different as long as gNB does not configure anything UE does not support. For example, if UE supports both switchedUL and dualUL, gNB configures either one of the operation mode in Rel-16/17. So, even if UE supports dualUL for a certain band pair, gNB may not use the band pair for concurrent transmission, and hence it would be good to have gNB configuration/indication on the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission as in the agreement. |
| ZTE | The current switchedUL/dualUL RRC configuration and capability reporting are copied below. The RRC configuration is under cellGroupConfig, which is clear configured per cell group. The UE capability is under BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-r16, which is clear per band combination.  Thus, it is clear that the UE capability for switchedUL/dualUL should be reported per band combination and UE is not expected to be configured with switchedUL and dualUL simultaneously for the same band combination.  CellGroupConfig ::= SEQUENCE {  ……  uplinkTxSwitchingOption-r16 ENUMERATED {switchedUL, dualUL}  }  BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  bandCombination-r16 BandCombination,  bandCombination-v1540 BandCombination-v1540 OPTIONAL,  ……  supportedBandPairListNR-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxULTxSwitchingBandPairs)) OF ULTxSwitchingBandPair-r16,  uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r16 ENUMERATED {switchedUL, dualUL, both} OPTIONAL,  uplinkTxSwitching-PowerBoosting-r16 ENUMERATED {supported} OPTIONAL,  …,  [[  -- R4 16-5 UL-MIMO coherence capability for dynamic Tx switching between 3CC 1Tx-2Tx switching  uplinkTxSwitching-PUSCH-TransCoherence-r16 ENUMERATED {onfigurati, fullCoherent} OPTIONAL  ]]  }  Thus, we propose the following.  **Proposal:**  If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported,   * UE capability for switchedUL/dualUL should be reported per band combination. * UE is not expected to be configured with switchedUL and dualUL simultaneously for the same band combination. |
| China Telecom | We think option 1 means switchedUL/DualUL is reported/configured per band pair, and option 4 means switchedUL/DualUL is reported/configured per band combination. Both are workable and we are open to discuss. Since the switching period is reported/configured per band pair, we slightly prefer to apply switchedUL/DualUL per band pair either for the similar signaling structure. |
| CMCC | We think that switchedUL/dualUL configured per band pair can also be supported in Option 1, and we are open to further discuss if there is any issue on the simultaneous switchedUL/dualUL report for a band pair. |
| CATT | Since RAN1 has onfig UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission, one method is that the UE reports supported UL Tx switching option (i.e. switchedUL, dualUL, both) based per band pair, and gNB configure UL Tx switching option for per band pair based on the reported capability.  We think the above UE capability report and gNB onfiguration can in line with the achieved agreement. It can be one potential possible alternative as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | UE capability | Report band combination: A+B+C  Report supported band pairs and switching option:  A+B ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL, both),  A+C ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL, both),  B+C ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL, both), | | gNB configuration | Configure/indicate switching option for per band pair:  A+B ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL),  A+C ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL),  B+C ENUMERATED(switched UL, dual UL), | |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for FL to kick off the capability discussion. Compared with Rel-16/17 two bands switching, three or four band switching would require some new structure of the signaling as much more switching cases are introduced and switching case pairs largely increased. There are some other potential related issues pending decision like which band takes the switching periods, switching periods for more than 2 bands, and etc., We would suggest we agree with some basic principles for UE capability as starting point.   * UE reports Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for three or four bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands * UE reports Rel-18 DualUL capability should at least support one concurrent transmission on two of the bands. |
| LG Electronics | We share a similar view to NTT DOCOMO. The gNB configuration should take into account what UE reports and they can be different. Likewise, there is no issue for the mixed case of switchedUL and dualUL. Based on UE reporting, gNB could configure and/or schedule UL transmissions to the extent that the UE can handle. |
| OPPO | Share view as Apple, the intention of this agreement is to reduce UE complexity, so UE reporting is an essential aspect. gNB configuration and scheduling are subject to UE reported capability.  Regarding to UE reporting, we prefer to report the following 3 information:   * Supported bands for Tx switch: e.g. A,B,C as three bands * Supported Tx switch mode: e.g. Dual UL and/or Switched UL * Supported concurrent band pairs for Tx switch: e.g. A+B, A+C, etc   Regarding to gNB configuration, the following two information can be (re)configured subject to what UE report. To be specific,   * Bands potentially for Tx switch: It is a subset of Supported bands for Tx switch reported by the UE. * Tx switch mode is only one option of Supported Tx switch mode reported by the UE. Even both dual UL and switched UL are reported by UE, either dual UL or switched UL but not both can be configured by gNB.   In addition, gNB scheduling should avoid using a concurrent transmission band that is not reported by the UE in Supported concurrent band pair for Tx switch. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Regarding UE capability and gNB configuration, following can be observed.   * UE capability   + Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination     - Apple, Xiaomi, CTC, CATT, LG   + Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination     - ZTE * gNB configuration   + Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig     - ZTE   + Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair (combination of serving cells?)     - CTC, CMCC, CATT   + Alt.3: at least configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission     - DCM, LG   + Alt.4: No configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission, i.e., UE just assumes as it reports     - Apple, Xiaomi   Also, Qualcomm proposed some high-level principles as below.   * UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands * UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission   The moderator thinks above high-level principles are quite straightforward, and hence it can be checked whether it is agreeable.  **Proposed agreement 3.1.1**   * **UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands** * **UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission**   We can further discuss on the UE capability and gNB configuration alternatives. |
| OPPO | For the proposed agreement 3.1.1,   * 1st bullet reads as that, as long as a UE reports Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability, the UE should support whatever Tx it reports as supported. * 2nd bullet reads as that, as long as a UE reports Rel-18 DualUL capability, the UE should support at least one band pair for concurrent transmission. It seems to mean that if the UE supports nothing for DualUL, the UE should not perform the Rel-18 DualUL capability report at all.   To be honest, it is not quite immediately clear to us what purpose the proposal (especially the 1st bullet) tries to achieve. The 2nd bullet seems relating to capability signaling design that should be taken in UE capability agenda. Could FL please clarify? |
| New H3C | Support in principal |
| LG Electronics | Regarding the report/configuration of switching options (i.e., switchedUL, dualUL), the existing report/configuration method can be reused in Rel-18. UE can report the supported option by *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r16* and can be provided one of reported options by *uplinkTxSwitchingOption*. As pointed out by OPPO, when UE reports both dualUL and switchedUL, either dualUL or switchedUL but not both can be configured by gNB.  Regarding Proposed agreement 3.1.1 by Moderator, one question is whether the Rel-18 UE capability mentioned in the proposal is newly introduced UE capabilities from the existing ones in Rel-17. |
| ZTE | We can agree on the Proposed agreement 3.1.1 in principle to have some progress.  @OPPO, to us, the 1st bullet is trying say that if UE indicated switchedUL for 3/4 bands, UE can perform UL transmission on any of the band. As discussed in other proposals, UE may need different switching period for different {switching-from, switching-to} band paris. The 2nd bullet is trying to say, if UE reports dualUL, it has to support concurrent transmission at least one band pair. Otherwise, it is not dualUL at all. |
| Qualcomm | We support the latest FL’s proposal. Maybe one revision on 1st bullet that no simultaneous Tx is expected, which is the sprits since Rel-16.  **Proposed agreement 3.1.1**   * **UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands. UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands.** * **UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Regarding OPPO’s comment, I think it is good to have this kind of high-level principle as agreement at this stage since there may be different understanding/assumption among companies even about these things.  1st bullet is of course obvious for me, but it can achieve common understanding that UE supporting Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands should support Tx from any one of the bands, i.e., if UE does not support Tx from certain band, the band should not be included as part of supported 3 or 4 bands for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. I think it is also applicable to DualUL capability and hence the proposal can be updated.  2nd bullet is also obvious for me, but it can also achieve common understanding that UE supporting at least one band pair for concurrent transmission among 3 or 4 bands can report the support of “Dual UL” (at least for the band pair). This is a kind of clarification on the meaning of Dual UL, which is a bit different from Rel-16/17 since there are multiple band pairs in Rel-18 and not necessary to support concurrent transmission on all band pairs to report “Dual UL” according to the agreed proposal 3.1. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check whether updated proposal from Qualcomm is agreeable.  We can also discuss more on the UE capability and gNB configuration. |

**Proposed agreement 3.1.1**

* **UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands. UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands.**
* **UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 3.1.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Thanks moderator explain the motivation of the proposal. From my reading, the proposal supports UE reporting SwitchedUL/DualUL capability per band combination although I believe this is not the intention. In order to avoid ambiguity, we propose the following modification for the proposal:  **Proposed agreement 3.1.1**   * **UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability ~~for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands~~ supports Tx from any of the supported bands. UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands.** * **UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL capability ~~for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands~~ should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission** |
| LG Electronics | It seems this proposal is closely related to Proposal 3.1.2. In our view, each bullet in this proposal should be regarded as a consequence or condition of each alternative in Proposal 3.1.2. So, we think this proposal can be discussed after Proposal 3.1.2. |
| Vivo3 | For the first bullet, clarification is needed. First, it seems to imply the reporting is per BC. Second, ‘any of the supported bands’ and ‘any two bands’ are ambiguous, do you mean any band in the BC and any two bands in the BC, respectively? Or, if ‘the supported bands’ is referrting to bands supporting SwitchedUL while the ‘any two bands’ is referrting to any two bands among the bands urthermor switchedUL? If the first understanding is correct, we suggest changes as ‘**any of the ~~supported~~ bands in the band combination**’ and ‘**any two bands among the band combination**’. But we are not sure if the proposal should be put under alt2 of 3.1.2 as it would conflict with alt1 in 3.1.2. In alt1 UE may report switchedUL for band pair1 and DualUl for band pair2 but this proposal assumes that simulatenous tranmssion on band pair 2 is not allowed   * + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**   If the 2nd understanding is correct, the text should be revised as ‘**any of the ~~supported~~ bands supporting switchedUL**’ and ‘**any two bands among the bands supporting switchedUL**’  Thrid, which bullet should be applied if UE reports {both} for a band combination? Is this case still FFS or is 2nd bullet applied? It urth we need either a FFS on {both} case or add the following bullet:  **UE reporting Rel-18 {both} capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission, and UE supports Tx from any of the supported bands urthermor SwitchedUL.** |
| China Telecom | For the first bullet, if the UE reports SwitchedUL capability for some band pairs and DualUL capability for other band pairs within the band combination, the second sentence does not apply. The suggested modification is:   * **UE reporting only Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination or band pairs in the band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands. UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands.**   For the second bullet, we think it also applies for UE reporting both capability.  **UE reporting Rel-18 DualUL or ‘both’ capability for a band combination or band pairs in the band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support one band pair for concurrent transmission.** |
| ZTE | Overall, we are ok with the direction of this proposal. However, we think the first bullet should be applicable to both SUL and switchedUL. Thus, we update the first bullet to reflect this.  Meanwhile, regarding the second bullet, we think it makes more sense if dualUL CA UE supports at least two band pairs for concurrent transmission because Rel-16/Rel-17 UL Tx switching already supports one band pair for concurrent transmission. Otherwise Rel-18 UL Tx switching may not be able to harvest the gain/flexibility compared with Rel-16/17.  **Proposed agreement 3.1.1**   * **UE reporting Rel-18 UL Tx switching capability for SUL and SwitchedUL CA for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx switching from any of the supported bands. UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands.** * **UE reporting Rel-18 UL Tx switching capability for DualUL CA ~~capability~~ for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands should at least support ~~one~~ two band pairs for concurrent transmission** |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s proposal.  Given Rel-18 supports UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands, not less bands, not more bands, we slightly prefer to keep “for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands”. |
| Samsung | We support FL proposal 3.1.1 |
| Apple | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems companies have confusion due to wording which may imply specific alternative in the proposal 3.1.2.  The intension of the proposal 3.1.1 is not to select specific alternative in the proposal 3.1.2. The intension is to clarify the basic definition of switched UL and dual UL in case of 3 or 4 bands UL Tx switching in Rel-18.  If UE supports “switched UL” only i.e., does not support dual UL at all, UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with simulatenous tranmssion on any two bands among the band combination.  If UE supports “dual UL”, UE should support at least one band pair for concurrent transmission i.e., if UE supports no band pair for concurrent transmission among the band combination, UE should not report “dual UL”.  If it is quite straightforward interpretation for switched UL and dual UL, it may not be necessary to agree on it, or it can be agreed after the discussion on alternatives in the proposal 3.1.2 so that we can easily find an appropriate wording. |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 3.1.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| CATT | With the explaination of FL, we are ok with the Proposed agreement 3.1.1. It can provide clear definations of Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability and DualUL capability. |
| Vivo4 | We support to either discuss this proposal after the discussion on proposal 3.1.2, or to add a bullet for alt1 in 3.1.2 first and then approve this proposal, saying that ‘**report supported band pair for concurrent transmission**’. Because current alt1 in 3.1.2 does not metion the co-current transmission report, which seems to imply that all band pairs supporting DualUL in alt1 should support co-current transmission as well, this is conflicted with 2nd bullet of this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the direction to first discuss proposal 3.1.2. |
| China Telecom | Fine to discuss alternatives in the proposal 3.1.2 firstly. |
| ZTE | OK to postpone the discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Regarding the first bullet, it seems to preclude the simultaneous scheduling/configuratons for the two intra-band CCs at the same band. Additionally, if a serving cell is configured with SUL, then UE behaviors to avoid simultaneous transmissions within the cell have been specified well as a nature of SUL feature since Rel-15, including the UCI multiplexing for simultaneously scheduled PUSCH and PUCCH and configured grant skipping for collicion between configured grant and dynamic grant. Therefore, additional Rel-18 scheduling restriction for the one serving cell is unnecessary. We propose,   * **UE reporting Rel-18 SwitchedUL capability for a band combination including 3 or 4 bands supports Tx from any of the supported bands. For any two bands configured for two respective serving cells, UE is not expected to be scheduled or configured with uplink transmissions that result in simultaneous transmissions on the two bands.**   + **Note: For any serving cell configured with SUL for the band combination, the Rel-15 UE behaviour & UE capabilities to prevent simultaneous transmissions between SUL and NUL within the cell are reused.** |
| Samsung | Thank you FL for the good proposal. From our side, fine to discuss/decide 3.1.2 first. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok either agree this proposal or discuss Proposal 3.1.2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to discuss this proposal after 3.1.2. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems many companies prefer to discuss the proposal 3.1.2 first, while given the situation on the proposal 3.1.2, it may not be possible to decide specific alternative for UE capability/gNB configuration at this meeting.  Therefore, although this is quite straightforward interpretation for switched UL and dual UL, we should try at least the proposal 3.1.2 and then we can resume the discussion on the proposal 3.1.1. |

**Proposed agreement 3.1.2**

* **Consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**
  + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**
  + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination**
* **Consider following alternatives for gNB configuration regarding dual UL**
  + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig**
  + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair (combination of serving cells?)**
  + **Alt.3: at least configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission**
  + **Alt.4: No configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission, i.e., UE just assumes as it reports**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 3.1.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Support.For the UE capability reporting, we support alt.1 which can provide more flexibility. urthermore, alt.1 is similar as the reporting framework in previous release.  For gNB configuration, our preference is not alt.4 sorry for late reply. We support alt.2 which aligns with the UE capability reporting. |
| LG Electronics | We basically think the existing UE capabilities *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r16* and RRC configuration *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* can be reused in Rel-18.  For each bullet of the proposal,   * For the 1st bullet, we support Alt 1 as a flexible and simple method * For the 2nd bullet, we prefer Alt 1 or Alt 2. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Vivo3 | For gNB configuration, we prefer alt.1 for simplify. But if alt 1 for UE capability reporting is adopted, alt.2 seems direct.  Switching cases in SwitchedUL are quite different from the dualUL, alt.4 leads to ambiguity when “both” is reported, because UE would have no information about whether some certain switching cases/states/methods can be expected/allowed by Gnb.we prefer to delete alt.4. |
| China Telecom | Support for further discussion. |
| ZTE | We support the the proposal in principle. Note that as we commented in the previous round of discussion, the following alternatives are the existing design, which can be reused without any issue. We support the following two alternatives.   * + Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination   + Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig   If RAN1 can’t decide which alternative to go, we are also ok to let RAN2 decide the detailed signalling framework. |
| Qualcomm | **UE capability – Alt.2**  For UE capability report, Rel-16 and Rel-17 use the same structure, UE reports band combination for UL Tx switching with “***supportedBandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch***”, then report “***uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport***” for the band combination.  Among the above two alternatives for UE capability, **we prefer Alt.2 as it use the same capability signaling structure as Rel-16/17.**  For Alt. 1, I may miss something important, but I don’t know how & why a UE report “switchedUL” for a band pair (e.g. A+B) within a band combination (e.g. A+B+C). My understanding is switchedUL is for the whole band combination and non concurrent transmission for any band pair within the band combination. If UE could concurrently transmit on at least one band pair, UE should report DualUL for this band combination and indicate which band pair is capable for concurrent transmission.  **gNB configuration – Alt. 4**  The current Rel-16/17 configuration is per band combination, not per band pair. The reason is UE may report both (SwitchedUL+DualUL) while network may only support one of switching options. With network configuration (SwitchedUL or DualUL), UE would know which switching option it should be expected. We support reusing per band combination configuration from network even though we think this should be within RAN2 scope & spec.  We are not convinced why per band pair configuration is needed at least for above Alt.2 UE capability reporting. **In this sense we slightly prefer Alt. 4** but would be appreciated if companies could clarify the necessacity |
| Samsung | @F: thank you!  We support FL proposal 3.1.2. We think that the capability signaling can be discussed and decided on later in RAN2. From our side, we have a slight preference for UE: Alt.2, gNB: Alt. 1 or 2. |
| Apple | We support the proposal and our preference is Alt 2 for UE capability reporting and for gNB configuration we prefer Alt 4. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following agreement was made.  **Proposed agreement 3.1.2**   * **Consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**   + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**   + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination** * **Consider following alternatives for gNB configuration regarding dual UL**   + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig**   + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair (combination of serving cells?)**   + **Alt.3: at least configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission**   + **Alt.4: No configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission, i.e., UE just assumes as it reports**   Companies preferenecs among alternatives are as below. Further discussion is necessary.   * UE capability reporting about supported UL Tx switching options   + Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination     - Apple, Xiaomi, CTC, CATT, LG, vivo   + Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination     - ZTE, Qualcomm, Samsung   + Alt.3: decide in RAN2     - Samsung, (ZTE) * gNB configuration regarding dual UL   + Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig     - LG, vivo, ZTE   + Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair (combination of serving cells?)     - CTC, CMCC, CATT, Xiaomi, LG, vivo   + Alt.3: at least configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission     - DCM   + Alt.4: No configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission, i.e., UE just assumes as it report**s**     - Apple, Qualcomm, Samsung     - Not support: vivo, DCM, LG |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 3.1.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | For gNB configuration, Alt 2 would also be acceptable, if Alt 2 is not supported by majority |
| CATT | For UE capability reporting, we can compromise to support Alt 2. For gNB configuration, in oder to reduce the complexity of configuration, we slightly prefer Alt.4 |
| Vivo4 | Reporting: prefer alt1, but alt2 is also acceptable  Configuration: alt1/2  One more comment for clarification, 1) in our witchedding, in Alt.1 (report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair) for UE capability reporting, UE should support co-current transmission on each band pair supporting dualUL. **Is this correct understanding?** 2) “supported band pair(combination of serving cells)” in alt3 for gNB configuration means all the cells configured on the supported band pair as band may be transpant in RRC configuration, **is this correct understanding? Hope FL or companies could confirm.** |
| MediaTek | For UE capability, Alt-2 is not clear to us. What is the interaction between “band combination” reporting and the “band pair” reporting? For example, for (A,B,C) band combination:   1. the UE report switchedUL for (A,B,C), then the UE report dualUL for each band pair (A,B), (B,C), (A,C).  * Does this mean the UE support “both” for all the band pair (because the UE reporting switchedUL in the “band combination” reporting and dualUL in the “band pair” reporting)?  1. the UE report “dualUL” (or “both”) for (A,B,C). Is there a need to “band pair” reporting?   Thus, we prefer Alt-1.  For gNB configuration, we prefer Alt-4. |
| Apple2 | Previous comment updated here (there was a typo):  For gNB configuration, Alt 2 would also be acceptable, if Alt 4 can not be supported by majority |
| CMCC | For UE capability reporting, we slightly prefer Alt 1.  For gNB configuration, we think Alt 1 or Alt 2 can be considered. |
| ZTE | One question for clarlfication, is the moderator’s inteintion to decide it now? If yes, we have the same comments as in previous round, i.e., trying to reusing the existing capability/signaling as much as possible. In other words, we support the following alternatives, which are exactly the same as what we have in Rel-16/17.   * + Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination   + Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig   If “**Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair”** is adopted, then it means mixed operation of swtichedUL CA and dualULCA is supported. This is what we want to avoid because the RRC configuration will become very complicated if one cell can belong to different band pairs. In addition, RAN1 has to discuss how to perform dynamic switching between switchedUL CA and dualUL CA, e.g., triggering mechanism, potential ambiguity issue as discussed in proposal 4.3.1.  Again, if RAN1 couldn’t decide among the alternatives, we can send them to RAN2 and ask RAN2 to decide. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Regarding capability Alt. 1, one question for clarification, whether a gNB can always configure “switchedUL” to a UE for only switchedUL operation if the UE reports switched UL for some band pairs and dual UL for the remaining band pairs? For example, a UE reports {switchedUL, switched UL, dual UL} for band pairs {A-B, B-C, A-C**}, the UE behavior between band pair A-B and B-C should follow the UE behaviors specified for the functionality of witched UL**. Because the switchedUL funcitionality is a subset of dual UL and has less RF requirement than dual UL, thus the UE should be also capable of switched UL at the band pair A-C. As a result, a gNB should always be able to configure “switchedUL” to the UE. Therefore, we suggest to add a note to Alt. 1,  **Proposal**: add the note below to Alt. 1.  *Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs.*  Additionally, In Alt. 1, “both” seems redundant and can cause forward compatibility issue as the issue addressed by the latest Rel-17 RAN2 LS. To simply the Alt.1 and save signaling overhead, an eviqualent to Alt.1 is proposed as Alt. 1b  **Proposal**: add a simplified version of Alt. 1   * + *Alt.1b: report { dualUL} for each band pair in the band combination*   *Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs.*  We prefer Alt. 1b for simplicity, also support Alt. 1 with the proposed note as 2nd priority.  For gNB configuration, CellGroupConfig is a signaling detail and thus put too much restriction on future RAN2 design. Suggest to replace “in CellGroupConfig” with “for all serving cells” in configuration Alt.1. Then we support the revised Alt.1. |
| OPPO | For UE capability, Alt 2 is preferred.  For gNB configuration, Alt 4 is preferred. |
| Samsung | From our side, we have a slight preference for UE: Alt.2. For gNB: Alt. 2 is acceptable if Alt. 4 can’t find support by majority of companies. |
| Qualcomm | For UE capability, we prefer Alt. 2, and ok to go with Alt. 3 – leave it to RAN2 make the decision. We are not ok with Alt. 1 as per band pair  For gNB configuration, we think this is a RAN2 issue and would suggest RAN2 to make decision. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For UE capability, Alt.1 and Alt.2 can achieve the same reporting granularity (i.e., UE can report whether the concurrent transmission is supported or not for each band pair in the band combination) and hence RAN1 can just ask RAN2 to decide.  On the other hand, for gNB configuration, RAN1 should discuss and decide either Alt.1/2/3 or Alt.4 since it results difference. In our understanding, usually gNB configuration is provided for a certain feature since even if UE reports the support of the feature, gNB may not support or may not use the feature. So, we prefer Alt.1/2/3 rather than Alt.4.  Alt.3 intends to achieve the same/similar configuration flexibility as Alt.2 (e.g., Alt.3 intends that {switchedUL, dualUL} is configured in CellGroupConfig and a list of paired serving cell IDs for concurrent transmission can be configured in ServingCellConfig for each serving cell), and hence we are fine to discuss between Alt.1 and Alt.2/3 for gNB configuration. In Alt.1, gNB just configures {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig and hence the UE cannot know exact band pairs to be used for concurrent transmission while the UE can just assume reported band pairs if dualUL is configured in CellGroupConfig. So, we prefer Alt.2/3 compared with Alt.1. |
| Google | For UE capability, we prefer Alt.1 and ok with Alt.3.  For gNB configuration, we prefer Alt.4. The gNB can control the switching mode by proper scheduling. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Since companies’ preferences are still diverse, can we ask RAN2 to decide as some companies suggested? At least for UE capability, Alt.1 or Alt.2 seems just detailed capability signaling design which is RAN2 work. In addition, I heard from RAN2 colleague that RAN2 had no online discussion at their Oct meeting and is waiting for inputs from RAN1/4.  For gNB configuration, at least whether configuration is necessary or not should be discussed in RAN1 as usual. It seems some of companies supporting Alt.4 (no configuration) can kindly accept Alt.2 (configuration of band pair(s) for concurrent transmission) for the progress, let’s try to see if the direction to have a certain configuration (Alt.1/2/3) is acceptable.  **Proposed agreement 3.1.3**   * **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**   + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**   + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination**   + **Alt.3: report {dualUL} for each band pair in the band combination**     - **Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs**   **Proposed agreement 3.1.4**   * **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for gNB configuration**   + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination)**   + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., for each band pair in the band combination)**   + **Alt.3: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination), and configure combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., as supported serving cell pair(s) for concurrent transmission)**   Some reply comments are also provided below.   * Regarding vivo’s question below, it is same understanding with FL that if the UE reports “dualUL” or “both” for specific band pair, the UE shall be capable of concurrent transmission on the band pair.   >in Alt.1 (report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair) for UE capability reporting, UE should support co-current transmission on each band pair supporting dualUL. **Is this correct understanding?**   * Regarding vivo’s question on the alt.3 of gNB configuration, the DOCOMO’s comment clarified the intension of the alt.3 as below.   > Alt.3 intends that {switchedUL, dualUL} is configured in CellGroupConfig and a list of paired serving cell IDs for concurrent transmission can be configured in ServingCellConfig for each serving cell.   * Regarding MTK’s question on Alt.2 of UE capability, the FL’s understanding based on ZTE’s detailed example is below.   + In Alt.2, reporting {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination is same as Rel-16/17. On top of this, since we agreed to support the complexity reduction option 1, the UE is allowed to support concurrent transmission only on some of band pair(s) within the band combination even if the UE supports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination. Therefore, reporting supported band pair(s) for concurrent transmission for the band combination is performed only when the UE supports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination, and it is necessary according to the complexity reduction option 1. If there is no report on the supported band pair(s) for concurrent transmission while the UE reports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination, gNB may assume that the UE supports concurrent transmission on all the band pairs within the band combination. * Regarding ZTE’s question on whether we are trying to decide now or not, yes, the FL intends to try to make further progress considering the limited TU/meeting by the RAN1 completion of this WI. We could list up possible alternatives and details on the UE capability and RRC configuration designs are RAN2 work according to the WID. So, we are trying to decide some basic principle so that RAN1 can ask RAN2 to design details. * Regarding ZTE’s comment on “mixed operation of swtichedUL CA and dualULCA is supported”, the FL thinks it is the consequence of complexity reduction option 1 where the UE is allowed to support concurrent transmission only on some of band pair(s) within the band combination. Alt.1 or Alt.2 is just signaling details that should be handled in RAN2 if RAN1 cannot reach consensus. * Regarding HW’s question below, the FL’s understanding is that if UE supports “both” for the band pair, gNB can configure either switchedUL or dualUL. But if UE supports “dualUL” for the band pair, the UE would not be capable of switchedUL for the band pair according to the Rel-16 capability principle on the supported options. But as HW pointed, basically the functionality of switchedUL would be a subset of that of dualUL. So, we can add suggested Alt.3 for further discussion.   > whether a gNB can always configure “switchedUL” to a UE for only switchedUL operation if the UE reports switched UL for some band pairs and dual UL for the remaining band pairs? |

**Proposed agreement 3.1.3**

* **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**
  + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**
  + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination**
  + **Alt.3: report {dualUL} for each band pair in the band combination**
    - **Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 3.1.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | Regarding FL’s reply on alt2: ‘*If there is no report on the supported band pair(s) for concurrent transmission while the UE reports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination, gNB may assume that the UE supports concurrent transmission on all the band pairs within the band combination*’ **we are not sure if this is common understanding in this group. If yes, should we also agree this**?  **Proposed agreement 3.1.3**   * **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**   + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**   + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination**     - **Note：If there is no report on the supported band pair(s) for concurrent transmission while the UE reports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination, gNB may assume that the UE supports concurrent transmission on all the band pairs within the band combination**   + **Alt.3: report {dualUL} for each band pair in the band combination**     - **Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs** |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s proposal |
| Apple | Support |

**Proposed agreement 3.1.4**

* **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for gNB configuration**
  + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination)**
  + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., for each band pair in the band combination)**
  + **Alt.3: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination), and configure combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., as supported serving cell pair(s) for concurrent transmission)**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 3.1.4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | Ok to support. We suggest the following change for clarity  **Proposed agreement 3.1.4**   * **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for gNB configuration**   + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination)**   + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., for each band pair in the band combination)**   + **Alt.3: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for all serving cells (i.e., for the band combination), and configure combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., as supported serving cell pair(s) for each band pair** **in the band combination) for concurrent transmission~~)~~** |
| Qualcomm | We support to ask RAN2 to define the gNB configuration. Given RAN2 is the WG to define the normative work we suggest making following updates.   * **Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives and specify gNB configuration** |
| Apple | Support |

## 3.2 Option 2: UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on some of bands out of configured bands for UL Tx switching

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding complexity reduction option 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 6:*** *For dynamic UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands,*   * *Option 1 can alleviate UE memory management for UL-CA Option2.* * *Option 4 cannot solve the UE memory issue and is unreasonable because the size of UE memory is not related to the number of band pair.* * *Option 2 has been supported by existing UE capability reporting.*   ***Proposal 5:*** *Confirm the working assumption with following revision for UL-CA Option 1*   * *UE complexity Reduction Option 2 is supported by reusing the existing UE capability reporting mechanism for uplink MIMO, e.g., per feature set reporting granularity.*   ***Proposal 6:*** *Confirm working assumption with following revision for UL-CA Option 2,*   * *UE complexity Reduction Option 2 is supported by reusing the existing UE capability reporting mechanism for uplink MIMO, e.g., per feature set reporting granularity.* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 5****: Regarding the complexity reduction for Rel-18 UL Tx switching, prioritize Option 2 (UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on some of bands out of configured bands for UL Tx switching).*   * *At least two bands should support up to 2 Tx* * *It is applied to both switched UL and dual UL.* * *It is applied to both 3-band case and 4-band case.* |
| [4] | 1. ***RAN1 can support Option 2: UE is allowed to report the supportive only 2 ports transmission only on some of bands out of configured bands for both 3 and 4 bands.*** |
| [5] | Observation 1: Option 1 and option 2 allow flexible UE implementation and reduce UE complexity.  **Proposal 1: If Option 1 and option 2 are supported, they can be applied for TX switching with 3 bands and TX switching with 4 bands. Moreover, option 2 can be applied for both switched UL and dual UL cases.** |
| [6] | **Proposal 11: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, to reduce UE complexity,**   * **UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases on 2 (out of 3 or 4) bands.** * **UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on at least 1 band out of configured bands.** * **UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time only for some specific switching cases/patterns.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Option 1 -4 are benefit for complexity reduction and can be considered to be specified.*** |
| [8] | **Proposal 2： From perspective of specification, UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission all of bands out of configured 3/4 bands UL Tx switching.**  **Proposal 3： UE also can be allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on some of bands of configured 3/4 bands, and the limitations is based UE capability reported.** |
| [9] | **Proposal 4**   * For Rel-18 multi-carrier Tx switching, at least Option 1 and Option 2 can be supported for complexity reduction.   + For Option 1, at least one band pairs need to support concurrent uplink transmission.   + For Option 2, at least two bands should support up to 2 Tx.   + UE capability is introduced UE to report concurrent uplink cases or 2 ports transmission on some of the bands that are supported for Tx switching |
| [11] | **Proposal 3. For Rel-18 UL Tx switching mechanism, 2 Tx transmission (0/1/2 ports) can be supported on any of 3 or 4 bands to provide scheduling flexibility and performance improvements.** |
| [12] | **Proposal #2: Revise the WA as follows.**   * **Remove Option 4** * **Add the following Notes and remove FFSs which is related to the Note**   + **Note: Rel-18 UL Tx switching should cover all switching cases which are supported in Rel-17.**   + **Note: Above option(s) can be applied for both 3 and 4 bands cases, if supported.** |
| [13] | ***Proposal 2: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, limiting/removing certain switching cases for certain bands/band combinations should be avoided:***   * ***Option 1, 2 and 4 from the WA should be considered with lower priority*** |
| [14] | **Observation 1:** *Full flexible port switching, e.g., any UE Tx chain can be mapped to any arbitrary band configurable for 3- or 4-bands UL Tx Switching is not a realistic assumption.*  **Observation 2:** *Support for full flexible 2p/1p/0p port switching in the NR band where UL MIMO is supported by the UE cannot be assumed.*  **Proposal 2:** *Rel-18 UL Tx Switching for 3 or 4 bands supports UE complexity reduction Options 1, 2 and 4*  **Proposal 3:** *For Options 1, 2 and 4, at least one band pair should be supported as in Rel-17 and UE capability indication is provided separately for 3 and 4 bands cases*  **Proposal 4:** *Options 2 and 4 are supported for both switched UL and dual UL cases* |
| [15] | 1. ***For UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands:***  * ***Support Option#1 and Option#2.*** * ***Do not support Option#4.*** * ***Consider Option#3 with the following modification: “UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time ~~(or interruption time) only~~ for ~~some specific~~ all switching cases/patterns”.*** |
| [16] | 1. Dynamic UL TX switching across 3 or 4 bands should include 2 TX transmission (i.e. 0/1/2 ports transmission) on any of the 3 or 4 bands. |
| [17] | **Observation 2: The complexity reduction Option 2 is applicable to both switched UL and dual UL scenarios. For UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands, there would be some implementations where a Tx chain is applicable to only some of 3 or 4 bands but not all bands so that 2 ports transmission cannot be performed on some band(s) among 3 or 4 bands.**  **Proposal 4: To ensure the clear performance gain of Rel-18 UL Tx switching with complexity reduction Option 2 over Rel-17 UL Tx switching where 2 ports transmission is supported for 2 bands, it is preferable to consider complexity reduction Option 2 with some condition, e.g., at least 2 or 3 bands should support 2 ports UL transmission for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands.**  **Proposal 8: At least following UE capability and RRC signaling should be considered for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands with potential complexity reduction options.**   * **UE capability regarding the supported band(s) for 2 ports transmission for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands**   + **Corresponding RRC signaling to configure up to 2 ports transmission mode for a band**     - **If the complexity reduction Option 2 is supported, UE may support up to 2 ports transmission only on some of bands, and hence UE/gNB needs to report/configure specific bands where up to 2 ports transmission is possible/expected. Existing parameters such as *uplinkTxSwitching-2T-Mode* in *CellGroupConfig* and *uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier* in *ServingCellConfig* may or may not be reused.** |
| [18] | **Proposal 3: For inter-band UL CA Option 1 and Option 2 without SUL for UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands, adopt following Options for complexity reduction with the highlighted revisions.**   * **Identify an anchor band in the switching band combination among the bands.** * **Direct switching is only between anchor band and non-anchor band.** * **Indirect switch between non-anchor bands is allowed and revised Option 3 as below.**   + **Indirect switch means that the gap time is increased, which in principle allows going through a two-step RF state switch sequence {non-anchor  anchor  other non-anchor}, irrespective of whether transmission in anchor in the middle state is performed or not.**   + **Revised Option 3: UE is allowed with more ~~preparation procedure time (or~~ interruption time~~)~~ only for non-direct switching band pairs ~~some specific switching cases/patterns~~.**      - **The non-direct switching band pairs could be reported as UE capability and/or configured by network.**     - **The longer interruption time could use the sum of the two switches and no RAN4 work is expected.** * **No restriction on the UEs choice of MIMO capability on any of the bands/CCs involved in the Rel-18 UL Tx switching band combination** * **After one RF state switch, the next RF state switch must occur after 14 symbols or later.**    + **Which SCS assumed for symbol duration is TBD.** |
| [19] | **Observation 1: Option 2 can be satisfied by using Rel. 16, Rel. 17 band pair capability and with a new UL Tx switching band pair capability for 1T-1T case (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*-r18 and *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18*).**  **Proposal 1: UE should support Option 1, 2 and 3 by introducing new band pair UE capability for 1T-1T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-1T-r18), 1T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-2T-r18), and 2T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*2T-2T-r18) Tx states, each band pair parameter includes**   * **a uplink Tx switching option indication (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18*), and** * **a Tx switching period (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod1T1T-r18*)** |
| [20] | **Proposal 4: Complexity reduction Option 2 is supported:**   * **Do not require the UE to support 2-port transmission in all the bands in a UL Tx Switching band combination** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support complexity reduction option 2 for both switched UL and dual UL [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [11], [12], [14], [15], [17], [18], [19], [20]   + Regarding the restriction on number of bands to be supported for 2 ports transmission:     - At least two bands for both 3 bands and 4 bands [3], [9]     - At least one band for both 3 bands and 4 bands [6]     - At least three bands for both 3 bands and 4 bands [11]     - At least two bands for 3 bands and at least three bands for 4 bands [17]     - Only for dual UL [9]     - No restriction [12], [18]   + UE capability to report the supported bands [2], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [12], [14], [17], [18], [19]     - Reuse existing capability reporting mechanism for UL MIMO e.g., per FS [2], [7], [20]   + RRC signaling to indicate up to 2 ports transmission mode for a band [17]     - Existing parameters for Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching may or may not be reused [17] * Complexity reduction option 2 should be considered with lower priority [13] * The design should not impose restriction on 2 ports transmission, but the complexity can be addressed by capability [16] |

It seems that majority is ok to support the complexity reduction option 2 based on the UE capability. The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 3.2**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**
  + **FFS on potential restriction**
    - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed [in RAN2]**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed [in RAN2]**
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt. 1 as this is inline with current MIMO layer which is already a UE capability.  To correctly includes this, we propose revision of major bullet to include Alt. 1.   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some or none of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability** |
| ZTE | We are open to consider this proposal for complexity reduction. Regarding the three alternatives above, our first preference is Alt.3 as we commented in last meeting since Rel-17 already supported 2-ports on 2 bands. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 3.2. Regarding potential restriction, our preference is Alt.3 to ensure the performance improvement compared with Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | As commented for previous proposal, our first preference is to agree on some of the principles that allow reduced UE complexity by considering additional time for at least new switching cases (compared to Rel-16/17). In principle, we are fine with Qualcomm’s proposed updates |
| CATT | Support the updated proposal by Qualcomm. UL MIMO layer is already a UE capability in the current spec. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with the proposal. Considering the potential restriction, we slightly prefer Alt 3, it is reasonable to extend the capability that more than 2 bands can support 2 ports transmission in Rel-18 UL Tx switching, which may provide more performance gain and flexibility. |
| Vivo | Support, we can support alt3 as it is already supported in R17 |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 3.2 |
| Xiaomi | Similar comments as previous proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support. And we further agree to go with QC suggestion to resolve the FFS with Alt 1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt. 3 to improve the flexibility compared to Rel-17 Tx switching scheme. |
| Google | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK except that the following bullet should be FFS or be added with RAN1 as task group, because it requires RAN1 inputs similar to Rel-17 discussion before the RAN2 detailed signaling design. We are not sure the Rel-17 RRC configuration can be reused here.   * + **FFS: Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed [in RAN1& RAN2]** |
| China Telecom | We support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK. Our preferred alternative is Alt3 as this is the baseline Rel-17 already |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority supports this proposal, and further discussion among Alt.1/(2)/3 seems necessary.  Similar to the proposal 3.1, following small modification is possible based on the feedbacks so that RAN1 can discuss at least some basic principles of UE capability and RRC signaling.   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some or none of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**  **Updated Proposed agreement 3.2**  * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**   + **FFS on potential restriction**     - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**   + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed ~~[in RAN2]~~**   + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed ~~[in RAN2]~~**   + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 3.2**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**
  + **FFS on potential restriction**
    - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed**
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 3.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the FL proposal.  Rel-18 UL Tx switching provides a generic framework to support up to 4 bands switching, while Rel-16/17 are specific cases focusing only two bands. Alt. 1 should be generic enough to cover all possibilities. Restrictions on one or two bands with up to 2 ports UL Tx would lose the generity & flexibility or even set some barriers when combine some specific bands only with 1 layer capability for UL Tx switching in the future. |
| ZTE | We are basically fine with this proposal. However, regarding “FFS on potential restriction”, we propose to change it to “further down-select the following alternatives”. Using “FFS” may be unfair for Alt.2/Alt.3 since if there is no conclusion on this, it basically means Alt.1 from our perspective. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the updated FL proposal. |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the FL proposal |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the FL proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There are existing MIMO mechanisms to setup MIMO mode and should be reused instead of being replaced. Here the focus is to facilitate the switching gap determination of UL Tx switching, which is in line with the following Rel-17 agreement. Therefoere, a small revision is,  **Details on the gNB configuration/indication for facilitating switching gap determination such as whether/how to additionally indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed**  RAN1#107-e  **Agreement:**   * For a UE capable of 2Tx-2Tx switching and configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, to differentiate the switching delay for 1Tx-2Tx switching from that for 2Tx-2Tx switching, a new RRC parameter is used to indicate 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode. * If 1Tx-2Tx mode is derived by the new RRC parameter, then there is on one uplink (or one uplink band in case of intra-band) configured with *uplinkTxSwitching*, on which the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources should be 1 and non-codebook based UL MIMO is not configured. RAN1 assume the uplink is configured with RRC parameter “carrier1” by RAN2*.* * The default value of the new RRC parameter is 1Tx-2Tx switching mode. * In a configured switching mode, the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode. * Note: This RRC parameter doesn’t imply any restriction on application of non-codebook transmission together with UL Tx switching. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks and flexibility for the progress!  The suggested update from ZTE and Huawei seems reasonable and hence it is reflected.  The updated proposal will be provided in the GTW session as stable one.  **Updated Proposed agreement 3.2**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**   + **Further down-select from the following alternatives**     - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**   + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed**   + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication facilitating switching gap determination such as whether/how to additionally indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed**   + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following proposal was agreed at the GTW session.  Proposed agreement 3.2  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**   * + **Further down-select from the following alternatives**     - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**     - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**   + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed**   + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to additionally indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed**   + Existing MIMO mechanism for MIMO mode indication should be reused   + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction**   Based on the agreement, we can further discuss alternatives regarding the restriction as well as some details (or at least some high-level principles) on the UE capability and the gNB configuration/indication. So, companies are encouraged to provide their views on the alternatives, the UE capability and the gNB configuration/indication regarding supported band(s) for 2 ports UL transmission. |

#### 3rd round Feedback form for 3.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | We don’t have strong preference in terms of the alternatives. On gNB configuration/indication, similar comment as for proposed agreement 3.1 |
| New H3C | We slight prefer Alt.1 without any restriction and are open for other altenatives. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt.3 to achieve at least the same performance and flexibility as Rel-17 UL Tx switching. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding the alternatives on possible restriction, we prefer Alt.3 as we commented in 1st round to ensure performance gain from Rel-16/17. We can compromise to Alt.2 as Rel-16 supports only one band for up to 2 ports transmission and extension from it for 3 or 4 bands may be possible.  Regarding UE capability and gNB configuration/indication, we think existing capability/configuration framework can be reused to some extent. However, existing parameters can only differentiate 1T-2T and 2T-2T while they may not be able to differentiate 1T-2T-2T, 1T-1T-2T, etc. for 3 bands and more cases in 4 bands. So, we think extension of capability/configuration would be necessary. |
| ZTE | As we commented in the previous round discussion, we prefer Alt.3 in order to enjoy the performance gain of Rel-18 UL Tx switching compared with Rel-16/17.  Regarding the MIMO capability reporting and configuration, we think the existing signalling can be mostly reused. |
| China Telecom | For the switching between two bands in Rel-16&17, one or two bands support up to 2 ports UL transmission depending on UE BandCombinationList-UplinkTxSwitch-v1700 capability reporting, which means at least one band within the two bands supports up to 2 ports. When extending to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18, it should not require all the Ues have the capability supporting up to 2 ports on at least two bands. It also restricts the feature to be applied for some lower frequency bands not supporting 2Tx. |
| Vivo | we are ok to consider the forward compatibility with R16/R17 UL Tx switching. Thus, we prefer alt 2 or alt 3. |
| CMCC | We are open to further discuss the detailed restrictions, and we slightly prefer Alt 3, in our views, configuring 2 or more bands to support 2 ports transmission in Rel-18 UL Tx switching may provide more performance gain and flexibility. |
| CATT | Alt.1 is preferred, since it can provide more possibility and flexibility to both of UE and network. The main difference between Alt.1 and Alt.2/Alt.3 is whether support the case of 1T+1T+1T/1T+1T+1T+1T for 3/4 bands or not. In our understanding, the UE/gNB can get some gains by selecting 1-port band for UL transmission among 3 bands or 4 bands subject to UE capability.  For the MIMO capability reporting and configuration, we think the existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Alt.1 which is with most flexibility.  Rel-18 UL Tx switching provides a generic framework to support up to 4 bands switching, while Rel-16/17 are specific cases focusing only two bands. Alt. 1 should be generic enough to cover all possibilities. Restrictions on one or two bands with up to 2 ports UL Tx would lose the generity & flexibility or even set some barriers when combine some specific bands only with 1 layer capability for UL Tx switching in the future.  For example, if one operator only wants Tx switching among three 1Tx bands (e.g. sub 2GHz), Alt.2 or 3 would not work as most likely all of the three bands would only have 1 Tx each. Even for same band pair (e.g. A+B) of Rel-17 extendingg to three or four bands (e.g. A+B+C+D), it would be hard to guarantee the same antenna ports for same band pair (A+B) due to RF & power constrains. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.3 should be precluded because in real deployment there could be two low frequency bands where Ues cannot be capable of 2Tx UL-MIMO. We propose to preclude Alt.3 first.  Regarding whether Alt.1 or Alt.2, we would like remind that it is coupled with whether UE memory sharing is supported or not. We may have to decide what is the minimum UE memory unit in Rel-18 first if UE memory sharing is introduced.  The reasons are the following,   * UE memory sharing needs extra standand efforts but this is the last second RAN1 meeting. * The less bands are reported with UL-MIMO, the less UE RF memory is needed. However, some companies have proposed that UE memory sharing is a prerequisite for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. * If Alt. 1 is agreed now, then we may have to spend standard efforts to support UE memory sharing for a UE reporting only 1Tx-1Tx-1Tx for 3 bands, which we prefer to avoid. Because 2Tx+2Tx UL Tx switching and 2Tx+(intra-band 2Tx+2Tx) UL Tx switching have been supported without UE memory sharing, we fell that the Rel-18 UE above can be equipped with the same size of UE memory as Rel-17 and then has no UE memory issue.   Therefore, we propose to adopt Alt. 2, or the following proposal (revised Alt. 1),  ***Proposal-alt****:*  *For band combinations of Rel-18 UL Tx switching, a UE can report up to 2-port MIMO capability on any band with no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands.*   * *UE memory sharing is not needed for the following combination of MIMO capabilies on bands*   + - *1Tx+1Tx+1Tx band combination*     - *1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination*     - *FFS: 1Tx+2Tx+2Tx band combination*     - *FFS: 1Tx+1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination*   If the above proposal cannot be agreed, for the sake of progress, we suggest to continue the discussion on the maximum dimemsion (i.e. UL-MIMO plus number of band) of band combinations that are not worth standard efforts on introduction of UE memory sharing. |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with NTT DOCOMO that Alt 2 or Alt 3 is preferred to ensure performance gain from Rel-17. |
| OPPO | Existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused and no additional spec work is considered. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Regarding alternatives, the moderator would like to propose Alt.2 as compromise since companies’ views are distributed among Alt.1/2/3.  **Proposed agreement 3.2.1**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**  Regarding UE capability, it seems many companies think existing UL-MIMO capabilities can be reused. On the other hand, regarding gNB configuration, we can have further discussion e.g., on whether/how existing parameter such as uplinkTxSwitching-2T-Mode is used assuming UE may support up to 2 ports UL transmission on 1 or 2 or 3 (or 4) bands. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal.  If it is not agreeable, as commented above, to avoid standard efforts to support UE memory sharing for some band combinations requiring smaller UE memory than Rel-17, we propose a revised Alt.1  ***Proposal-alt****:*  *For band combinations of Rel-18 UL Tx switching, a UE can report up to 2-port MIMO capability on any band with no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands.*   * *UE memory sharing is not needed for the following combination of MIMO capabilies on bands*   + - *1Tx+1Tx+1Tx band combination*     - *1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination*     - *FFS: 1Tx+2Tx+2Tx band combination*     - *FFS: 1Tx+1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination* |
| New H3C | Support in principal |
| LG Electronics | Fine with Proposed agreement 3.2.1 |
| ZTE | Although it is not our preference, we can compromise to support Proposed agreement 3.2.1 for progress.  Regarding the nw proposal from Huawei, companies has discussed memory sharing in the 1/2 round of discussion. Since it is highle related to different UE implementation, it is impossible to achieve any consensus on this aspect. We propose not to spend more time discussing the detailed memoery sharing proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check whether proposal 3.2.1 is agreeable. |

**Proposed agreement 3.2.1**

**If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 3.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal for sake of progress. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the proposal |
| MediaTek | We are not sure if this proposal needed. |
| Vivo3 | support |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal for sake of progress. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for FL’s promotion, but we still prefer Alt. 1 as it could reuse current per FS UL MIMO capability which could reduce the spec efforts largely.  Alt. 1 provides most flexibility and not prevent any possibility if operator wants to mandate UL MIMO on any specific band during profiling phase. |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal 3.2.1 |
| Apple | Fine to support |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  The proposal 3.2.1 seems fine for almost all companies but it seems MTK and QCM have preference on Alt.1.  Again, this is the compromised proposal from the moderator given the situation. Even if there is no consensus, any alternative cannot be considered as the default one. So, the moderator would like to ask companies to consider the proposal again for the progress.  **Proposed agreement 3.2.1**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 3.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Fine to support |
| CATT | We prefer to support Alt.1. The UE/gNB can get UL date rate/UL capability gains by selecting 1-port band for UL transmission among 3 bands or 4 bands subject to UE capability. It is better to not put additional restrictions on the UL-MIMO capability among 3 or 4 configured bands. |
| Vivo4 | support |
| Xiaomi | Fine to support. |
| MediaTek | We don’t see a need to the proposal. We should have such requirement if RAN1 thinks that R18 Tx switching will not work unless “*at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission*”. If there is no such issue, we shouldn’t arbitrary introduce such “minimum requirements”.  It will be good if some explain what will be the issue with R18 UL-Tx-switching if the proposal is not supported. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the proposal |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. Alt.1 is also OK to us. |
| ZTE | We support the Proposed agreement 3.2.1. Even in Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching, at least one band should support 2-port transmission, we think this is a baseline and the proposal is a good way forward. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If it is confirmed that no UE memory sharing is supported, then we agree with MediaTek that the proposal is unnecessary.  To make the proposal useful, we suggest,  **Proposed agreement 3.2.1**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, if UE memory sharing is supported for a band combination, then at least two band in the band combination should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands** |
| OPPO | We share the views from Qualcomm and MTK. In addition, Alt-2 requires that one 2-port band has to support both Tx switch modes for both 3-band and 4-band cases. It does not sound like a “restriction”, but a requirement of at least one “superman” band. We think such decision should need RAN4 inputs. |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks FL’s promotion, but sorry our preference is Alt. 1 – no MIMO layer restriction on any band.  As we explained for many times, Alt. 1 as it could reuse current per FS UL MIMO capability which could reduce the spec efforts largely.  From specification efforts perspective, we also think Alt.1 is with less efforts compared with above proposal. Alt. 1 allows spec reusing current MIMO layer capability and almost with no additional efforts. The above proposal would require UE to report which band is the “special” band.  Furthermore, this bundle might restrict operators’ flexibility to configure some 1Tx bands with UL Tx switching. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. We think companies supporting this proposal or Alt.2 argued following points, and it seems not related to UE memory sharing issue.   * In Rel-16, the UE needs to support up to 2 ports on one of the two bands. * In Rel-17, the UE needs to support up to 2 ports on both of the two bands. * Rel-18 UL Tx switching should ensure the performance gain from Rel-16/17.   In addition, it was discussed for the proposal 3.2 that any of alternatives cannot be assumed as default one if we cannot reach consensus to select one alternative. So, we don’t think the proposal is unnecessary.  For the progress, we can accept Alt.1. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  The situation is summarized as below.   * Support the compromised proposal: Apple, vivo, Xiaomi, LG, CMCC, CTC, ZTE, Samsung, DCM * Not support the proposal and prefer Alt.1: CATT, OPPO, Qualcomm   + Can accept Alt.1: CTC, DCM * No need this proposal: MTK, HW(if no memory sharing)   Regarding the necessity of this proposal, as in above DOCOMO’s comment, it was discussed for the proposal 3.2 that any of alternatives cannot be assumed as default one if we cannot reach consensus to select one alternative. We need to have a decision to complete the agreement on the support of complexity reduction option 2.  Based on the above situation, the FL would like to try another way. As some companies can kindly accept Alt.1 (no restriction on the number of bands supporting up to 2 ports) for the progress, is it acceptable for all considering the RAN1 completion of this WI?  **Alternative Proposed agreement 3.2.1**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, there is no restriction on the number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**  Some reply comments are also provided below.   * Regarding HW’s comment on the UE memory sharing, as already commented by some companies, we could not reach consensus on the UE memory sharing issue due to different implementations/assumptions. We should not consider the UE memory sharing aspects anymore. * Regarding OPPO’s comment on “Alt-2 requires that one 2-port band has to support both Tx switch modes for both 3-band and 4-band cases. It does not sound like a “restriction”, but a requirement of at least one “superman” band. We think such decision should need RAN4 inputs”, there is misunderstanding. Alt.2 does not intend to mandate to support both Tx switch modes. This discussion is only about the restriction (or requirement) on the number of bands supporting up to 2 ports for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. It just says that a certain restriction (or no restriction in case of Alt.1) is applicable to both switching modes and both 3 bands case and 4 bands case. * Regarding QCM’s comment on specification efforts, the FL’s understanding is that any alternative will bring additional specification effort. It is only about minimum required number of bands supporting up to 2 ports. How to report the UL MIMO capability and how to configure UL MIMO can be same for all alternatives. |

**Alternative Proposed agreement 3.2.1**

**If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, there is no restriction on the number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 3.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks FL’s promotion and considerable proposal. We support FL’s alternative proposed agreement 3.2.1. |
| Apple | Support |

## 3.3 Option 3: UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time (or interruption time) only for some specific switching cases/patterns

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding complexity reduction option 3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 4:*** *From UE memory perspective, each unit of memory serves each band, instead of band pair or switching path.*  ***Observation 7:*** *The same mechanism of memory sharing is applicable to both UL-CA Option 1 and 2. But with the same limited UE memory size, there is more scheduling restriction to minimize transmission interruption for UL-CA Option 2 than UL-CA Option 1 simply because more UE memory are occupied at one time for UL-CA Option 2 than UL-CA Option 1.*  ***Observation 8:*** *Memory sharing is useful but not essential for UL-CA Option 1.*  ***Observation 9:*** *Since UL-CA Option 1 is an operation subset of UL-CA Option 2, the mechanisms of memory sharing can be also applicable to UL-CA Option 1 if memory sharing are introduced for UL-CA Option 2.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Confirm working assumption with following revision for UL-CA Option 2,*   * *UE complexity Reduction Option 2 is supported by reusing the existing UE capability reporting mechanism for uplink MIMO, e.g., per feature set reporting granularity.* * *UE complexity Reduction Option 3 with additional preparation time is supported and only required if either of the following switching condition meets*   + *Switching condition 1: the number of bands within a band set that contains all transmitted bands involved in both determinations of the triggered UL Tx switching and its preceding UL Tx switching is more than X*   + *Switching condition 2: the number of bands within a band set that contains all transmitted bands involved in determination of the triggered UL Tx switching is more than X for UL-CA Option 2*   + *The additional preparation time can be reported by UE*   + *Minimum interval between the triggered UL Tx switching and its preceding UL Tx switching is Y(us)*   + *The reduction Option 3 should be common solution and also applicable to UL-CA Option 1*   + *FFS: the value of X and Y* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 7****: Study potential performance impact if more preparation procedure time or more interruption time is introduced. If it is introduced, UE supports per BC report on whether/how much more preparation procedure time or more interruption time is needed.* |
| [4] | 1. ***RAN1 can support Option 3: UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time for some specific switching cases for both 3 and 4 bands.*** 2. ***Switching cases that require more preparation procedure time can include more than 2 bands involved in one switching.*** |
| [5] | Proposal 3: It is suggested to make more clarification on option 3, including which switching cases to apply a longer preparation time and how to indicate the longer preparation time. |
| [6] | **Proposal 11: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, to reduce UE complexity,**   * **UE is allowed to support only some of concurrent UL cases on 2 (out of 3 or 4) bands.** * **UE is allowed to support 2 ports transmission only on at least 1 band out of configured bands.** * **UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time only for some specific switching cases/patterns.** |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Option 1 -4 are benefit for complexity reduction and can be considered to be specified.*** |
| [8] | **Proposal 4：For the UE that can pre-stored two bands RF parameter configuration, the following cases that more preparation procedure time are necessary**   * **Case 1: one new band is involved on the next transmission state, and the new band is not any band included in current UL TX switching band pair.** * **Case 2: two new bands are involved on the next transmission state, and the two new bands are all not same as bands in current UL TX switching band pair.**   **Proposal 5：For the UE that can pre-stored three bands RF parameter configuration, the following case that more preparation procedure time is necessary**   * **Case 3: one new band is involved on the next transmission state, the new band is not any of current UL TX switching band pair whose RF parameter are stored in firs two memory units or not the band whose RF parameter is stored in the third memory unit.**   **Proposal 6: when the special switching is occurring, which band(s) RF parameter will be replaced by new band transmission shall be specified.**  **Proposal 7：The duration of more preparation procedure time can be a reference slot, and the reference slot can be same as SCS of configured for the band transmission. And it may not be RAN4 issue**  **Proposal 8：The earliest timing of more preparation procedure for loading new band parameter can be as following**   * **On the start of first symbol of uplink transmission whose band parameter will be replaced by new band transmission.**   **Proposal 9：It does not include interruption happens during the preparation procedure time. And it should not include switching period.**  **Proposal 10：The report/indicate the specific switching cases/patterns is necessary, and UE capability reported is based on number of band RF parameter configuration can be pre-loaded, the range of number is {2,3,4}.**  **Proposal 11：Minimum interval between two succeeding special UL Tx switching can be duration of prepare time. And the special UL Tx switching case refers to the cases that need preparation procedure time.** |
| [9] | For Option 3, the main motivation is to allow more preparation time for a UE with shared memory across different bands. In this case, memory flushing and reloading is needed in case of Tx switching. Note that this option may need input from RAN4 on the exact preparation time for Tx switching, which highly depends on specific UE implementation. Further, this additional preparation time may impose certain restriction on the gNB scheduling for dynamic Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, and also degrade the system performance. |
| [10] | ***Observation 4:*** ***UL Tx switching across more than two bands may increase UE memory.***  ***Proposal 3: UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands once band pair is changed.***  ***Proposal 4: The preparation procedure time needs to be defined independently.***  ***Proposal 5: UE doesn’t expect any uplink transmission during preparation procedure time caused by band information updating.***  ***Proposal 6: The preparation procedure time needs to be reported to the gNB.***  ***Observation 5: The values of the preparation procedure time needs insights from RAN4.*** |
| [11] | From our perspective, Option 3 was proposed to address UE complexity issue related to UE memory sharing and hardware resources. The specific switching cases/patterns that require more preparation procedure time needs to be identified firstly, which also need RAN4 involvement to determine whether extra preparation time is needed for these specific switching cases, and whether different value can be reported for the band pair with the specific switching cases/patterns also need to be discussed. |
| [12] | **Proposal #3: Additional preparation time (as a UE capability) can be supported only for the switching cases newly introduced in Rel-18.**  **Proposal #4: The minimum interval between two succeeding Tx switching should be defined separately depending on the number of bands involved with the Tx switching.** |
| [13] | ***Proposal 1: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, the baseline assumption is that UE is not mandated/required to have increased memory requirements compared to Rel-16/17 switching across 2 bands***   * ***Memory sharing is assumed for 3 or 4 bands (2 memory units shared across 3 or 4 bands)***   ***Proposal 3: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, support additional preparation/processing time reporting by UE for the cases where at least one of the two memory units is actively used for a band for UL transmission in the preceding state and the same memory unit needs to be reallocated to a different band for UL transmission in the succeeding state:***   * ***Case 1: Switching from State 1: 1Tx (band A) – 1Tx (band B) to State 2: 1Tx (band C) – 1Tx (band D)*** * ***Case 2: Switching from State 1: 1Tx (band A) – 1Tx (band B) to State 2: 2Tx (band C or band D)*** * ***Case 3: Switching from State 1: 2Tx (band C or band D) to State 2: 1Tx (band A) – 1Tx (band B)***   ***Proposal 4: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, RAN1 should consider further restriction in terms of minimum duration between two consecutive switching instances***   * ***FFS whether such minimum duration is applied only to new switching cases in Rel-18*** |
| [14] | **Proposal 5:** *For Option 3, RAN4 to discuss and decide the need and applicability for increased interruption and preparation procedure time for some specific switching cases/patterns* |
| [15] | 1. ***For UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands:***  * ***Support Option#1 and Option#2.*** * ***Do not support Option#4.*** * ***Consider Option#3 with the following modification: “UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time ~~(or interruption time) only~~ for ~~some specific~~ all switching cases/patterns”.*** |
| [16] | ***Observation 3 To support Alt 1 while addressing the claimed UE complexity, the notion of anchor band to switch a TX chain to/from, can be reflected properly in the procedure such that the relaxed UE complexity does not result in scheduling complexity.***  ***Proposal 5 Apply the following procedures for dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands:***  ***• Indicate N band(s) among 3 or 4 bands are configured as anchor band(s).***  ***• N = 1 for dynamic UL TX switching across 3 bands***  ***• N = 2 for dynamic UL TX switching across 4 bands (FFS N=1)***  ***• For an indicated UL transmission, if after the preceding UL transmission, the UE is under operation state that is different from the ending state, and if none of the bands in the ending and operation states are an anchor band, the UE expects that the indicated UL transmission to occur after at least a gap of duration X after the end of the proceeding transmission.***  ***• Note: Operation state refers to the state of Tx chains on two bands before an indicated UL transmission***  ***• Note: Ending state refers to the state of Tx chains on two bands after transmission of an indicated UL transmission***  ***• FSS on X (e.g. slot duration corresponding to the band w largest SCS)*** |
| [17] | **Observation 3: The complexity reduction Option 3 is applicable to both switched UL and dual UL scenarios. For UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands, there would be some implementations where UE memory flushing and loading are necessary for the specific switching patterns such as followings.**   * **Switching from a case where Tx chains are on two bands (e.g., band A and B) to another case where Tx chains are on different band from the two bands (e.g., band C) assuming the memory size of 2** * **Switching from a case where Tx chains are on one band (e.g., band A) to another case where Tx chains are on different bands from the band (e.g., band B and C) assuming the memory size of 2** * **Switching from a case where Tx chains are on two bands (e.g., band A and B) to another case where Tx chains are on two different bands from the two bands (e.g., band C and D) assuming the memory size of 2 or 3**   **Observation 4: The additional preparation procedure time is different from the switching period. During the procedure for the memory flushing for band A and loading for band B, UL transmission on the band A and/or B would not be possible, while if another unit of the memory has band C information and no flushing/loading is performed in the unit, UL transmission on the band C would be possible even during the memory flushing/loading at another unit.**  **Proposal 6: The complexity reduction Option 3 should be considered as possible optional restriction based on UE capability.**   * **Reporting the UE memory size is required, while reporting/indicating specific switching patterns where the additional preparation procedure time is required would not be necessary.**   **Proposal 8: At least following UE capability and RRC signaling should be considered for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands with potential complexity reduction options.**   * **UE capability regarding the supported memory size for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands**   + **There is no such capability for Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching, and hence new capability signaling is necessary if the complexity reduction Option 3 is supported.**   + **Corresponding RRC signaling would not be necessary since UE and gNB can have common understanding regarding when the additional preparation procedure time is necessary for the UE based on the memory size reported by the UE.** |
| [18] | **Proposal 3: For inter-band UL CA Option 1 and Option 2 without SUL for UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands, adopt following Options for complexity reduction with the highlighted revisions.**   * **Identify an anchor band in the switching band combination among the bands.** * **Direct switching is only between anchor band and non-anchor band.** * **Indirect switch between non-anchor bands is allowed and revised Option 3 as below.**   + **Indirect switch means that the gap time is increased, which in principle allows going through a two-step RF state switch sequence {non-anchor  anchor  other non-anchor}, irrespective of whether transmission in anchor in the middle state is performed or not.**   + **Revised Option 3: UE is allowed with more ~~preparation procedure time (or~~ interruption time~~)~~ only for non-direct switching band pairs ~~some specific switching cases/patterns~~.**      - **The non-direct switching band pairs could be reported as UE capability and/or configured by network.**     - **The longer interruption time could use the sum of the two switches and no RAN4 work is expected.** * **No restriction on the Ues choice of MIMO capability on any of the bands/CCs involved in the Rel-18 UL Tx switching band combination** * **After one RF state switch, the next RF state switch must occur after 14 symbols or later.**    + **Which SCS assumed for symbol duration is TBD.** |
| [19] | **Observation 2: Option 3 can be satisfied by using Rel. 16, Rel. 17 band pair switching period indication and with a new UL Tx switching band pair switching period indication for 1T-1T case (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod1T1T-r18*).**  **Proposal 1: UE should support Option 1, 2 and 3 by introducing new band pair UE capability for 1T-1T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-1T-r18), 1T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*1T-2T-r18), and 2T-2T (e.g. *ULTxSwitchingBandPair*2T-2T-r18) Tx states, each band pair parameter includes**   * **a uplink Tx switching option indication (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18*), and** * **a Tx switching period (e.g. *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod1T1T-r18*)** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support complexity reduction option 3 [2], [4], [6], [7], [8], [10], [12], [13], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19]   + Switched UL and/or Dual UL     - Only for Dual UL [2]     - For both Switched UL and Dual UL [2], [17]   + Definition of additional preparation procedure time or interruption time     - Additional preparation procedure time is required when memory is flushing and reloading [2], [3], [4], [6], [8], [10], [13], [17]     - UL transmission on a band for which the memory is flushing and reloading cannot be performed [2], [6], [10], [13], [17]     - UL transmission on a band for which the memory is flushing and reloading is possible and memory flushing/reloading can start after the start of the UL transmission [8]     - The value of additional preparation time or interruption time should be discussed in RAN4 [5], [9], [10], [11]       * How long additional preparation time is required can be discussed in RAN1 [8], [12], [18]     - Additional preparation time can be within a reference slot (minimum interval between two UL Tx switchings) and does not include interruption and switching period [8]     - Additional preparation time is required when switching between non-anchor bands is performed and it is minimum gap from the end of the preceding transmission to succeeding transmission [16]     - Longer interruption time which is sum of two switching periods for indirect switching [18]     - Longer interruption time based on per band pair switching period [19]   + Specific switching cases/patterns     - When the number of bands involved for a switching exceeds the memory size [2], [8], [17]     - When the memory of a band combination including 3 or 4 bands is larger than a bandwidth threshold [3]     - When more than 2 bands are involved for a switching [4], [10], [12], [13]     - All switching cases/patterns [15]     - When none of the bands involved in the switching is an anchor band [16], [18]   + UE capability     - Reporting the memory size [2], [8], [17]     - Reporting whether/how long the additional preparation time is needed [2], [3], [4], [6], [7], [10], [12], [13]     - Reporting the cases requiring the additional preparation time [5], [7]     - Reporting per band pair switching period [19]   + Anchor band(s)     - One anchor band is indicated among 3 bands configured for UL Tx switching, and two anchor bands are indicated among 4 bands configured for UL Tx switching [16]     - One anchor band is identified among 3 or 4 bands configured for UL Tx switching [18] * Study potential performance impact due to additional preparation procedure time or interruption time [3], [9] * Further clarification is necessary [5], [11] * RAN4 should discuss and decide the need and applicability for additional preparation procedure time or interruption time [14] * Memory sharing across bands is possible and necessary in some cases [2], [6] * Memory is related to supported bandwidth of each band [3] * Memory is necessary for each switching band pair and cannot be shared by different band pairs [18] |

It seems that majority is ok to support the complexity reduction option 3 in principle, but there are some different understandings on the implication of the complexity reduction option 3. In addition, companies may have different implementations in mind regarding the memory used for UL Tx switching. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following discussion points to reach some common understandings.

### **Proposed discussion 3.3**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide views on following points**
  + **Q1: Regarding the memory unit**
    - **Option 1: memory unit is related to number of bands**
    - **Option 2: memory unit is related to bandwidth of each band**
    - **Option 3: memory unit is related to number of band pairs**
  + **Q2: Regarding the memory sharing and definition of additional preparation time or interruption time**
    - **Option 1: memory sharing is possible, and additional preparation time is a time required for memory flushing and reloading where UL transmission cannot be performed on a band for which the memory is flushing and reloading**
    - **Option 2: memory sharing is not possible, and additional interruption time is a time required for indirect switching such as a sum of two switching periods**
  + **Q3: Regarding the memory size**
    - **Option 1: memory size is UE capability**
    - **Option 2: only same memory size as in Rel-17 is assumed**
  + **Q4: Regarding the value of additional preparation time or interruption time**
    - **Option 1: it should be discussed in RAN1**
    - **Option 2: it should be discussed in RAN4**
  + **Q5: Regarding the specific switching case/pattern where the additional preparation time or interruption time is necessary**
    - **Option 1: only when the number of bands involved for a switching exceeds the memory size**
    - **Option 2: when bandwidth of 3 or 4 bands exceeds a certain threshold based on the memory size**
    - **Option 3: only when none of the bands involved in the switching is an anchor band**
    - **Option 4: all switching cases/patterns**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Based on RAN4 input, R4-2214464, “*For UL switching period with Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, RAN4 agreed to reuse the same set of values as in Rel-16/17, i.e., {35 us, 140 us, 210 us} for UL CA and SUL*.”, we don’t see a need for new switching period from RF perspective.  However, if there are some Ues require more PUSCH preparation time due to having more configured carriers, then this should be applicable to all the switching cases within the 3 or 4 bands.  Regarding the “meomory sharing”, it is not clear to us at what level this sharing is done, is it for “RF configurations”? or is it for “L1/RRC configurations”? Anyway, we don’t think RAN1 should discuss such detailed UE implementations. All what RAN1 need to discuss if there is a need to introduce new UE capability for extra PUSCH preparation time or not. |
| Qualcomm | Please find our response to the questions.  Q1: There are two types of memory used for UL transmission, which includes the memory storage of UL data and the RF memory for switching accessed by RF components for Tx switching. To optimize the fast switching the UE needs larger memory to store the RF configurations, status and some data before and after switching. The first memory storage is for each band but the memory for RF is needed for each switching band pair. Our most concerned memory is the 2nd - memory for RF which is per band pair.  Q2: The answer is Option 2 as the memory for RF could not be shared and thus additional interruption time is needed for indirect switching between band pairs.  Q3: Considering Rel-18 requires switching among 3 or 4 bands, the memory would be likely larger than Rel-17. However, as it could not be shared UE may not need to directly report its memory as a UE capability.  Q4: For indirect switch, the switching period could use sum of two switches as starting point.  Q5: we prefer Option 3. |
| ZTE | First of all, the emory sharing is highly dependent on the implementation, we don’t think it helps to discuss memory sharing in RAN1. In addition, the previous RAN1 simulation results are based on the legacy switching period, if requires additional processing delay or interruption time is required, more simulation is needed to justify the potential gain for this case.  Below, we share our views in terms of the above questions raised by FL.  Q1: Our understanding is Option2. A band with 10MHz bandwith clearly requires less memory compared with a band with 100MHz.  Q2: We don’t think memory sharing is possible for both switchedUL and dualUL cases. Since Tx switching is done dynamically, frequent memory sharing operation e.g. flushing is needed to catch up with Tx switching, which is not realistic in most of the cases.  Q3/Q4: We don’t think RAN1 can determine how to report UE memory size, which highly depends on UE implementation and has never been specified in NR.  Q5: We are negative on memory sharing and it is impossible define specific switching case/pattern for memory sharing. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Although our understanding/assumption so far is as below, it seems different companies have different understanding/assumption on the memory according to their implementation. However, as we can observe from the summary that majority wants to have this complexity reduction option, and the support of this option would be the most important point to confirm the working assumption for some companies. So, we may need to consider some general way to cover different assumptions or to support multiple options.  Q1: Option 1  Q2: Option 1  Q3: Option 1  Q4: Option 1  Q5: Option 1 |
| New H3C | Q1: our understanding is Option 2  Q2: our understanding is Option 2  Q3: our understanding is Option 1  Q4: our understanding is Option 2  Q5: our understanding is Option 3 |
| Apple | We think that spending time discussing specific implementation related to memory sharing may not be helpful in this regard. In our view, all the proponent companies including us for option 3 realize that regardless of how exactly implementation is done, it is beneficial to introduce additional preparation/interruption time.  So probably the main point of discussions is covered by Q4, Q5 and partially Q1.  Nevertheless, here are our responses for the questions  Q1: Option 1  Q2: Option 1, but also fine with option 2  Q3: Either option, but just to clarify we don’t expect any capability reporting related to memory sharing to be introduced  Q4: Option 1  Q5: Option 1 |
| CATT | Sharing our views on the proposed questions as follows:  Q1: Memory unit is related to UE implementation. We slithtly pefer to adopt Option1 as the baseline to further discussion.  For option 2, memory unit is related to bandwith of each band. That means, if the bandwidth configured for two CCs within the same band is the same, the number of memory units is one; otherwise, the number of memory units is two.It is a bit confused that the number of memory unit is related to the bandwidth configuration.  Option 3 means that each band pair requires one memory unit. The number of memory will increase with the number of supported band pairs, at most 6 memory units for 3 bands and at most 10 memory units for 4 bands. In our understanding, these memory units will not work at the same same. Assuming a UE capability of dual UL, only two bands of one band pair can be scheduled/ configured simultaneously. Only the associated memory unit works and other memory units are idle state. The efficiency of memery unit is very low.  Q2: We support the memory sharing is quivale and additional preparation time is a time required for memory flushing and reloading. **But the UL transmission can performend on a band for memory is flushing and reloading.**  As shown in the figure, the baseband chip sends related RF parameter to memory unit via C-1 interface, which is the process for memory flushing and reloading. Next, the related RF parameter of memory unit will be witteren to FR hardware via C-2 interface, and then UL transmission can be quivalen. Once the related RF parameter of memory unit will be witteren to FR hardware, the memory unit can perform flushing and reloading for next transmission. In another word, the UL transmission and flushing and reloading of memory can be perforemend in parallel.    Q3: We slight prefer Option1.  Q4: Option1. The additional preparation time should be discussed in RAN1.  Q5: Option is preferred. When the number of bands involved for a switching doesn’t exceeds the memory size, the quivalent time is not required at all. |
| LG Electronics | For Q1-Q3: We have similar view with MediaTek that RAN1 does not need to discuss such detailed implementation options.  For Q4: We don’t think the value(s) of additional preparation/interruption time should be discussed in RAN1. Rather, we think RAN1 may discuss, if needed, on those values only in RAN1’s perspective (e.g., additional PUSCH preparation time), not in general (e.g., any interruption time).  For Q5: Although we also think this issue is better to be discussed in RAN4, we slightly prefer Option 1 among the listed options. Regarding Option 3, it is unclear to us why should a discussion here be with an anchor band concept while the general Tx switching mechanism is already agreed as WA without considering such concept. And, if Option 4 is adopted, it would be an inefficient operation for the switching cases involved with only 2 bands. |
| Vivo | Memory sharing is heavily dependent on the UE implementation, we don’t think it is helpful to discuss or define how the memory sharing is working in RAN1. The intention of option3 is to allow a more relaxed the timeline for switching and processing, from RAN1’s quivalent, RAN1 only need to decide whether the timeline can be extended or not. |
| Samsung | We are generally not supportive for more procedure and processing time and consider this undue complexity when extending Rel-17 UL Tx Switching to the 3 and 4 bands cases. One issue is UE implementation complexity. Changes to the procedure and processing timeline to joggle memory to (fast) load pre-stored configurations would appear to ease the UE implementation. On the other hand, it requires more sophisticated inter-process management and complicated BB/RF control. The net effect that we except is that it makes the UE implementation of the Rel-17 feature more complicated. An additional concern different UE behavior depending on transmission case and release which also need to be captured by modem control.  We are open to consider increased interruption time (>210 us) for some selected Rel-17 switching cases/patterns if really necessary. This however should be decided by RAN4 (non-withstanding the earlier LS) and on a per-case basis. |
| Xiaomi | Our preference on each question is shown as below:  Q1: Option 1  Q2: Option 1  Q3: Option 2  Q4: Option 2  Q5: Option 1 |
| Ericsson | For Q1 to Q3, We think these areimplementaiton specific. To elaborate, when UL Tx switching on more than 2 bands add extra complexity, that is addressed by the corresponding capability. The reason is not important.  When a NW knows a UE is capable, what is needed to be specified is whether additional gap as compared to exiting one is needed (Q4), and better insite that how it is handled when applying the feature from 2 bands to 3 /4 bands (Q4).  Therefore, with the understanding of capability in place, we think we need to focus on Q4 and Q5 that in fact reflect the underlying implementation constraints in specification language.  For Q4: Option 4.   * We lean towards RAN4, but we think both WGs should be involved. That can be handled by LS.   For Q5: Option 3   * The reason is as explained before, we need to see the delta complexity as compared to Rel17. By configuration (e.g. based on indicated capability), an anchore band is determined and additional interruption time, if any, would be applicable. That simplified both operation of NW and UE implementation when extensing the support from 2 to 3 / 4 bands. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that this highly depends on UE specific implementation on memory sharing. We do not think RAN1 has the expertise to discuss this issue. |
| Google | We think that UE does not have to report memory size to the base station, the complexity reduction can be covered by reporting different switching time and num  Q4: Option 1  Q5: Based on the switching period reported per band pair. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More detailed analysis for the questions above are provided in our tdoc R1-2208427.  Maybe we can focus on Q1 and Q2 first to align views.  Q1: Option 1 per-band.  Q2: Option 1 sharable. Because a UE supporting multiple bands can be configured by RRC on any one of the bands with one sharable memory. It is universe feature in current network, irrespective of UL Tx switching. We don’t feel RF memory cannot be shared among bands, otherwise, Ues have to prepare exclusive RF memory for each band, which is not economical one. Additionally, if some UE implementation had exclusive RF memory for each band and no sharing is needed, then both bands could be operated simultanenously. It makes no sense to introduce additional spec impact for such case of exclusive RF memory in the first place.  Q4: preparation time is discussed in RAN1, which is the main reason for RAN4 to leave the memory sharing issue to RAN1. For interruption time, it is up to RAN4 and RAN4 has made decision on it. So no need further discussion in RAN1 for it.  Q5: Option1, which depends on the outcome of Q1. |
| China Telecom | RAN4 had recommended RAN 1 to discuss the UE memory sharing issue in the reply LS: “RAN4 would like to recommend the UE memory sharing issue to be further discussed in RAN1 if necessary.” We share with LG’s view the WA takes Alt.1 without considering the anchor band concept. Our understanding is option 1 for Q1~Q3. For Q5, we think the bands involved for previous switching and the current switching should be checked. |
| Nokia, NSB | Questions 1-3 are related to UE internal implementation and should not be a subject to 3GPP specification. It maybe helpful to understand different quivalention architectures of the Ues, but this should stay beyond specifications themselves.  Q4: value of additional preparation time. This is a RAN1 discussion, BUT **it should be clearly understood by the proponents that if additional UE preparation time is allowed, then the Rel18 switchig implementation in the network cannot leverage the Rel-16/17 switching implementation.** New switching gap implementation is required, additional performance loss due to longer gaps would need to be factored in when determining if there is any point in configuring the UE to >2 bands. There is no point in features that ensure that each and every UE architecture can be ensured to be able to implement it, no matter what the impact to performance or fragmentation to the system implementation.  Q5: The only acceptable relaxation for the system compatibility is option 3. This can be supported by the system with existing switching framework without additional loss to performance. It maybe expected that the Pcell (with PUCCH) is typically a party in switching anyway so vast majority of the switching cases would likely include the Pcell as either the source or the target. Still, to be clear, we do not support option 3 either, but it is the only one of the options that doesn’t break system compatibility when adding more bands on top of Rel-17 functionality. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  As many companies commented, it seems we cannot converge on a single common assumption on the memory or memory sharing issue as it is highly related to implementations. Nevertheless, according to the contributions and the summary, majority wants to support the complexity reduction option 3 in some sense.  So, maybe we can try to have a possible generalized proposal to cover different implementations as below. **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**  * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional preparation time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**   + **UE can report information regarding required additional preparation time for specific switching patterns**     - **FFS on the value of the additional preparation time**       * **Alt.1: same as value for switching period (for specific switching pattern)**       * **Alt.2: different from the value for switching period, e.g., like minimum separation between switchings**       * **Alt.3: ask RAN4**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**     - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional preparation time is necessary**       * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**       * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **UE has some restriction during the additional preparation time**     - **FFS on the details of restriction**       * **Alt.1: same as switching period where no UL transmission is possible for all bands and there may be DL interruption for some band(s) as well**       * **Alt.2: only restriction on UL transmission on some bands (not all bands)**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL** |

**Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional preparation time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**
  + **UE can report information regarding required additional preparation time for specific switching patterns**
    - **FFS on the value of the additional preparation time**
      * **Alt.1: same as value for switching period (for specific switching pattern)**
      * **Alt.2: different from the value for switching period, e.g., like minimum separation between switchings**
      * **Alt.3: ask RAN4**
      * **Other alternative is not precluded**
    - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional preparation time is necessary**
      * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**
      * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**
      * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**
      * **Alt.3: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**
      * **Other alternative is not precluded**
  + **UE has some restriction during the additional preparation time**
    - **FFS on the details of restriction**
      * **Alt.1: same as switching period where no UL transmission is possible for all bands and there may be DL interruption for some band(s) as well**
      * **Alt.2: only restriction on UL transmission on some bands (not all bands)**
      * **Other alternative is not precluded**
  + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 3.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for FL’s proposal and efforts to merge the proposals together.  Based on previous discussion, our understanding there are at least two different proposals covered in this Option. One proposal needs additional preparation time without any UL Tx interrupted, and another (our) proposal wants some additional switching time as for some band pair (non-anchor to non-anchor) would need double switch time.  For major bullets, we have concern on using “preparation time” as this is used for UE or Network internal processing without UL transmission interrupted, which also pointed out by some companies in previous meeting. We prefer to use other neutral wording or just remove “preparation”. |
| Vivo | Thanks for FL’s update.  For alt1 in the “FFS on the value of the additional preparation time”, we would like ask for clarification: the additional preparation time is separate from the switching period, right? If not, e.g, if additional preparation time includes switching period, then alt1 means no additional time for sharing.  Alt2 for restriction in the 2nd sub-bullet is not clear to us. Does it mean that UE apply the additional preparation time only for UL on some bands in the configured 3/4 bands? If yes, we prefer to revise the wording   * + - * **Alt.2: additional preparation time is applied for ~~only restriction on~~ UL transmission on some bands (not all bands)** |
| ZTE | Similar view as othe companies, it is impossible to discuss and agree on the UE implementation on memory sharing. Based on the input from different companies, there are already several different implementation flavors already. Thus, we agree that we should not continue the discussion of quiva sharing at least in RAN1. If companies see the need to discuss it, companies can submit tdocs to RAN4.  Then in terms of more preparation time and intertuption time, as we commented in the 1st round discussion, proponents of more preparation time and interruption time should bring simulation results to show the performance impact. The condition to agree to support UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands is the performance gain. The previous simulation results assume no additional preparation time and interruption time. Thus, the performance impact should be discussed at the first place.  Agreeing on the proposal without a clear understanding on the detailed number of preparation time or interruption time is not meaningful. For example, if companies require a pretty large preparation time or interruption time, then the necessity to have R18 UL Tx switching is questionable. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | Updated formulation of the proposal seems better to us. We are fine with three main bullets.  Regarding the 1st main bullet,   * For the 1st FFS, we are fine with reporting a value of the additional preparation time for specific switching pattern. However, it is unclear to us if “switching period” in the proposal refers to one value of {35 us, 140 us, 210 us}. If so, we are not sure the switching period can be sufficient as an additional preparation time for any switching pattern. For clarify, it does not mean that RAN4 involvement is needed for determining the value. In this perspective, we support Alt 2. * For the 2nd FFS, we prefer Alt 1 due to its full flexibility. We can think the situation that one UE may require an additional time due to the number of bands involved for a switching but another UE may require due to sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching. To address these cases with one principle, Alt 1 can be a reasonable solution.   Regarding the 2nd main bullet, we are open to discuss on either alternative. Alt 1 can give a better complexity reduction as well as this is analoguos to Rel-17, but Alt 2 can be beneficial for some UE.  The last main bullet is FFS. We can further discuss after the previous two main bullets are concluded. |
| Samsung | As we indicated in our 1st Round comments, we are generally not in favor of allowing for more preparation time. We are not sure to understand the updated FL proposal and some clarification from FL during online presentation is appreciated. Does the additional preparation time for some specific switching patterns then explicitly include the actual switching time or rather not? |
| OPPO | We support this proposal in principle.  Given there is not much time left in RAN1 for this WI, maybe it deserves a consideration to merge “preparation time” into “switch time”, so as to avoid dealing with a new concept in specification.  We are also not quite sure about the value of “**Alt.3: ask RAN4**” given the cycle of LS between RAN1 and RAN4 might miss the RAN1 ending time for this WI. |
| Apple | In principle, we support the proposal  However, on the 1st FFS regarding the value of the additional time, we think qui this should be hanled in RAN1, as RAN4 already concluded on switching period values. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For a UE configured with Rel-18 4-band UL Tx switching, if the scheduled transmissions are only on two of 4 bands, e.g. at slot#1 on carrier#1, slot#2 on carrier#2, slot#3 still on carrier#1, then there is no UE memory needed. In this case, the UE behavior should be the same as Rel-16/17, i.e. no additional preparation time is needed.  Therefore, a note is suggested to add,  Note: If the UE is scheduled only between two out of 4 bands, then the Rel-16/17 UE behavior is reused, i.e. if an UL Tx switching and its previous UL Tx switching are triggered only between the same two bands, then no additional preparation time is needed. |
| MediaTek | As we commented in earlier, RAN4 already provided input on switching gap by reusing the same set of values as in Rel-16/17, i.e., {35 us, 140 us, 210 us}, and we don’t see a need for new “interruption” to be introduced in RAN1.  Also, we are fine with having UE capability for longer PUSCH preparation time (N2) due to having more configured carriers, however this should be applicable to all the switching cases within the 3 or 4 bands. Otherwaise, there could be piplining issues due to different PUSCH preparation times. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  I tried to address companies’s comments as much as possible in the following updated proposal. We can further discuss during GTW session. Please note that as I clarified, this proposal is to cover different implementations in general manner.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional ~~preparation~~ time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**   + **UE can report information regarding required additional ~~preparation~~ time for specific switching patterns**     - **FFS on the value of the additional ~~preparation~~ time**       * **Alt.1: same as value for switching period (for specific switching pattern), i.e., no additional reporting is necessary**       * **Alt.2: different from the value for switching period, e.g., like minimum separation between switchings**       * **~~Alt.3: ask RAN4~~**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**     - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional ~~preparation~~ time is necessary**       * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**       * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **UE may have some restriction during the additional ~~preparation~~ time**     - **FFS on the details of restriction**       * **Alt.1: same as switching period where no UL transmission is possible for all bands and there may be DL interruption for some band(s) as well, e.g., for indirect switching, additional time is one additional switching period followed by another switching period**       * **Alt.2: additional time is applied for ~~only restriction on~~ UL transmission on some bands (not all bands) e.g., additional time is scheduling offset/restriction for some bands**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Based on the discussion in GTW session, it seems better to discuss another possible direction such as possible solution for a certain assumption rather than generalized solution covering different assumptions.  The updated proposal is based on the “memory sharing” assumption as it is mentioned in RAN4 LS and large number of companies. Also, it can be noted that UE can report the switching period for each band pair, i.e., if longer switching period is necessary for specific band pair for the UE, the UE can report longer switching period value for the band pair. RAN4 also agreed that existing switching period values are sufficient for UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands. So, this reporting mechanism would already address “indirect switching” assumption.  Maybe we can discuss following updated proposal.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional preparation time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**   + **Additional preparation time is required before performing UL Tx switching for specific switching patterns. During the additional preparation time, UE is not expected to perform UL Tx switching [and UL transmission on bands involved in the specific switching pattern]**     - **FFS on the value of the additional preparation time**   + **UE can report information regarding required additional preparation time for specific switching patterns**     - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional preparation time is necessary**       * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**       * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL**   + **Note: UE can report the switching period for each band pair, i.e., if longer switching period is necessary for specific band pair for the UE, the UE can report longer switching period value for the band pair** |

**Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional preparation time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**
  + **Additional preparation time is required before performing UL Tx switching for specific switching patterns. During the additional preparation time, UE is not expected to perform UL Tx switching [and UL transmission on bands involved in the specific switching pattern]**
    - **FFS on the value of the additional preparation time**
  + **UE can report information regarding required additional preparation time for specific switching patterns**
    - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional preparation time is necessary**
      * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**
      * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**
      * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**
      * **Alt.3: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**
      * **Other alternative is not precluded**
  + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL**
  + **Note: UE can report the switching period for each band pair i.e., if longer switching period is necessary for specific band pair for the UE, the UE can report longer switching period value for the band pair**

#### 3rd round Feedback form for 3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | We support the proposal. In terms of alternatives, our preference is Alt 1 |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the proposal. Based on the sharing memory assumption, additional preparation time is only needed when UE needs to update or reload band information. For example, band pair is switching from A+B to B+C. Hence we want to understand what the common understanding on switching pattern: is it the change of band pairs within the supported band combination? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. Regarding alternatives, although our original proposal is Alt.3, we can accept Alt.1 as it may be the most flexible one to indicate specific switching patterns. |
| ZTE | As we commented in the previous round and commented online, the performance impact should be considered. Whether to support Rel-18 UL Tx switching is on hold, one of the mian reasonas is that companies argued that longer switching time / preparation time/ interruption time will impact the reparation and repa make it less meaningful to support Rel-18 UL Tx switching. Before knowing the detailed numbers of additional preparation time/ interruption time and the performance impact, it is difficult for us to accept this proposal at this stage.  Meanwhile, all the 4 alternatives under the second FFS are highly dependent on the UE implementation, we doubt companies can reach consensun on this. Although we don’t support this proposal, we think a more general alternative for it would be the following. Then in this case, we don’t need to define switching patterns such kind of thing.  Alt.5: UE reports whether/how long additional time is needed for each band pair. |
| Vivo | Typo:  **Alt.~~3~~4: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**  The note is confusing, the main bullet is about preparation time which is expected for memorysharing instead of switching, while the note below talks about longer switching period. What’s the relationship between them?  Currently, UE reports switching period per band pair, and surely UE can report the a larger value if needed, that’s how UE works, we don’t understand why we need this note.   * + **Note: UE can report the switching period for each band pair i.e., if longer switching period is necessary for specific band pair for the UE, the UE can report longer switching period value for the band pair** |
| CATT | We support the proposal. For the specific switching pattern reporting, we support Alt.1. As analys in our tdoc, the specific switching pattern is related the number of memory supported by UE. Alt.1 is a very straightforward and effective methd to identify which case(s) require the additional reparation time. |
| Qualcomm | Sorry, we could not accept this due to following considerations.  We prefer to keep the additional interruption time and have concern on additional preparation time as some key questions are not addressed as below.   * For additional interruption time, RAN4’s agreement on switching period values are sufficient for UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands are based on the assumption. It’s not clear whether this is only for direct switching or double switching. Our understanding these values are direct switching period as any band could be anchor band for direct switching. Therefore, the additional inturption time should be discussed & agreed in RAN1 as some extreme case (e.g. 210us additional UL interruption time) could not be covered by the value set. * We are not convinced with the additional preparation time as the solution is not clear to us.   + As we commented in last RAN1 meeting, long preparation time would cause long scheduling issue due to lack of out of order scheduling mechanism. Specifically, due to the out-of-order restriction, once a grant is sent *X* preparation procedure time (e.g. 500us) in advance, there cannot be any other grant be sent to fill in the time. Therefore, in order to avoid the interruption, all grants will have to be sent 500us in advance, irrespective of which CC they are scheduling and irrespective of whether they require memory re-load. Sending all grants X preparation procedure time (e.g. 500us) in advance is not really workable given that the gNB wants to make scheduling decisions for all Ues at the same time.   + Whether UL interruption is potentially needed. Even companies claim the transmission could be maintained during the preparation, but we don’t understand how the transmission could be kept without any additional eruptionion when memory reflushing & reloading. If this interruption is needed, we would suggest explicit indicate this.   + How long the preparation time is needed. Is there any typical value we can refer to for potential analysis? The evaluation in some proponents’ paper is just assumption without any solid analysis why this special value works. Or is there any outcome from RAN4 that what’s the value is?   It would be highly appreciated If proponents could provide Insight of the above questions on additional preparation time. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with FL proposal in general. Some revisions are suggested below.  Regarding the “during the additional preparation time”, it should be interpreted as a window ending at the starting symbol of the current transmission instead of a window starting at the ending symbol of PDCCH scheduling the current transmission. Therefore, we suggest  **During the additional preparation time (i.e. a window lasts for the additional preparation time and ends at the starting symbol of the current scheduled transmission), UE is not expected to perform UL Tx switching**  Regarding reporting switching pattern, Alt 3 only covers the case of one switching, e.g. Band A+BandB switched to Band C+Band D. For two succeeding switchings, e.g. Band A switched to Band B then switched to Band C, a new alterative is needed. We suggest,   * Alt.3-rev: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching(s) where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching or for the switching and its preceeding switching   Regarding additional interruption time, it should not be introduced because of RAN4 LS. Furthermore, we would like to proponents to clarify why SwitchedUL needs such additional interruption time. It seems to us that only DualUL needs more interruption time based on discussions. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal in principle and prefer Alt 1 due to its full flexibilities than others.  Other comments   * Note in the last bullet does not seem to be necessary. It might be details to be further discussed. * If the updated proposal is based on the assumption of “memory sharing”, it would be better to specify this assumption in the proposal. Now the proposal was written in general sense while the moderator said that it is for UE with “memory sharing”. |
| OPPO | We support the intention of proposal. And if new terminology,i.e. preparation time, is introduced, further discuss is needed for interaction between preparation time and switch period. Due to limited TU, we prefer to reuse switch period to reduce spec work and avoid restriction on UE implementation.  Although UE can report switching period for each band pair, it can not fully solve the concern in option 3, e.g. memory sharing. For example, in the following two cases where Tx switch occurs from Band A to C, 1st case needs memory sharing time due to the involved band number exceeds 2, while 2nd case does not. So the required time to switch from band A to C in 1st case is larger than that in 2nd case.   * Case 1 of Tx switch from A to C: A(1T)+B(1T) -> B(1T)+C(1T). * Case 2 of Tx switch from A to C: A(2T) -> C(1T or 2T).   One simple way is to report **switch period for each specific switching patterns**, which can help to solve memory sharing issue and to avoid new terminology and implementation restriction. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It is observed that almost all companies can support the principle of the updated proposal, while there are two companies having strong concern on the principle of the updated proposal.  Given this situation, one possible way is to have separate complexity reduction options for different assumptions based on the UE capability, or some general way as the moderator tried before.  **Alt.1: support the updated proposal in principle, and also support another proposal to allow additional interruption time**  **Alt.2: support the reporting of whether/how long additional time is needed for each band pair**  **Alt.3: support the updated proposal in principle**  **Alt.4: do not support complexity reduction option 3**  We need to have further discussion on above directions first, and then details can be discussed. The moderator believes some compromise/flexibility is necessary to make progress and complete this item on time. If we cannot reach consensus on any of above potential directions, we would need to consider whether we should continue working on this objective or stop working and focus on MC scheduling objective given limited TU/meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the updated proposal with some refinements, as suggested above.  If it is not agreeable, as commented in proposal 3.2, a better alternative is to discuss   * whether or not the Rel-18 UE memory size is supposed not to be smaller than Rel-17 UL Tx switching (2Tx+2Tx UL Tx switching and 2Tx+(intra-band 2Tx+2Tx) UL Tx switching have been supported without UE memory sharing in Rel-17), * the maximum dimemsion (i.e. UL-MIMO plus number of band) of band combinations that are not worth standard efforts on introduction of UE memory sharing.   The reasons are the following,   * UE memory sharing needs extra standand efforts but this is the last second RAN1 meeting. * The less bands are reported with UL-MIMO, the less UE RF memory is needed. * Because 2Tx+2Tx UL Tx switching and 2Tx+(intra-band 2Tx+2Tx) UL Tx switching have been supported without UE memory sharing, we fell that the Rel-18 UE above can be equipped with the same size of UE memory as Rel-17 and then has no UE memory issue.   Therefore, we propose  ***Proposal****:*  *For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, UE memory sharing is not needed for the following combination of MIMO capabilies on bands*   * *1Tx+1Tx+1Tx band combination (if agreed in proposal 3.2)* * *1Tx+1Tx+1Tx+1Tx band combination (if agreed in proposal 3.2)* * *1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination* * *FFS: 1Tx+2Tx+2Tx band combination* * *FFS: 1Tx+1Tx+1Tx+2Tx band combination* |
| New H3C | Support Alt.1 |
| ZTE | Thanks moderator for the effort.  We share similar view as moderator that we need to first discuss some some general way first. Regarding the four alternatives listed by moderator, our understanding is the following.  Alt.1: Companies even havn’t reach consensus on whether more preparation time is needed or whether more interruption time is needed. And if they are needed, what would be the detailed numbers and what would be the performance impact. Before understanding the details, we are not sure how companies can agree on Alt.1.  Alt.2: This may be a more generic solution and common to different UE implementations. However, similar issue as Alt.1, companies need to identify whether it is preparation time or interruption time and what would be the performance impact.  Alt.3；Similar comments as for Alt.1  Alt.4: If companies can’t reach consensus, then we think this should be the default one.  Regarding Huawei’s comments “Furthermore, we would like to proponents to clarify why SwitchedUL needs such additional interruption time. It seems to us that only DualUL needs more interruption time based on discussions”, I think you have already give an good example on whether switchedUL may need more interruption time, i.e.,   |  | | --- | | Example copied from Huawei’s previous comment.  *For two succeeding switchings, e.g. Band A switched to Band B then switched to Band C, a new alterative is needed. We suggest,*   * *Alt.3-rev: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching(s) where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching or for the switching and its preceeding switching* |   Also, we don’t think the epara is only related to the number of bands. Instead, it should take into lots of aspects, e.g., bandwidth, RF configurations, etc. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the FL’s efforts to promote the discussion.  We propose to agree on additional UL interruption time, which is with clear motivation and limited standard impact.  We feel not good to be forced to agree on something with quite lots of open issues never been addressed. Until now, we don’t fully understand how additional preparation and related memory sharing work as our above questions on additional preparation time have never been answered.  We understand the limited TU constraints, in sprite of compromise, if proponents could clarify following questions we may be ok with updated Alt. 2.  1. what’s typical value or value set for additional preparation time? The only value porponents mentioned is 0.5ms, is there any reference or rational for this value?  2. is there any additional UL/DL interruption during additional preparation?  3. If yes to Q2, is the additional interruption time equal to the additional preparation time?  4. If no to Q3, what’s the expected additional interruption time is?  5. Beyond additional time, any spec impact for additional preparation foreseen?  As compromist, we could accept Alt.1 with following revised Alt.1  **Alt.1: support the updated proposal in principle, and also support allow additional interruption time at the same time.** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | The proposed working assumption is updated based on the feedbacks (from companies ok with the proposal in principle).  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.3**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have additional preparation time for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**   + **Additional preparation time is required before performing UL Tx switching for specific switching patterns. During the additional preparation time, UE is not expected to perform UL Tx switching [and UL transmission on bands involved in the specific switching pattern]**     - **FFS on the value of the additional preparation time**   + **UE can report information regarding required additional preparation time for specific switching patterns**     - **FFS on the details of information including how to report/identify the specific switching patterns where additional preparation time is necessary**       * **Alt.1: reporting specific switching patterns explicitly**       * **Alt.2: reporting anchor band(s) and specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching**       * **Alt.3a: reporting number of bands and specific switching patterns are switching(s) where larger number of bands than reported number are involved for the switching or for the switching and its preceeding switching**       * **Alt.4: reporting bandwidth threshold and specific switching patterns are switching where sum of bandwidth among bands involved for the switching exceeds the threshold**       * **Alt.5: reporting whether/how long additional time is needed for each band pair**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL**   + **~~Note: UE can report the switching period for each band pair i.e., if longer switching period is necessary for specific band pair for the UE, the UE can report longer switching period value for the band pair~~**   Also, to allow additional interruption time or extended switching period, following proposal can be checked.  **Proposed working assumption 3.3.1**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to have extended switching period for specific switching patterns based on UE capability**   * + **The extended switching period is required to perform UL Tx switching for specific switching patterns.**   + **UE can report information regarding required extended switching period for specific switching patterns**     - **Alt.1: reporting anchor band(s). The specific switching patterns are switching where none of anchor band(s) is involved for the switching. The extended switching period is sum of switching periods from non-anchor to anchor band and from anchor to another non-anchor band.**     - **Alt.2: reporting** **switching period for each switching patterns instead of each band pair**   + **FFS it is applicable only for dual UL or for both switched UL and dual UL**   If neither proposal 3.3 nor 3.3.1 is agreeable even in principle, we can check the suggestion from Huawei.  **Proposed conclusion 3.3.2**  **Neither additional preparation time nor extended switching period is necessary at least for the following combination of MIMO capabilies on bands for Rel-18 UL Tx switching (if supported)**   * **1Tx-1Tx-1Tx band combination** * **1Tx-1Tx-1Tx-1Tx band combination** * **1Tx-1Tx-2Tx band combination** * **FFS: 1Tx-2Tx-2Tx band combination** * **FFS: 1Tx-1Tx-1Tx-2Tx band combination** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following conclusion was made in GTW session.  Conclusion:  No consensus in RAN1 on complexity reduction option 3 |

## 3.4 Option 4: UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for tx switching

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding complexity reduction option 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 5:*** *Both* ***complexity reduction*** *Option 1 and Option 4 are dedicated only to UL-CA Option 2.*  ***Observation 6:*** *For dynamic UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands,*   * *Option 1 can alleviate UE memory management for UL-CA Option2.* * *Option 4 cannot solve the UE memory issue and is unreasonable because the size of UE memory is not related to the number of band pair.* * *Option 2 has been supported by existing UE capability reporting.* |
| [3] | ***Observation 2****: For complexity reduction Option 4, UE can achieve the same reporting flexibility as complexity reduction Option 1 by indicating different band pairs for switchedUL and dualUL. Meanwhile, the switchedUL/dual UL indication remains as per BC (band combination) report.*  ***Proposal******6****: If one of complexity reduction Option 1 and complexity reduction Option 4 is to be adopted, then Option 4 is supported.* |
| [5] | Proposal 2: If UE capability is reported per band pair, Option 4 can be considered. |
| [6] | This option limits the flexibility for one Tx switching procedure and would result in more switching times with possible longer total switching period. For example, Tx switching is performed across 3 bands and Tx switching is not supported between the second band and the third band. When the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on the second band, and the third band is the best band for next UL transmission, the Tx should switch to the first band firstly and then switch from the first band to the third band. The switching period takes the two switching times into account which may be longer than directly switching from the second to the third band. |
| [7] | ***Proposal 1: Option 1 -4 are benefit for complexity reduction and can be considered to be specified.*** |
| [9] | For Option 4, it is not clear the benefit of only supporting some of band pairs for Tx switching for complexity reduction. This can be realized by appropriate configuration for Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. |
| [10] | ***Proposal 1: There should be no restrictions on the band pairs for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.*** |
| [11] | Considering whether to support only some of band pairs for UL Tx switching, our understanding is that this may have great impact on network scheduling flexibility, which is contrary to the motivation of flexible spectrum utilization. Besides, the principle of selecting the band pairs that support UL Tx switching need to be clarified, otherwise, different UE can support different band pairs, which may result in the increasing network implementation complexity. |
| [12] | * Regarding Option 4, we have the similar view on the first three FFSs. However, we believe that Rel-17 UL Tx switching should be prerequisite for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. According to Option 4, UE may restrict supporting UL Tx switching for some of band pairs, though such restriction is not supported even in Rel-17. If this is correct understanding, we don’t see the motivation of introducing such restrictions as in Option 4 (so, it can be removed). |
| [13] | ***Proposal 2: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, limiting/removing certain switching cases for certain bands/band combinations should be avoided:***   * ***Option 1, 2 and 4 from the WA should be considered with lower priority*** |
| [14] | **Proposal 2:** *Rel-18 UL Tx Switching for 3 or 4 bands supports UE complexity reduction Options 1, 2 and 4*  **Proposal 3:** *For Options 1, 2 and 4, at least one band pair should be supported as in Rel-17 and UE capability indication is provided separately for 3 and 4 bands cases*  **Proposal 4:** *Options 2 and 4 are supported for both switched UL and dual UL cases* |
| [15] | 1. ***Option#4 doesn’t offer UE complexity reduction, and it will require two switching gaps in some scenarios, which degrades the UL performance.*** 2. ***For UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands:***  * ***Support Option#1 and Option#2.*** * ***Do not support Option#4.*** * ***Consider Option#3 with the following modification: “UE is allowed with more preparation procedure time ~~(or interruption time) only~~ for ~~some specific~~ all switching cases/patterns”.*** |
| [17] | **Observation 5: The complexity reduction Option 4 is equivalent to Alt.3 scheme which was dropped by the working assumption. Since this option allows UE to not support some switching patterns, this complexity reduction option does not follow the fundamental principle of the Alt.1 and working assumption that the dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission.**  **Proposal 7: The complexity reduction Option 4 should not be further discussed.** |
| [19] | As for Option 4, it not clear to us. In one example, it may mean that a UE can report a number of band pairs in a band combination, which is larger than the UE can support. Then the UE should indicate a number of supported band pairs to the base station, where the base station can configure band pairs to the UE accordingly. If it is the case, it can be an optional feature on top of Option 1, 2 and 3. However, in our opinion, adopting Option 1, 2, and 3 directly is clear to us.  **Observation 3: Option 4 can be an optional feature on top of Options 1, 2, and 3.** |
| [20] | **Proposal 6: Complexity reduction Option 4 is not supported:**   * **All transitions from one valid band/port combination transmission to another valid band/port combination transmission of the indicated band combination should be supported by the UE** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support complexity reduction option 4 for both switched UL and dual UL [3], [7], [14]   + For both switched UL and dual UL [14]   + UE capability to report the supported band pairs [3], [14]   + Option 4 can achieve same reporting flexibility as Option 1 [3] * Depends on whether U capability is reported per band pair or per band combination containing 3 or 4 bands [5] * Complexity reduction option 4 should be considered with lower priority [13] * Do not support complexity reduction option 4 [2], [6], [9], [10], [11], [12], [15], [17], [19], [20]   + This option means indirect switching with doubled switching periods [6], [15] |

It is observed that companies have different understanding or unclear understanding on option 4. Some companies consider this option as similar to option 1, while some other companies consider this option as similar to Alt.3 (anchor band based switching mechanism). However, such considerations can be covered by the discussion on option 1 and option 3. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed conclusion 3.4**

* **Complexity reduction option 4 is not supported**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| ZTE | Let’s further clarify complexity reduction Option4. The main difference between complexity reduction option1 vs option4 can be summarized in the following table.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Complexity reduction Option1 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Report supported band pairs and switched/dual UL:  A+B (switched UL, dual UL),  A+C (switched UL, dual UL),  B+C (switched UL) | | Complexity reduction Option4 | Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Switched UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C, B+C  Report band combination: A+B+C  Switched/dual UL: Dual UL  Report supported band pairs: A+B, A+C |   Note that, complexity reduction Option 4 can already be supported by current report information ‘*supportedBandPairListNR*’ within ‘*BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch*’ in Rel-16/17 since UE can already indicate the supported band pairs since Rel-16. We don’t understand why something without any additional cost is not supported. If such kind of complexity reduction is needed, it is straightforward to support Option4 with the quivale capability report. Otherwise, it is acceptable to us that neither of Option1 and Option4 is supported. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposed conclusion 3.4.  As we commented in 3.1, the proposal 3.1 covers ZTE’s interpretation of Option 4. |
| CATT | Support.  Option 4 is an issue on the UE capability reporting and should be discussed in the AI of UE capability. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposed conclusion |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Ok and acceptable conclusion from our side if majority view of companies. |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Ericsson | OK, but it seems to us that is part of the UE capability.  In RAN1 we should defined the mechanism that for a set of supported switching cases, what are the consequneces regarding gap, etc.  Then RAN2 defines the capability/RRC which would be as input to the developed procedires in RAN1. |
| Intel | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| Google | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support as commented above in proposal 3.3. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the feature lead proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority is fine with the proposed conclusion, and the intension of the proponent of the complexity reduction Option 4 can be discussed as part of UE capability discussion based on the complexity reduction Option 1.  So, I suggest closing the discussion in the section 3.4 |

## 3.5 Other complexity reduction options

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding other complexity reduction options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [8] | **Proposal 21: The UE is not expected to perform more than one uplink switching in a reference slot, where the SCS of the reference slot for 3/4 bands is determined by the minimum SCS of the reference slot in Rel-16/Rel-17 for combinations of any two bands among 3 or 4 bands.**   * **Case 1: if the UE is configured with 3 bands for UL Tx switching, and the SCS of the carrier n is the SCS of reference slot for 3 bands shall be as below:**   ***µUL* =**   * **Case 2: If the UE is configured with 3 bands for UL Tx switching, and the SCS of the carrier n is , the reference slot shall be as below:**   ***µUL* =** |
| [12] | **Proposal #4: The minimum interval between two succeeding Tx switching should be defined separately depending on the number of bands involved with the Tx switching.** |
| [13] | ***Proposal 4: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, RAN1 should consider further restriction in terms of minimum duration between two consecutive switching instances***   * ***FFS whether such minimum duration is applied only to new switching cases in Rel-18*** |
| [18] | * **After one RF state switch, the next RF state switch must occur after 14 symbols or later.**    + **Which SCS assumed for symbol duration is TBD.** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * No more than one uplink Tx switching in a certain time duration [8], [12], [13], [18]   + Within a reference slot where SCS is determined by minimum SCS of the reference slot in Rel-16/Rel-17 for combinations of any two bands among 3 or 4 bands [8]   + Within 14 symbols where SCS is TBD [18]   + the minimum interval between two succeeding Tx switching can be defined per specific switching case [12] |

Several companies proposed to define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings. Although it seems some company considers it is similar to complexity reduction option 3, probably it can be separate discussion. The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 3.5**

* **Define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**
  + **FFS on the minimum separation time**
    - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**
    - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | We don’t support such restriction. |
| Qualcomm | We support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We understand the intention of this proposal. However, we think this proposal should be deprioritized until we have onsensus on the previous complexity reduction options first and then come back to this proposal later on. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open but prefer to discuss this proposal at least after the discussion on the complexity reduction option 3. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | We support the FL proposal. Considering that switching will be allowed across 3 or 4 bands, then this may lead to quite frequent switching if this proposal is not supported. |
| CATT | For the minimum separation time, Alt.1 can be considered.  We would like to clarify ‘the definition of minimum separation between two UL Tx switching’ and ‘no more than one uplink TX swiching within a reference slot’ should be discussed separately.  The minimum separation between two UL Tx switching is used for nsuring memory flushing and reloading time for UL Tx switching among 3 and 4 bands. However, no more than one UL TX swiching within a reference slot has been specified for Rel 16/17 UL Tx switching. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with FL that it can be a separate discussion since it was clearly specified in Rel-17 about the minimum interval as well as an additional PUSCH preparation time for UL Tx switching.  We support the proposal in general, but suggest one more Alt, as follows   * **Define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**   + **FFS on the minimum separation time**     - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.3: X slots for 3-band switching case and Y slots for 4-band switching case, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**   Besides a need for an additional preparation time in Section 3.3, the minimum interval between two succeeding Tx switching should be guaranteed for complexity reduction of Tx switching and it should be dependent on the number of involved bands for two succeeding Tx switching. |
| CMCC | We are open to the issue and further discussions are needed. |
| Vivo | Clarification is needed on what a TX switching in “two UL Tx switching for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands “ means. Does it refer to switching from one TX state to another when 3 or 4 bands are configured, or TX switching between a band pair in the configured 3 or 4 bands?  For example, if a UE is configured with band A+B+C+D, when it switches from band A(1T)+ band B(1T) to band C(1T)+ band D(1T), is this considered one R18 TX switching or two TX switching? We assumed this should be one R18 TX switching. If this is the correct understanding, we are ok with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We do not support FL proposed agreement 3.5. |
| Xiaomi | Similar views as ZTE. |
| Ericsson | We agree that is a separate discussion. Before knowing how we proceed with previous proposals, specially 3.3, it si difficult for us to commit any thing here. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If UE memory sharing is introduced, a conditional scheduling restriction on the gap between two concerned UL Tx switching is needed, as the FFS part under reduction Option3. Otherwise, it is not needed because it has been concluded in Rel-16 UL Tx switching and the existing restriction can be reused. |
| China Telecom | We are open to further discuss. |
| Nokia,NSB | We are in general OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although there are some companies supporting the proposal, there are more companies having preference to discuss this proposal after the discussion on the complexity reduction options especially Option 3 as it may provide the sufficient gap for concerned case so that additional restriction as in this proposal may not be necessary.  So, the discussion on this proposal can be resumed once some discussion outcome is obtained from the discussion on the complexity reduction options especially Option 3. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Given the situation in 3.3, it is a time to resume the discussion in 3.5. |

**Updated Proposed agreement 3.5**

* **Define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**
  + **FFS on the minimum separation time**
    - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**
    - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**
    - **Alt.3: X slots for 3-band switching case and Y slots for 4-band switching case, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 3.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 3. As the number of bands involved in a single switching increases, the UE complexity may increase. For example, frequent switching between 4 bands (e.g., A(1T)+B(1T) and C(1T)+D(1T)) can be more burdensome to UE than switching between 2 bands (e.g., A(1T) and C(1T)), which requires a different minimum separation time/interval depending on the number of bands involved to Tx switching.  @vivo: We share the same understanding with you about what one switching refers to. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support such restriction. |
| Vivo3 | Thanks LG for the kind reply.  We support this proposal.  We support alt 2 as it is also aligned with the spirit of the restriction of no more than 1 TX switching in a slot in R16/17 |
| ZTE | We suggest companies bring some detailed numbers and then we can further discuss whether this restriction is needed or not. Especially for Alt.3, the numbers are too vague. |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | We prefer no such restriction is introduced as by 3.5. However, we are open to discussion. Given progress in the other design issues, we should look and decide on some more detailed numbers in the next meeting. |
| Apple | We support the proposal. Our concern is due to fully flexible Alt 1, there could be quite frequenct switching instances. Therefore, minimum eparation between two switching iinstances should be supported. We would also prefer to add Alt 4 where the minimum separation time could be reported by UE for different switching cases. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thanks for the feedbacks!  It seems many companies are fine to define the minimum separation time and further discuss on the alternatives, while there are several companies not prefer to have such minimum separation time. So, one possibility is to make this as working assumption and companies are encouraged to bring more details in next meeting.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.5**   * **Define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**   + **FFS on the minimum separation time**     - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.3: X slots for 3-band switching case and Y slots for 4-band switching case, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**     - **Alt.4: report the minimum separation time for different switching cases** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 3.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | We support to agree on the proposed WA by moderator |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposed WA by moderator |
| Vivo4 | For the newly added alt4, we are not sure why the separation time would depend on switching case. This proposal is to avoid frequent switching, a unified gap or a gap depending on the number of bands would be sufficient and preferred, there is no clear motivation to couple separation time with certain switching cases and to introduce new capabilities.  For alt3, the wording is not clear to us, whether the ‘3-band’ or ‘4-band’ are the total number of involved bands in the two succeeding Tx switching, or the number of involved bands for each Tx switching. Clarification is needed, and if it refers to the total number, we suggest the following changes to make it clearer  **Alt.3: X slots for ~~3-band~~ two succeeding switching cases involving 3 bands in total, and Y slots for ~~4-band~~ two succeeding switching case involving 4 bands in total, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)** |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposed WA. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support such restriction for the following reasons:   * The restriction doesn’t help with UE complexity. * It is not expected that the network to schedule the UE with UL-Tx switching very frequent (e.g., multiple times within a slot). |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and fine with Vivo4’s change as well.  @ZTE, thank you for your comment. We basically think that the min separation time should be larger than 1 slot, at least for the case of which both 2 Tx chains should be switched (i.e., this is not the existing case in Rel-17). However, we have no strong view of the specific value at this time. |
| Apple2 | On Alt 4, our intention is to avoid frequent switching instances at least for the switching cases for which switching gap can be longer. Since longer switching gap would result in transmission interruption, so it is not beneficial to have frequent instances of such switching cases. For example, for the cases when 4 switching bands are involved in a case. |
| China Telecom | We think the restriction of no more than 1 TX switching in a slot in R16/17 should be inherited. The restriction in Rel-18 needs to be compatible with R16/17 two bands switching. In R16/17, if there is Tx switching at the end of a reference slot, the next Tx switching could be at the beginning of the next reference slot. There is no restriction on how close the two consecutive switching could be as long as they are belonged to different reference slots.  Based on the above consideration, we find the wording “minimum separation time” does not express the spirit of what had defined in Rel-16/17, as well as Alt2,Alt3 exactly.We suggest the wording as:   * **Define the ~~minimum separation~~ reference time the UE does not expect to perform more than one uplink switching ~~between two UL Tx switchin~~gs for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**   + **FFS on the ~~minimum separation~~ reference time** |
| ZTE | We understand the intention of this proposal. However, we still think RAN1 should first identify the basic framework and procedures for R18 UL Tx switching and then check whether we need this further restriction or not. Especially, the values for Alt.3/4 are still not determined, it doesn’t provide much meaning since anyway we need to come back to this is next meeting anyway.  To compromise, we propose the following.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.5 by ZTE**   * **Study the following alternatives for the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands and decide in RAN1#111 whether/which of the following alternative is needed or not**   + - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.3: X slots for 3-band switching case and Y slots for 4-band switching case, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**     - **Alt.4: report the minimum separation time for different switching cases**   + **Note: Companies are encoureaged to provide detailed numbers of minimum separation time** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Similar view as MediaTek, the restrictions does not help to reduce any UE burden except for some band combinations with high dimemsion of combined UL-MIMO capabilities across all bands. At the same time, the scheduling restrictions are not free meal but may cost complicate scheduling design as commented by some network vendors before. Therefore, we propose to restrict the proposal to only some band combinations. Additionally, the backward compatibility should be remained that if the UL Tx switchings are always occurs within the same band pair, then it is a Rel-16/17 behavior and needs no additional scheduling restriction. Therefore, alt.5 is added.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.5**   * **Only for the following band combinations, define the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands**   + **Applicable band combinations:**     - **2Tx-2Tx-2Tx band combination (3 bands)**     - **1Tx-1Tx-2Tx-2Tx band combination (4 bands)**   + **FFS on the minimum separation time**     - **Alt.1: 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.2: no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**     - **Alt.3: X slots for 3-band switching case and Y slots for 4-band switching case, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**     - **Alt.4: report the minimum separation time for different switching cases**     - **Alt.5: Minimum interval between the current triggered UL Tx switching and its preceding UL Tx switching is Y(us) if the two UL Tx switching are not switched within the same band pair.** |
| OPPO | Support the proposal WA. |
| Samsung | We can support the FL proposal for a WA. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with FL’s proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Google | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  The situation is summarized as below.   * Support the proposal (further discussion on the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings): Apple, CATT, vivo, Xiaomi, LG, OPPO, Samsung, Qualcomm, DCM   + Can accept as compromise: ZTE * Not support the proposal: MTK, CTC, HW/HiSi   Based on the above situation, ZTE’s suggested wording may be possible way forward. It includes possibility of taking no alternative, possibility of alternative to define the minimum separation time only for specific cases/patterns such as Alt.4, and other alternatives. At least listing up the remaining discussion points with possible alternatives/options is quite important and helpful for next meeting to complete RAN1 work.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 3.5**   * **Study the following alternatives for the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands, and decide in RAN1#111 whether/which of the following alternatives is needed**   + **Alt.1: define 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS) as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings**   + **Alt.2: define that no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**   + **Alt.3: define X slots as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings where 3 bands are involved in total, and define Y slots as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings where 4 bands are involved in total, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**   + **Alt.4: report the minimum separation time for different switching cases**   + **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **Note: Companies are encoureaged to provide detailed numbers of minimum separation time**   Some reply comments are also provided below.   * Regarding vivo’s question on Alt.4, Apple already provided the answer. There are also some other companies that such minimum separation time is necessary only for specific switching pattern (band pair). * Regarding vivo’s question on Alt.3, the FL tries to provide updated wording. * Regarding CTC’s comment on Rel-16/17 principle, Alt.2 is based on Rel-16/17 requirement while there are some companies that it is not sufficient since two consecutive switchings may be too close with such principle. |

**Updated Proposed working assumption 3.5**

* **Study the following alternatives for the minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings for Rel-18 UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands, and decide in RAN1#111 whether/which of the following alternatives is needed**
  + **Alt.1: define 14 symbols based on a SCS (FFS on SCS) as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings**
  + **Alt.2: define that no more than one uplink Tx switching within a reference slot based on a SCS (FFS on SCS)**
  + **Alt.3: define X slots as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings where 3 bands are involved in total, and define Y slots as minimum separation time between two UL Tx switchings where 4 bands are involved in total, where X or Y is greater than 1 (FFS on X,Y)**
  + **Alt.4: report the minimum separation time for different switching cases**
  + **Other alternative is not precluded**
  + **Note: Companies are encoureaged to provide detailed numbers of minimum separation time**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 3.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | support |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s updated proposal. |
| Apple | Support |

## 3.6 Other general aspects related to the working assumption

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding other general aspects related to the working assumption.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Proposal 5:*** *Confirm the working assumption with following revision for UL-CA Option 1*   * *UE complexity Reduction Option 2 is supported by reusing the existing UE capability reporting mechanism for uplink MIMO, e.g., per feature set reporting granularity.*   ***Proposal 6:*** *Confirm working assumption with following revision for UL-CA Option 2,*   * *UE complexity Reduction Option 2 is supported by reusing the existing UE capability reporting mechanism for uplink MIMO, e.g., per feature set reporting granularity.* * *UE complexity Reduction Option 3 with additional preparation time is supported and only required if either of the following switching condition meets*   + *Switching condition 1: the number of bands within a band set that contains all transmitted bands involved in both determinations of the triggered UL Tx switching and its preceding UL Tx switching is more than X*   + *Switching condition 2: the number of bands within a band set that contains all transmitted bands involved in determination of the triggered UL Tx switching is more than X for UL-CA Option 2*   + *The additional preparation time can be reported by UE*   + *Minimum interval between the triggered UL Tx switching and its preceding UL Tx switching is Y(us)*   + *The reduction Option 3 should be common solution and also applicable to UL-CA Option 1*   + *FFS: the value of X and Y* |
| [4] | 1. ***Confirm the following part in the working assumption.***   ***If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, following switching mechanism is considered as baseline for the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands***   * + ***Alt.1: Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission*** |
| [12] | **Proposal #1: Complexity reduction options for UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands can be supported as a UE capability.** |
| [14] | **Proposal 1:** *Confirm the RAN1#110 WA that Rel-18 UL Tx switching supports Alt.1: dynamic Tx carrier switching across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on UL scheduling, i.e., via UL grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission* |
| [16] | 1. Design principle for extension of dynamic UL Tx switching to three or four bands, should ensure additional performance enhancements as compared to legacy procedures without introducing scheduling complexity or discarding UE complexity.   Observation 1 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands design based on Alt 2 and Alt 3 results in scheduling dependency and error propagation. Any design based on Alt 2 and Alt 3 makes the promised benefits and usefulness of dynamic UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands questionable.  Observation 2 If UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is supported, only operation based on Alt1 that properly addresses UE complexity is meaningful.   1. Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via UL grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission (i.e. Alt 1). |
| [17] | **Proposal 1: Any complexity reduction option to be supported on top of Alt.1 scheme should be basically optional and should still be able to provide clear performance gain over Rel-17 UL Tx switching scheme.** |
| [20] | **Proposal 1: Confirm the 1st part of the RAN1#110 working assumption as below**  **Working Assumption**   * If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, following switching mechanism is considered as baseline for the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands   + Alt.1: Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission   **Proposal 2: The UE complexity reduction solutions adopted should not increase the network implementation complexity** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Confirm working assumption for Alt.1 [2], [4], [14], [16], [20] * Complexity reduction options are supported as optional capability [12], [17] * Rel-18 UL Tx switching with complexity reduction options should ensure the performance enhancement from Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching [16], [17] * Rel-18 UL Tx switching with complexity reduction options should not increase the network implementation complexity [20] |

There is no contribution proposing to revert the working assumption and the proposals in previous sub sections for complexity reduction options are discussed with positive manner. Hence, some companies proposed that it should be fine to confirm the working assumption. Other general proposals for the working assumption seem to be already considered in proposals in previous sub sections. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and the following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 3.6**

* **Confirm the following working assumption made at the RAN1#110 meeting.**

**Working Assumption**

* If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, following switching mechanism is considered as baseline for the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands
  + Alt.1: Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission

#### 1st round Feedback form for 3.6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Qualcomm | As far as complexity issue could be solved, we are ok to support this WA. |
| ZTE | We are ok to confirm this working assumption. However, we would like to emphasize that the switching period is reported per band pair as agreed by RAN4. Without clear rule or indication of the band pair or the corresponding switching period, Alt.1 may not work. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 3.6. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | In principle, we are okay, but would prefer to come back to this discussion once there is some agreement on the restrictions being considered |
| CATT | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| CMCC | We are fine to confirm the WA. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 3.6 |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Google | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority supports this proposal, but it may be better to confirm the working assumption after agreeing on at least one of the complexity reduction options to be supported. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check whether the WA can be confirmed with agreements on the support of complexity reduction option 1/2.  If it is not acceptable, we may need to discuss proposal 3.5 first. |

**Proposed agreement 3.6**

* **Confirm the following working assumption made at the RAN1#110 meeting.**

**Working Assumption**

* If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, following switching mechanism is considered as baseline for the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands
  + Alt.1: Dynamic Tx carrier switching can be across all the supported switching cases by the UE and based on the UL scheduling, i.e., via dynamic grant and/or RRC configuration for UL transmission

#### 4th round Feedback form for 3.6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Vivo3 | Support |
| Nokia, NSB 14.10 | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| ZTE | We are ok to confirm this working assumption. However, we would like to emphasize that the switching period is reported per band pair as agreed by RAN4. Without clear rule or indication of the band pair or the corresponding switching period, Alt.1 alone may not work. |
| Samsung | Support. |
| Apple | We prefer to agree on other details and come back to this later. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  The proposal 3.6 seems to be fine for almost all companies while only Apple prefers to agree on other details first.  However, the moderator thinks we should confirm the working assumption at this meeting given the situation that we are discussing many details already. In addition, considering the RAN1 completion schedule, it would not be possible to change the assumption on basic switching mechanism in later timing.  Therefore, the moderator would like to ask again whether confirming the WA now is acceptable or not. |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 3.6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | It is okay, we can accept to confirm the WA considering majority view |
| CATT | Support |
| Vivo4 | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and agree with Moderator’s thoughts. |
| CMCC | Support to confirm the WA. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Samsung | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | After multiple rounds of discussions in two meetings, companies seem fine with the Alt.1. We suggest to replace “considered” with “taken” |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Google | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems the proposal is now acceptable for all.  Regarding HW’s suggestion, we can just focus on confirming the working assumption for now since we are approaching to the end of the meeting. |

1. Discussions on the detailed mechanisms for Rel-18 multi-carrier UL Tx switching

## 4.1 Issue on ambiguous switching state

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding the issue on ambiguous switching state.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 3:*** *For UL-CA Option 2, the following specification impacts need to be considered,*   * *Tx state ambiguity after Tx switching* * *Switching ambiguity issue* * *4 new switching instances, i.e. current UL transmission band(s) and the preceding band(s) involve 3 or 4 bands, should be specified* * *Supporting only some concurrent UL transmission cases by UE reporting.* * *Switching location configuration issue for 4 new switching instances* * *Switching period issue for 4 new switching instances* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 10****: The legacy RRC configuration* {*oneT*, *twoT*} *via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState is reused to address the ambiguity issue.*   * *If the band pair is indicated after the Tx switching,*    + *oneT indicates 1Tx is assumed on each band of the indicated band pair;*   + *twoT indicates 2Tx is assumed on the carrier with UL scheduling.* * *If the band pair is not indicated after the Tx switching,*   + *oneT indicates 1Tx is assumed on the band with UL scheduling and the band with a lowest/highest carrier frequency among the bands other than the band with UL scheduling;*   + *twoT indicates 2Tx is assumed on the carrier with UL scheduling.*   ***Proposal 11****: Introduce band pair indication for Alt.1.* |
| [4] | 1. ***RRC parameter can be used for resolving the ambiguous states.*** |
| [5] | Observation 2: For approach 1 and approach 2, ambiguity issue remains, a RRC indication is needed to resolve the ambiguity.  Observation 3: For approach 3 and approach 4, there is no ambiguity issue because 1-port transmission only maps to one Tx chain state. However, unnecessary interruption and more frequent Tx switching may be required.  Observation 4: For approach 4, switchedUL is only applied for the Tx chain state with 2 Tx in the same band.  Proposal 8: Either approach 2 or approach 4 can be considered to handle the ambiguity issue.  **Approach 2**: For <1T+1T> in each Tx chain combination, the port-mapping combination is one of <0P+1P> and <1P+0P> for option1 to mitigate the ambiguity issue.  **Approach 4**: For <0T+2T> in each Tx chain combination, the corresponding port-mapping combination are <0P+1P> and <0P+2P>. The <1T+1T> in each Tx chain combination is only applied to option 2, with the corresponding port-mapping combination <1P+1P> |
| [6] | **Proposal 8: Reuse the Rel-17 RRC configuration principle to address the issue that the state of Tx chains after Tx switching may not be unique.** |
| [8] | **Proposal 20: For ambiguity switching cases issue, RRC parameter (e.g. uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState) can be re-used.**   * **If the parameter is configured as twoT, no further indication is needed.** * **If the parameter is configured as oneT, gNB shall give further indication, detail is FFS.** |
| [9] | **Proposal 3**   * RRC configuration as defined in Rel-17 can be extended to resolve the issues that state of Tx chains after Tx switching is not unique for Rel-18 Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. |
| [10] | ***Observation 1: There may be ambiguity on determining the Tx chain state between two adjacent uplink transmissions in some cases, i.e. band pairs contains the same band on which single port transmission is allowed.***  ***Observation 2: UE is aware of its operation state and whether switching period is needed or not before a pending uplink transmission.***  ***Observation 3: Limited combinations of UL transmission will not only limit the flexibility of base station scheduling, but also introduce additional delay.***  ***Proposal 2: Ambiguity on switching period can be resolved by implementation.*** |
| [12] | **Proposal #7: Reuse *uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState* to handle the ambiguous cases in Rel-18 UL Tx switching. In addition, a new RRC parameter or a pre-defined rule can be considered to determine one state of Tx chain when the states of Tx chains after Tx switching is not unique even configured with *uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState*.** |
| [14] | **Proposal 6:** *For Rel-18 UL Tx Switching with 3 or 4 bands, when more than one resulting state of Tx chain configuration is possible for the UE during UL Tx switching, the UE assumes the state resulting in the smallest number of Tx switches* |
| [16] | **Proposal 6 To support dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, resolve any ambiguity in TX chains state transition via RRC configurations (similar to Rel-17).** |
| [17] | **Proposal 8: At least following UE capability and RRC signaling should be considered for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands with potential complexity reduction options.**   * **RRC signaling to solve ambiguous state issue in Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands**   + **Since the existing parameter *uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState* in *CellGroupConfig* has only {oneT, twoT} as candidate values, extension of this parameter or new parameter would be necessary for ambiguous state issue in Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands where the number of possible switching cases in ambiguous state issue is more than 2.** |
| [19] | **Proposal 2: When UE is to switch to a Tx operation state that is not unique, the UE configures the non-scheduled Tx according to a RRC configuration, where the configuration can indicate a single carrier to all antenna port assignments (e.g. 1P-0P-0P, 0P-1P-0P, and 0P-0P-1P) that cause non-unique cases or indicate one carrier to each of the antenna port assignments (e.g. 1P-0P-0P, 0P-1P-0P, and 0P-0P-1P) that cause non-unique cases.** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState [3], [4], [6], [8], [9], [12], [16], [17], [19]   + If twoT is indicated, 2T are on the transmitting band   + If oneT is indicated, 1T is on the transmitting band and     - Remaining 1T is on the band based on gNB indication/configuration [3], [8], [12], [17], [19]     - Remaining 1T is on the lowest or highest carrier frequency among bands (i.e., based on a predefined rule) [3]     - Remaining 1T is on the band which can minimize the number of Tx chains to be switched (i.e., based on a predefined rule) [12], [14]       * [moderator] but this rule alone is not sufficient e.g., in case that current state is 1T+1T on band A+B and next transmission is 1 port on band C, switching either A or B to C results the same number of switched Tx chains, as many contributions explained   + Introduce new RRC parameter as extension of uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState [4], [9], [17], [19] * Limit the possible port mapping patterns [5]   + For each 1T+1T case, only either one of 1P+0P or 0P+1P is allowed [5]   + For each 1T+1T case, only 1P+1P is allowed (i.e., in dual UL) * Can be solved by implementation [10] * The ambiguous switching state issue is only in Dual UL [2], [6], [8], [9]   + For switched UL, only Tx chain states with 2T are assumed (i.e., states with 1T+1T are not assumed so that there is no ambiguous state issue) * The ambiguous switching state issue can also be in Switched UL [3], [5], [14]   + E.g., if some of the bands support up to 2 ports while other bands support up to 1 port, Tx chain states with 1T+1T on some bands may be supported so that there may be ambiguous state issue |

The majority proposes to solve the ambiguous switching state issue based on RRC configuration similar to Rel-17. In addition, multiple companies pointed that existing parameter ({oneT, twoT} in uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState) may not be sufficient for Rel-18 with 3 or 4 bands and some new parameter or predefined rule especially for the case of oneT would be necessary. By the way, many companies have assumed that this issue exists only in dual UL since only 2T switching cases are assumed for switched UL by those companies, while several companies considered that 1T+1T switching case(s) would exist for switched UL. Such points can be discussed in section 4.3.

The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback If any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 4.1**

* **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state**
  + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**
  + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**
      * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication**
      * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 4.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support the principle to use RRC to solve this ambiguity issue.  However, this might rely on the output of complexity reduction discussion and would be better to be discussed with progress of complexity reduction methods. |
| ZTE | Another ambiguity issue for switchedUL also needs to be discussed. We mark it as Case#3.   * + **Case#3 of the issue for switchedUL: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B and the 3rd transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain is switched to band C**   Another issue needs to be discussed for switchedUL is, if band B only supports 1-port transmission but not 2-port transmission, is it possible to switched both of the two Tx chains to band B? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 4.1.  Regarding Alt.1 or Alt.2 for Case#2 with oneT, we are open but Alt.1 would have more flexibility. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| CATT | We support the proposal. For case#2, Alt.2 is preferred. Considering that the ambigugous issue of case#1 has been sloved by predefined rule, an additional predefined rule can be defined for case#2. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal.  For the Case#1, there is no ambiguous state with the pre-defined rule as shown in the proposal. Thus, no more rule or RRC configuration is needed.  For the Case#2, there is an ambiguous state even with the existing RRC *uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState*. We prefer a pre-defined rule for such ambiguous case rather than using an additional RRC configuration on top of the existing RRC. |
| CMCC | We support to use RRC configuration to solve the ambiguous issues. And considering Case#2 of the issue, we prefer Alt.1 to determine the associated band. |
| Vivo | This might rely on the output of supported switching cases, and we prefer to discuss the switching case first. |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 4.1 |
| Xiaomi | Firstly we would like to clarify our position: we support to reuse the current RRC signaling and don’t think additional RRC signaling is needed to resolve ambiguity. With the current RRC parameter, the ambiguity issue can be resolved by implementation.  Regarding to FL’s proposal, we support it. We have the same feeling as DCM that alt.1 is preferred for case#2. |
| Ericsson | We support in principle to solve by RRC. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal to reuse the RRC configuration to resolve the ambiguity issue. |
| Google | Support to use RRC signaling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is too early to agree this because it is not clear whether UE memory sharing is needed for UL-CA Option 2 yet, which makes the reuse of existing RRC parameters infeasible. |
| China Telecom | We support the RRC configuration principle to address the issue. We prefer to decouple the RRC signalling for case #1 and case#2. For case #1, the existing RRC parameter can be reused as explained. For case#2, we think a new RRC parameter can be used to configure the UE to consider this as if 1-port transmission was transmitted on both band C and A, or 1-port transmission was transmitted on both band C and B, or as if 2-port transmission on band C. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support using RRC |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although majority supports this proposal, some companies prefer to discuss this proposal after other proposals having impact on supported switching cases.  The moderator’s understanding is that even if we agree to support some complexity reduction options, it still allows UE supporting all possible switching cases and hence anyway some solution like this proposal is necessary. In addition, this proposal provides a solution with minimizing the impact by reusing existing signaling/mechanism. So, it would be reasonable to support at least the proposed approach for Case#1/#2 while we can add FFS on other potential cases that may depend on the outcome of discussion on other proposals having impact on supported switching cases. **Updated Proposed agreement 4.1**  * **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**   + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**   + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**       * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC quivalen**       * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**   + **FFS for other potential cases** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.1**

* **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**
  + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**
  + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**
      * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC quivalen**
      * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**
  + **FFS for other potential cases**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 4.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We slight prefer to discuss this level of details after we have a whole picture of how many ambiguous cases would be supported. Otherwise, we may need to reconsider the RRC parameter design if new cases show up. For example, the case #3 mentioned by ZTE may need to be included. |
| ZTE | Similrar view as our comment in the 1st round.  Instead of adding “FFS for other potential cases”, we propose to add the following case as well.   * + **Case#3 of the issue for switchedUL: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B and the 3rd transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain is switched to band C** |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| OPPO | This proposal closely relates with UE memory sharing solution. For complexity reduction option3, once switch pattern is defined, the ambiguity issue maybe solved simultaneously. So we prefer to discuss section 3.3 first. |
| Apple | We support the proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Regarding Case#3 from ZTE, it assumes switching case(s) with 1T+1T even for switchedUL. Based on the contributions, many companies consider only switching cases with 2T for switchedUL. Therefore, before including the Case#3 into this proposal for solving ambiguity issue, whether Case#3 like scenario for switchedUL is supported or not should be discussed first e.g., based on proposal 3.2 and 4.3.  Regarding OPPO’s comment, it would not be so related to UE memory sharing solution. The memory sharing solution is just to allow some time for memory flushing/reloading or indirect switching, while the issue here is about resulting Tx chain state ambiguity after switching.  Considering above comments and also Qualcomm’s comment, we can discuss this proposal for working assumption in GTW session if time allows.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 4.1**   * **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**   + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**   + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**       * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC parameter**       * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**   + **FFS for other potential cases** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |

**Updated Proposed working assumption 4.1**

* **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**
  + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**
  + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**
    - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**
    - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**
      * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC parameter**
      * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**
  + **FFS for other potential cases**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 4.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal including Case#1 and Case#2. For Case#2, we prefer Alt 2. |
| Vivo3 | We still prefer to postpone this discussion till the switching cases such as those proposed in working assumption 4.3.1 are determined. Othewise, we may need to revert the agreements if some cases are dropped or some new cases come up. |
| China Telecom | Since there are FFS cases, not sure existing RRC parameter can be reused for all the case. |
| ZTE | Seems there are typos in the Alt.1 of Case2.  Although we would suggest to discuss our previous Case#3 together, for progress, we can compromise to support the above proposal and discuss our Case#3 separately and decide whether any extra indication/parameter is used to resolve the ambiguity issue.   * + **Case#3 of the issue for switchedUL: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B and the 3rd transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**     - **one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain is switched to band C** |
| Samsung | Support the FL proposed WA 4.1 |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems almost all companies are fine with the proposal. Only vivo prefers to postpone the discussion on this until clarifying the supported switching cases in 4.3.  Again, the moderator thinks anyway Case#1/2 in this proposal will be supported cases and a solution for the ambiguous switching state issue is necessary. In addition, the proposal provides the solution based only on existing RRC parameter for the case#1, and the solution for the case#2 where only existing RRC parameter may not be sufficient is FFS (just alternatives are provided). We can allow other alternative to be considered if any.  **Updated Proposed working assumption 4.1**   * **Reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**   + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**   + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**       * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC parameter**       * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS for other potential cases** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 4.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Vivo4 | If the majority sees the needs of to approve this proposal at this stage, we can live with it |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal.  If companies have concerns on reusing existing RRC parameter due to an FFS, we would be fine to reformulate the proposal such as only Case#1 is in the current main bullet and Case#2 and other potential cases are in another main bullet separately. |
| CMCC | Fine to the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The ambiguity cases are only applicable to dualUL, therefore, suggest to clarify it in the main bullet,   * **For dualUL operation, reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases** |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Google | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems almost all companies are fine with the proposal.  Regarding HW/HiSi’s comment on the dualUL, it depends on the proposal 4.3.1 whether switchedUL also has such cases having ambiguous switching state issue.  So, based on the agreement 4.3 below, it would be fair to say “at least for dualUL” for now.  **Proposed agreement 4.3**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**   * + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**   + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**     - **For dual UL, following new conditions are considered**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**     - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**     - **FFS the same or different switch period for existing conditions and new conditions**   **Updated Proposed working assumption 4.1**   * **At least for dual UL, reuse existing RRC parameter {oneT, twoT} via uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState to solve the issue on ambiguous switching state at least for following cases**   + **Case#1 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band B, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band B is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band B**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band B while another Tx chain remains on band A**   + **Case#2 of the issue: two Tx chains are currently associated with band A and B, and next transmission is 1 port transmission on band C, but there are multiple possible switching cases where 1P on band C is supported**     - **if twoT is indicated, both of two Tx chains are switched to band C**     - **if oneT is indicated, one Tx chain is switched to band C while how to determine the associated band for another Tx chain is FFS**       * **Alt.1: based on gNB’s configuration/indication e.g., new RRC parameter**       * **Alt.2: based on predefined rule**       * **Other alternative is not precluded**   + **FFS for other potential cases** |

## 4.2 Issue on ambiguous switching period location and/or duration

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding the issue on ambiguous switching period location and/or duration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 3:*** *For UL-CA Option 2, the following specification impacts need to be considered,*   * *Tx state ambiguity after Tx switching* * *Switching ambiguity issue* * *4 new switching instances, i.e. current UL transmission band(s) and the preceding band(s) involve 3 or 4 bands, should be specified* * *Supporting only some concurrent UL transmission cases by UE reporting.* * *Switching location configuration issue for 4 new switching instances* * *Switching period issue for 4 new switching instances* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 2****: RAN1 discusses how to determine the switching gap for each of the following switching cases considering different switching periods may be reported for different band pairs.*  ***Proposal 3****: In order to derive the switching gap (Tgap) for different switching cases, consider the following method.*   * *The band before Tx switching and the band after Tx switching for each Tx is considered as a band pair.*   + *If UE is able to switch the 1st Tx and 2nd Tx independently, Tgap = max { Tswitch\_period\_1, Tswitch\_period\_2}*   + *If UE is not able switch the 1st Tx and 2nd Tx independently, Tgap = Tswitch\_period\_1 + Tswitch\_period\_2* * *Tswitch\_period\_1 and Tswitch\_period\_2 are the switching period for band pair for the 1st Tx and 2nd Tx, respectively.*   ***Observation 1****: Network is not able to figure out the exact switching opt the UE adopted. Without this information, network has to assume the maximum switching period for all the potential opts, which will negate the potential gain of per-band-pair reported switching period.*   * *Different Ues may apply different Tx switching options for different band pairs. For example, for the same Tx switching from Band A + Band B to Band C (1-port transmission), UE1 may implement it as switching the Tx on Band A to Band C, while UE2 may implement it as switching Tx on Band B to Band C.*   ***Proposal 4****: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, network indicates the band pair for UE in order to enjoy the gain of per-band-pair reported switching period.* |
| [6] | **Proposal 4: For inter-band UL CA Option 1, if Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is configured, the switching period for a switching procedure depends on the actually involved band pair.**  **Proposal 9: For inter-band UL CA Option 2, if Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is configured, the maximum length switching period is applied for a switching procedure, among the switching periods corresponding to all the possible band pairs as the previous and next bands of the switched Tx.** |
| [12] | **Proposal #6: The location of switching period for Rel-18 UL Tx switching can be pre-defined as the switch-from band or switch-to band.** |
| [15] | 1. ***For UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands, the required switching period is reported separately from R16/R17 switching period.***  * ***Reuse the existing set for switching periods {35 us, 140 us, 210 us}.*** * ***The switching period is reported per band pair.*** * ***For each band pair, the switching period can be reported separately for 1Tx-2Tx and 2Tx-2Tx switching.*** * ***For each band pair, the switching period can be reported separately for “2 bands” and “3/4 bands” switching.*** * ***The supported Tx switching option (switchedUL or dualUL) is reported per band pair.*** |
| [18] | **Proposal 8: On which band taking the switching period, leverage current RRC configuration structure and select one among** **the two alternatives below.**   * **Alt. 1: Configure the anchor band as the band to take the switching period.** * **Alt. 2: For direct switching between anchor and non-anchor bands, configure the non-anchor band as the band to take the switching period. For indirect switching between non-anchor bands, indicate the switch-from or switch-to to take the switching period.** |
| [19] | **Proposal 3: The switching period location is indicated to the cell group with one of the following options**   * **Option-1: The configuration indicates the switching period location by using a time slot in either the current or scheduled carriers/bands.** * **Option-2: The configuration indicates the switching period location per band pair, if the UE determines a switching period of a 1st Tx in the current cell and another switching period of a 2nd Tx in the scheduled cell, the UE use the earliest time slot (i.e. current cell) to conduct the Tx switching.** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * There is ambiguity issue on switching period location with current RRC parameter [2], [12], [18], [19]   + Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to [12]   + Switching period location can be determined based on anchor band [18]   + Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair [19]   + Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} [18], [19] * There is ambiguity issue on switching period when either one of two Tx chains is required to switch [3], [6]   + Network indicates the band pair [3]   + Maximum switching period among possible switching periods is assumed [3], [6] * Switching period per band pair is separately reported for 2 bands and 3/4 bands [15] |

Multiple companies pointed that there is ambiguity issue on switching period location with current RRC parameter, and hence a certain solution would be necessary. Regarding the potential ambiguity on which switching period needs to be assumed, the issue would be the same as ambiguity issue on switching state discussed in section 4.1 and hence the solution for determining the switching state can address the switching period as well. But only when four bands are involved for a switching (switching from 1T+1T on band A+B to 1T+1T on band C+D), there would be ambiguity on switching period such as whether switching is from A to C and from B to D or from A to D and from B to C assuming different switching periods for different band pairs. The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposals.

### **Proposed agreement 4.2.1**

* **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location**
  + **Alt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined based on anchor band**
  + **Alt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**
  + **Alt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 4.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Alt. 2. |
| ZTE | We are ok to further discuss these alternatives. But we think one alternative is missing in the above proposal.   * + Alt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on RRC configuration, e.g., uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation.   We think this issue is also related to the determination of the UL Tx switching gap. Take the following figure as an example, if different switching period locations are configured for Band pair A + C and band pair B+C, then the switching gap may be the sum of {switching period for Band pair A + C} and {switching period for band pair B+C}. However, if the same switching location is configured for Band pair A + C and band pair B+C, then the switching gap may be the maximum number of {switching period for Band pair A + C} and {switching period for band pair B+C} |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 4.2.1.  Alt.3 may be straightforward, but we are open for further discussion on other alternatives. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposals and also the addition of Alt 5 by ZTE. Our preference would be either Alt 1 or Alt 5 |
| CATT | We support down-select between Alt.1 and Alt.4. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and open to discuss all listed options.  In addition, we think Alt.3 may be modified as follows,  **Alt.3\_rev: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair** |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. And the Alt.5 proposed by ZTE can also be considered for down-selection. |
| Vivo | We support this proposal and agree to add ZTE’s alt.5 for further study. |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 4.2.1 |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal 4.2.1. Alt.3 is preferred. |
| Ericsson | We think it is better solved by RRC. Hence, support adding Alt 5 by ZTE. Then, the exact cases would depend on outcome of proposal 3.3 in our view. |
| Google | Support the proposal. We also support to resolve this issue by RRC, but we do not think the legacy parameter *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* can be applied to 3 or 4 bands cases. In addition to the listed alternatives, the order of RRC parameter *uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier* can be utilized as a priority for determining the switching period location when ambiguous issues occur. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | One better solution is not included in the proposal yet. Similar to the Rel-16 mechanism, define and configure a priority list of bands to Ues, when the switching location is needed to determine on which band, follow the same priority list for all UL Tx switchings. |
| China Telecom | Support, but other Alt should not be precluded. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems companies are fine with listing possible alternatives for further discussion and down-selection as next step.  Based on the feedbacks, the proposal can be updated to add some other alternatives although the moderator’s understanding based on the contribution is that there is ambiguity with existing RRC configuration such as uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation in ServingCellConfig. **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**  * **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location**   + **Alt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**   + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined based on anchor band**   + **Alt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**   + **Alt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**   + **Alt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on RRC configuration, e.g., uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation**   + **Alt.6: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**

* **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location**
  + **Alt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined based on anchor band**
  + **Alt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**
  + **Alt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**
  + **Alt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on RRC configuration, e.g., uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation**
  + **Alt.6: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 4.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt. 2 and 5. We support Alt. 2 but also think the switching period should be configurable between anchor band and non-anchor band by reusing current RRC signaling structure. We prefer to update the wording of Alt. 2.   * + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on anchor band** |
| ZTE | We are not clear about the Alt.6 especially considering that the proponents said “Similar to the Rel-16 mechanism, define and configure a priority list of bands to Ues, when the switching location is needed to determine on which band, follow the same priority list for all UL Tx switchings.” In the 1st round of discussion. I don’t think RAN1 has introduced this priority list for Rel-16 UL Tx switching, more clarification is needed. Otherwise, we propose to delete it for now. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the newly added alternatives. We would like to add one more Alt as below,  **Alt.7**: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair |
| Samsung | Fine for listing the alternatives and down-selection as next step. We support Alt.5 |
| Apple | We are a bit concerned as the list of alternatives has increased quite a lot. Considering that we have very limited remaining time, so we would prefer to start downselection, rather than adding more alternatives to the list. In terms of preference, we prefer Alt 5. Also, we don’t think that Alt 2 should be considered as we have not agreed on introducing anchor band. Also, this would would require additional discussion on the location of switching period when the none of the bands involved in switching is anchor band. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In Rel-16, the exact switching period location is up to UE implementation, e.g. 7 symbol PUSCH scheduled at the head of the first slot, another 7 symbol PUSCh scheduled at the tail of the second slot, there is 14 symbols for Ues to locate the 4-symbol switching period. Which 4 symbols for the exact switching period is not specified. This implementation freedom should be retained for Rel-18.  The ambiguity issue is only when the scheduled gap between two quivalent transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap. Therefore, we suggest to add   * **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location when the scheduled gap between two quivalent transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap.** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  This proposal is the first step so that the ambiguity issue on switching period location is identified and companies can further consider possible alternative solutions. Even within this meeting, we can discuss and down-select the alternatives if we can avoid spending too much time for discussing this first step proposal.  It seems multiple companies prefer Alt.5, but as I clarified, existing RRC parameter of uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation alone cannot solve the issue. Since uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation is just TRUE or FALSE for each serving cell, if switching happens between cells with both TRUE or both FALSE, the switching period location cannot be determined. So, I think Alt.5 requires some combination with other solution or extension of RRC parameter (like Alt.3).  It seems further discussion and clarification on each alternative from proponents (how it can solve the issue) would be necessary.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**   * **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location [when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap]**   + **Alt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**   + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on anchor band**   + **Alt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**   + **Alt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**   + **Alt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on RRC configuration, e.g., uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation**   + **Alt.6: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**   + **Alt.7: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**   FYI, RAN4 is discussing whether/what recommendation regarding this issue can be sent to RAN1, e.g., “Inform RAN1 that: RAN4 recommends to reuse the Rel-16/17 approach (i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period on one of the band for each switching band pair) and discuss further details for Rel-18 Tx switching scenario in RAN1.”. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal except for bracket part. Huawei’s comment is about switching period location in time domain, but the issue discussed here is about switching period location in carrier domain i.e., on which carrier switching period is located as in TS38.101-1 6.3A.3.3.2. |
| China Telecom | What’s the difference between Alt. 3, Alt. 5? We think they are all same as based on semi-static configuration of switching period on one of the band per band pair in the RAN4 agreement.  “**Agreement:**  For single-TAG case, RAN4 agrees to reuse the Rel-16/17 approach (i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period on one of the band for each switching band pair) and discuss further details for Rel-18 Tx switching scenario in RAN1.”  The alternatives not consistent with RAN4 agreement should be removed for down selection. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @NTT DOCOMO, Thank you for your comment. Our point is that as long as the scheduled gap is larger than the switching gap required by a UE, it does not matter which carrier the switching period locates because all transmissions on all carriers are complete and not interrupted by the switching gap. Only if the scheduled gap is not sufficient, then the question is which carrier should be the victim carrier and provide more gap. For example, the first transmission at slot 1 on carrier 1, then the second transmission at slot 2 on carrier 2. If the cheduled gap between two transmissions are 14 symbols, then both transmissions on carriers are not impacted by the switching gap so that no need to specify a carrier for the location of switching gap.  This topic has been discussed in Rel-16 and the current spec is in line with the understanding above.  We suggest to remove the bracket from the main bullet. |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**

* **Down-select one of following alternatives for the ambiguity issue on switching period location when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap**
  + **Alt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on anchor band**
  + **Alt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**
  + **Alt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**
  + **Alt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on RRC configuration, e.g., uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation**
  + **Alt.6: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**
  + **Alt.7: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 4.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG Electronics | We prefer Alt.1, Alt.3, Alt.4 and Alt.7.  For Alt.2 and Alt.6, we share the same views with Apple and ZTE, respectively.  For Alt.5, as Moderator pointed out, it cannot solve the issue without any combination of other Alt. We are open to discuss.  @Huawei, Thanks for explanations on how Rel-16 works. But, we are not sure, as similar as NTT DOCOMO, if your comment is about switching period location in time domain or in carrier domain. Per our understanding, the switching period location is indicated by *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation.* We don’t understand how the exact switching period location in “carrier domain” is up to UE implementation. Please correct me if we missed something. |
| Vivo3 | We support this proposal. |
| China Telecom | Our view is the same as previous round. RAN4 agreement should be taken into account then only Alt.3 or Alt.5 is left. But we did not understand the difference between Alt.3 and Alt.5. We agree Alt.3 or Alt.5 cannot solve the issue without any combination of other Alt. We can further discussion based on Alt.3 or Alt.5. |
| ZTE | We are open to list all these potential alternatives. However, please delete “**when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap**” in the main bullet. The argument that the above proposal is only for the case when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap is not correct from our perspective. If we check the following description, it is clear a RRC configuration to determine the carrier (i.e., whether the switching period is located in this carrier or not) to absore the switching period. It is not related to the condition “**when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap**” in the main bullet.   |  | | --- | | ***uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation***  Indicates whether the location of UL Tx switching period is configured in this uplink carrier in case of inter-band UL CA, SUL, or (NG)EN-DC, as specified in TS 38.101-1 [15] and TS 38.101-3 [34].  In case of (NG)EN-DC, network always configures this field to TRUE for NR carrier (i.e. with (NG)EN-DC, the UL switching period always occurs on the NR carrier).  In case of inter-band UL CA or SUL, for dynamic uplink Tx switching between 2 bands with 2 uplink carriers or 3 uplink carriers as defined in TS 38.101-1 [15], network configures this field to TRUE for the uplink carrier(s) on one band and configures this field to FALSE for the uplink carrier(s) on the other band. This field is set to the same value for the carriers on the same band. | |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the FL proposal to list all the possibilities for future discussion.  We have two cents:   * Overlapped RAN4 & RAN1 discussion. As China Telecom mentioned above, it seems RAN4 already made some agreement, shall we tell RAN4 that we (RAN1) are working on this to avoid duplicated efforts & potential conflict agreements from RAN1 & RAN4?   Per my understanding, alternative means orthogonal options and only one of them would be chose. At least Alt.5 overlaps with some other Alternatives. We think it would be more accurate to use Option to replace Alternative. |
| Samsung | We support updated proposed agreement 4.2.1 |
| Apple | We suggest to downselect or at least reduce the number of alternatives in this meeting. Our preference ia Alt 4. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  We should avoid duplicated discussion between RAN1 and RAN4. Based on the moderator’s understanding, RAN4 will recommend RAN1 to discuss further details based on Rel-16/17 approach i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands for each band pair. So, as some companies suggested, we should consider listed approached as options instead of alternatives to allow potential combination of some approach with Rel-16/17 approach (Alt.3/5).  The updated proposal can be as below.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**   * **Reuse Rel-16/17 approach to determine the switching period location i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands for each switching band pair, and consider following options to solve the potential ambiguity issue on the switching period location**   + **Opt.0 (baseline): Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**   + **Opt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**   + **Opt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on specific band(s)**   + **Opt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**   + **Opt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**   + **Opt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**   + **Other option is not precluded** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 4.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Support the proposal, and in our view, Opt. 0 and Opt. 5 seem to be essentially same |
| CATT | We are ok with the updated proposal for further down-selection. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. One clarification on the baseline case: does it mean option 0 is automatically supported while the other options can be additionally considered? |
| MediaTek | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal in principle. However, two comments as follows  It is a bit confused if Rel-16/17 approach can be reused in Rel-18 without any enhancement. The existing RRC just indicate whether the switching period is located in a carrier or not. Thus this cannot be directly applied to Tx switching in Rel-18 since there are new introduced switching cases which are involved more than two bands in Rel-18. In this perspective, we suggest the following update.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**   * **Reuse Rel-16/17 ~~approach~~ principle to determine the switching period location i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands ~~for each switching band pair~~, and consider following options to solve the potential ambiguity issue on the switching period location**   In addition, it is not clear to us the meaning of “baseline” in Opt.0. Does it mean that Opt.0 is automativally adopted unless one of the other options is selected to adopt? Even if so, indication per band pair over 3 or 4 bands requires the new RRC configuration which is not the same as in Rel-17. Therefore, in out view, Opt.0 should be one option without “baseline” like other options. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal and further discuss the potential options. |
| China Telecom | Fine to further discuss. About LG’s comments, opt.0 and the main bullet are based on RAN4 agreement. |
| ZTE | Thanks for the proposal. We understand the intention of this proposal, but some of the options in the list seem to be conflicting with the “semi-static configuration” in the main bullet. For example, Opt0/3/5 are based on indication instead of semi-static configuration if the intention of “indication” refers to dynamic indication. Can we make the following changes to this proposal to reflect that the list is just or information so that we don’t need to discuss and debate the detailed wording for each options in the list.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**   * **Reuse Rel-16/17 approach to determine the switching period location i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands for each switching band pair** * **FFS: consider following options to solve the potential ambiguity issue on the switching period location**   + **Opt.0 (baseline): Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**   + **Opt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**   + **Opt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on specific band(s)**   + **Opt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**   + **Opt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**   + **Opt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**   + **Other option is not precluded** |
| OPPO | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In Rel-16/17, as commented before, the switching location is only needed when the scheduled switching gap is smaller than reported switching period. It has only RAN4 impact but no RAN1 impact. We prefer to follow the same principle. Therefore, we suggest   * Add “**when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap**” into main bullet * Add an FFS bullet under the main bullet, “FFS: whether RAN1 impact is needed” * Please remove “**e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier**” from Opt.4, because it is irrelevant and a per-carrier RRC configuration. The list would be a per-BC RRC configuration.For better example, it could be “e.g. band1 is prioritized for location in a configured list of {band1, band2, band3}   @LGE, Thank you for your question. If the scheduled gap between two transmissions is too small, the UE should take a victim carrier to get more gap according to the RRC configuration. It is not up to UE implementation because the gNB needs to protect the more important carrier from UL interruption in any worst case. If the scheduled gap is sufficiently large, then the time domain location is assumed just right before the latest scheduled transmission. Since it has caused no interruption to the transmissions, the exact location is not specified in Rel-16. Hope it could answer your question.  @ZTE, the RRC uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation you cited is only linked to RAN4 spec. In the corresponding excerpt below, three key informations are in line with our previous comments: 1) The scheduled transmissions (marked in green) are contiguous and have no sufficient switching gap. 2) the resulting switching period on the victim carrier is no greater than the reported UE capability switching period although the victim carrier is determined based on RRC configuration; 3) No RAN1 spec impact; We hope the RAN4 excerpt could resolve your concern. |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Google | We support the proposal.  @Huawei, For the Opt.4 we think it is ok to add more examples, but didn’t see the necessity to remove the current example. Whether it is a per-cell or per-BC configuration can be further discussed after the down selection, or it can also up to RAN2 to design it. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems companies are basically fine with the proposal.  We can add “FFS whether RAN1 spec impact is needed” and can remove “e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier” from option 4 since anyway they are for further discussion.  However, adding “when the scheduled gap between two transmissions is smaller than the reported switching gap” to main bullet was already tried and some company commented it is not necessary.  So, it seems we can make whole this proposal as for further study towards next meeting similar to the proposal 3.5 as ZTE suggested.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**   * **Study on how to reuse Rel-16/17 approach to determine the switching period location i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands for each switching band pair, and consider following options to solve the potential ambiguity issue on the switching period location for decision in RAN1#111**   + **Opt.0 (baseline): Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**   + **Opt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**   + **Opt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on specific band(s)**   + **Opt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**   + **Opt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE~~, e.g., using uplinkTxSwitchingCarrier~~**   + **Opt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**   + **Other option is not precluded**   + **FFS whether RAN1 spec impact is needed** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.1**

* **Study on how to reuse Rel-16/17 approach to determine the switching period location i.e., semi-static configuration of switching period location on one of the bands for each switching band pair, and consider following options to solve the potential ambiguity issue on the switching period location for decision in RAN1#111**
  + **Opt.0 (baseline): Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location per band pair**
  + **Opt.1: Switching period location can be determined based on predefined rule such as switch-from or switch-to**
  + **Opt.2: Switching period location can be determined or configured based on specific band(s)**
  + **Opt.3: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to}**
  + **Opt.4: Switching period location can be determined based on the priority list of bands configured to the UE**
  + **Opt.5: Switching period location can be determined based on the indication of switching period location {switch-from, switch-to} per band pair**
  + **Other option is not precluded**
  + **FFS whether RAN1 spec impact is needed**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 4.2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | Generally fine. But as several companies commented, **clarification on ‘baseline’ is needed**. Does it mean that Opt.0 must be adopted meanwhile one of the other options is selected to adopt addtionally? If no, what’s the point of the ‘baseline’? |
| Qualcomm | We share vivo’s question. Maybe it’s good to list all options at the same level. |
| Apple | In principle, support the proposal, and agree with Vivo and Qualcomm that “baseline” can be removed from opt.0. Also, the difference between option 0 and option 5 is not fully clear to us. |

### **Proposed agreement 4.2.2**

* **Switching period is reported per band pair separately for 2 bands and 3/4 bands**
* **For the case where four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period** 
  + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 4.2.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support UE reports the switching periods as a UE capability for all the switching cases. |
| ZTE | The first bullet can be left to RAN2/RAN4 discussion. Actually it is now under discussion in RAN4 according to the following info from RAN4 LS.   * *For the same band pair, RAN4 has not concluded on whether the same or a different value can be reported for the specific band pair supporting Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18 compared to Tx switching across 2 bands specified in Rel-16/17.*   Regarding the second bullet, the determination of switching period is not just related to the case when 4 bands are involved for a switching, it is also related to the case when 2 or 3 bands are involved for a switching.   * For 3 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (1Tx) + Band B (1Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 2-port transmission, multiple switching periods are involved due to 1Tx from Band A is switched to Band C and the other 1Tx from Band B is switched to Band C. * For 3 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (1Tx) + Band B (1Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 1-port transmission, different switching period may be needed if 1Tx from Band A is switched or 1Tx from Band B is switched to Band C. * For 2 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (2Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 1-port transmission, different switching period may be needed if 1Tx or 2Tx are switched from Band A to Band C.   Overall, we think all these cases should be onsidered together and we are open to alternatives for how to determine the switching period. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 4.2.2.  Similar to the proposal 4.1, Alt.2 based on gNB indication/configuration may be more flexible, but we are open. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal and open to discuss different alternatives |
| CATT | We are ok to further down selection. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal in principle and prefer Alt 1. In addition, we are open to discuss on 3 band cases commented by ZTE. |
| CMCC | We are fine to further discuss how to determine the switching period. |
| Vivo | We share the same view with ZTE that the first bullet can be left to RAN4 discussion.  For the second bullet, we also think the similar issue exists for 3 bands Tx switching. |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 4.2.2 |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Google | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSicon | The first bullet is not necessary which is decided by RAN4 as usual.  For the second bullet, it is unclear what issue to be solved. For each band pair, a switching period has been reported. So the switching period for each UL Tx switching is clear. If anything here motivated by RF implementation, it should be decided in RAN4. Sorry if we miss anything, some clarification is suggested. |
| China Telecom | Agree the first bullet can be left to RAN4 discussion and similar issue exists for 3 bands Tx switching cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although larger number of companies are fine with the proposal, some companies pointed that the first bullet can be removed as RAN4 is discussing the point. In addition, there are some companies proposing to consider 3 bands cases as well and there is a company who do not understand the motivation.  The moderator’s understanding is as below.   * For 3 bands case, since the ambiguity issue on Tx chain state should be anyway solved, Tx chain state after the switching should be clear and common understanding between UE and gNB. Then, which port needs to be switched should be clear as well since there are only three bands and two Tx chains. * For 4 bands case, as explained above moderator’s summary, when four bands are involved for a switching (switching from 1T+1T on band A+B to 1T+1T on band C+D), there would be ambiguity on switching period such as whether switching is {from A to C and from B to D} or {from A to D and from B to C} assuming different switching periods for different band pairs. This would be only the case where Tx chain state after switching is clear but which port needs to be switched to which port is ambiguous.   It seems further discussion on the proposal with removing the first bullet Is necessary. **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**  * **~~Switching period is reported per band pair separately for 2 bands and 3/4 bands~~** * **For the case where four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**

* **For the case where four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period** 
  + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration**
* **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 4.2.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | In general, we think this is not a RAN1 issue & expertise on determine how long the switching period would be for switching band pairs including 3 or 4 bands. This should be discussed in RAN4, together with band pairs including 2 bands.  We don’t think any of the Alternatives in updated proposal are needed as they might conflict with RAN4 switching period discussion.  We can only agree the deleted bullet based on above considerations.   * **Switching period is reported per band pair separately for 2 bands and 3/4 bands** |
| Vivo2 | Thanks for the FL’s effort and update. We still suggest to include the 3 bands case in the proposal. When 3 bands are involved for a switching, there still can be similar ambiguity on switching as the example provided by FL on 4 band case, thus leading to ambiguous switching period:  e.g, considering switching from 1T+1T on band A+B to 1T+1T on band A+C, it is not clear if the switching is performed as option1{TX on A remains on A, another TX switches from B to C} or option2 {TX switches from A to B, another TX switches from B to C}. option2 can happen when the freq gap between band A and band B is large while band C is closer to band A.    **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **For the case where four or three bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists** |
| ZTE | The intention of this proposal is help UE/gNB to be on the same page about the switching period. For the cases where multiple band pairs are involved in the switching, the switching gap has to be determined. For example, is the switching gap equal to 1) max of switching periods for the involved band pairs, 2) sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs, or 3) indicated/configured by the network, etc.  Then, the determination of switching period is not just related to the case when 4 bands are involved for a switching, it is also related to the case when 2 or 3 bands are involved for a switching.   * For 3 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (1Tx) + Band B (1Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 2-port transmission, multiple switching periods are involved due to 1Tx from Band A is switched to Band C and the other 1Tx from Band B is switched to Band C. * For 3 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (1Tx) + Band B (1Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 1-port transmission, different switching period may be needed if 1Tx from Band A is switched or 1Tx from Band B is switched to Band C. * For 2 band case: if UE is currently in Band A (2Tx) and then UE needs to switch to Band C for 1-port transmission, different switching period may be needed if 1Tx or 2Tx are switched from Band A to Band C.   We think all these cases should be studied together to avoid divergent solutions in the end. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal by Moderator |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We share the similar view with Qualcomm that the discussion here may go beyond what RAN1 can take. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for FL’s clarification.  For UL-CA Option1, since Rel-16, it is quivalent to carrier switching where once a carrier is switched to all two Tx chains are assumed on the carrier while all the other carriers have no Tx chains. But whether only one or both two chains are actually used for 1-port PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is up to UE implementation. The same assumption should be inherited to Rel-18. Therefore, no ambiguity exists for UL-CA Option 1.  For UL-CA Option2, the effective switching gap that gNB scheduling should prepare needs some discussion.  Therefore, we suggest  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2-rev**   * **For UL-CA Option2, for the case where four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  I see the point from vivo about option 1/2 in three band example. It should be fine to add three bands case as well.  Regarding ZTE’s point, if both two Tx chains perform switching, they said that how to determine the switching period may not be clear. However, even in Rel-17, 2 band case mentioned by ZTE exists, and in my understanding, the reported switching period for the band pair is applied irrespective of whether both two Tx chains switch or only one of Tx chains switch. In that sense, I thought the issue is not applicable to 2 band case. On the other hand, in case with more than two bands and two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods, then it may not be clear whether the resulting switching period is the maximum between two switching periods associated with band pairs or not. Actually, it is different issue from the original intension of the proposal where just switching band pairs are ambiguous and the proposal is to determine the switching band pairs.  Regarding Qualcomm’s and OPPO’s comment, it seems possible alternative to ask RAN4 to provide their feedback on above ZTE’s point i.e., how to determine the resulting switching period when two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods. However, as clarified above, original intension of the proposal is just to discuss how to determine the switching band pairs (e.g., A->C + B->D or A->D + B->C in case of four bands as my example, and A->A + B->C or A->C + B->A in case of three bands as vivo’s example). I think it is not RAN4 area discussion. Anyway, ZTE’s point can be separate proposal and asking RAN4 to work on the issue is one possible way.  Anyway, it seems further discussion would be necessary on following updated proposal.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **For the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists**   **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3**   * **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**   + **Alt.1: RAN1 sends LS to RAN4 to define how to determine the resulting switching period in such case**   + **Alt.2: RAN1 defines how to determine the resulting switching period in such case**     - **Alt.2-1: it is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.2-2: it is sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.2-3: it is indicated/configured by the network** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 4.2.2. We are open between Alt.1 and Alt.2.  We are fine with Alt.1 for 4.2.3. |
| China Telecom | On proposed agreement 4.2.2, regarding Vivo’s three bands example, we think we’d better focus on option 1 which is the minimum number of swiching Tx chain considering the limited TU in RAN1 till the ending of the WI. Considering much switching possibilities seems optimization (if the switching period of option 2 is increased comparing with option 1 due to more switched Tx chain, the performance would be even worse) for some special cases.  On proposed agreement 4.2.3, sending LS to RAN4 might miss the RAN1 ending time for this WI, given the cycle of LS between RAN1 and RAN4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For UL-CA Option1, since Rel-16, it is equivalent to carrier switching where once a carrier is switched to all two Tx chains are assumed on the carrier while all the other carriers have no Tx chains. But whether only one or both two chains are actually used for 1-port PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is up to UE implementation. The same assumption should be inherited to Rel-18. For the band combinations with 1Tx on one band, our understanding is the following,   * In RAN4 LS, switching period is agreed to be per band pair. Since in UL-CA Option 1 UE Tx chains are always switched between only one band pair, the per-band pair values reported by a UE has directly indicate the switching gap required by the UE for the switching between the band pair. * In a BC of 1Tx+1Tx+2Tx (Band A, B, C), if the switching pattern is Band C -> A -> C, it is the same as Rel-16/17, no issue. * In a BC of 1Tx+2Tx+2Tx (Band A, B, C), if the switching pattern is Band C -> A -> B, two Tx chains are required by Band B, one is switched from band A and whether the other Tx chain is switched from Band C or Band A is up to UE implementation. **The UE can always report a proper per-band pair switching gap that covers all possible implementations for all possible situations.** * In a BC of 1Tx + 1Tx + 2Tx +2Tx, the situation is similar to the above, the UE can always report a proper per-band pair switching period.   Therefore, no ambiguity exists for UL-CA Option 1.  For UL-CA Option2, the effective switching gap that gNB scheduling should prepare may need some discussion.  Therefore, we suggest  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **For UL-CA Option 1, the Rel-17 mechanism to determine the length of switching gap is reused, i.e. the switching gap in TS 38.214 is determined by the reported switching period** * **For UL-CA Option 2, for the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists**   **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3**   * **For UL-CA Option 2, for the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**   + **Alt.1: RAN1 sends LS to RAN4 to define how to determine the resulting switching period in such case**   + **Alt.2: RAN1 defines how to determine the resulting switching period in such case**     - **Alt.2-1: it is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.2-2: it is sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**   **Alt.2-3: it is indicated/configured by the network** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Regarding switched UL scenario, whether the ambiguity issue on switching period exists or not depends on the outcome of the discussion in 4.3 i.e., whether switching cases with 1T-1T are also allowed or not. Since we have FFS, it may be fine to keep the proposals in general for now.  We can check updated proposals. |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**

* **For the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period** 
  + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**
  + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration**
* **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 4.2.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 1. In our view, when multiple switching periods are reported to band pairs involved to a switching case, the determined switching period for the switching case should not be less than the maximum value among the reported periods. In addition, if gNB can indicate the switching period in such case, the value larger than the maximum among the reported periods would cause a waste of resource. |
| Vivo3 | We Support the proposal and support alt1.  Since it is agreed in RAN4 that the switching period is applied per band pair and UE cannot transmit uplink on 1 TX during switching period of another TX, alt1(maximum among possible switching periods) should be sufficient for the TX switching completion when 3 or 4 bands are involved. |
| Nokia, NSB 14.10 | Support and prefer Alt1 |
| China Telecom | Same view as in the last round. The scenario causing ambiguous issue for three bands may be not supported. Prefer Alt.1. |
| ZTE | Thanks moderator for the clarification. But we are still a little confused why we have two separate proposals (4.2.2 and 4.2.3) for the same issue.  If I understand moderator’s intention correctly:   * Case#1: Proposal 4.2.2 seems to target the case when Tx chains have different switching options, e.g., {A🡪C & B🡪D} or {A🡪D & B🡪C}. * Case#2: While proposal 4.2.3 seems to target the case when Tx chian only has one determined switching option, e.g., {A🡪C & B🡪C}, but different switching periods may be associated with A🡪C and B🡪C.   However, for the Case#1 above, if we take all the potential switching options into account, e.g., {A🡪C & B🡪D} or {A🡪D & B🡪C}, then it is the same issue as Case#2 above. On the other hand, Case#2 only exists if three or four bands are involved for a switching.  If we combine these two proposals together, it would be like the following.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **For the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule ~~e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods~~**     - **Alt.1-1: it is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.1-2: it is sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.1-3: it is indicated/configured by the network**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists** |
| Qualcomm | Thanks FL’s clarification, and now I believe this is RAN4 expertise & scope.  For the case mentioned by ZTE, we think it should rely on the UE reported switching period value for a band pair of A+B -> C+D. For implementation, UE from different vendors would be likely with very different Tx and PA mapping rules. Due to some RF constraints (e.g. EVM, power or others), single Tx chain could not connect to every PA from different band. The mapping selection sometimes is very dynamic & random. Similar proposal for vivo’s case.  One example from my RAN4 college is as below. Tx0 connects to Pas for band A and B, Tx 1 connects to Pas for band B and C. Reason why TX0 can’t be connected to band C and why TX0 and TX1 can be connected to the both band B Pas is finite coupling between the branches that will cause degradation in EVM.  When UE switches from left (A+B) to right (B+C), vivo’s case happens. We guess for some other designs, there may be no switching from PA2.B to PA1.B.    Due to above reason, we would suggest we tell RAN4 the issue and recommend them to define switching period capability for band pair of A+B -> C+D if they don’t yet. |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. Our preference is Alt.1 |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although many companies support the proposal, there are still several companies having concern on this proposal, such as this issue should be discussed together with proposal 4.2.3 or this issue should be discussed in RAN4.  Probably the proposal 4.2.3 is a basic question on the switching period and one possibility is to ask the question to RAN4 or to ask RAN4 to check the RAN1’s assumption once RAN1 agreed on one of alternatives in the proposal 4.2.3.  On the other hand, the proposal 4.2.2 is to discuss possible solutions for the potential ambiguity issue on switching period, and the purpose and framework are similar to the proposals 4.1/4.2.1.  Therefore, the moderator thinks these proposals should be separately discussed.  The proposal 4.2.2 can be discussed in RAN1. |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 4.2.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Fine to support |
| Vivo4 | Support to fix the case with ambiguity in RAN1, we also suggest to list the cases for further discussion in next meeting. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to support |
| ZTE | See our detailed comments in proposal 4.2.3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As commented before, it should be clear in the main bullet that the proposal is only applicable to dualUL configuration. For switchedUL, the existing mechanism should be reused for the reaons we commented previously.   * **For UL-CA Option 1, the Rel-17 mechanism to determine the length of switching gap is reused, i.e. the switching gap in TS 38.214 is determined by the reported switching period only**   The existing R16/17 principle for per-band pair reporting should be reused, i.e. **the UE is supposed to report a proper value of switching period to cover all possible UE implementations of Tx chain management for a switching band pair.**  Understand FL’s view that the proposal may depend on the outcome of proposal 4.3. Then we suggest to discuss proposal 4.3 first before agreeing the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks FL’s promotion.  We still don’t think this might be avoided to be discussed in RAN1 as it’s mainly a RAN4 issue due to the reason we explained above. We would prefer to ask RAN4 together with below issues. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems almost all companies are basically fine with the proposal, while there are following different views from majority.   * ZTE suggested to combine the proposal 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 * HW/HiSi suggested to discuss proposal 4.3.1 first. * QCM suggested to ask RAN4 to discuss the proposal 4.2.2 and 4.2.3   Regarding ZTE’s comment, the FL already clarified that the proposal 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 are discussing bit different issues. As we discuss both, it should be fine for ZTE.  Regarding HW/HiSi’s comment, similar to other proposals such as 4.1, it would be fair to say “at least for dualUL” for now.  Regarding QCM’s comment, all other companies seem to prefer to discuss this issue in RAN1. Please kindly consider and accept this proposal for the sake of progress.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **At least for dual UL, for the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the switching period**    + **Alt.1: Switching period is determined based on the predefined rule e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods**   + **Alt.2: Switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists**   Alternatively, the alternative proposal 4.2.3 below can address ZTE’s and QCM’s concern. So, we can check if it is fine for all. |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3**

* **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**
  + **RAN1 defines how to determine the resulting switching period in such case**
    - **Alt.2-1: it is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**
    - **Alt.2-2: it is sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**
    - **Alt.2-3: it is indicated/configured by the network**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 4.2.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 2-1. In our view, when multiple switching periods are reported to band pairs involved to a switching case, the determined switching period for the switching case can be the max of the reported periods. In addition, if gNB can indicate the switching period in such case, the value larger than the max of the reported periods would mean a waste of resource and the value smaller than the max of the reported periods would mean a ncomplete period for the switching case. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Vivo3 | We are confused about the relationship between Proposed agreement 4.2.3 and Proposed agreement 4.2.2, and clarification would be appreciated.  As FL explained, 4.2.2 is for switching period determination when the switching band pairs are ambiguous, 4.2.3 seems to be the case where the number of TX during switching is ambiguous. Then our understanding on 4.2.3 is as following,  for example, assuming that the source state is band A 2T, while the target state is band B 1T+ band C 1T, UE may perform either of the following ways by implementation   1. switch 1T from A to B, and switch 1T from A to C 2. switch 2T from A to B(or C), and then switch 1T from B(or C) to C(or B)   in 1) the 2TX can be switched simultaneously, while in 1)2steps are needed; thus alt2-2 is mainly intended for 2), is this the correct understanding of the issue that the proposal is trying to resolve? |
| Nokia, NSB 14.10 | OK, and support Alt 2-1 |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal and prefer Alt.2-1. |
| ZTE | See our comments for proposal 4.2.2. |
| Qualcomm | Please refer to our above comments. |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. Our preference is Alt. 2-1 |
| Apple | Fine to support |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although many companies support the proposal, there are still several companies having concern on this proposal, such as this issue should be discussed together with proposal 4.2.2 or this issue should be discussed in RAN4.  Probably the proposal 4.2.3 is a basic question on the switching period and one possibility is to ask the question to RAN4 or to ask RAN4 to check the RAN1’s assumption once RAN1 agreed on one of alternatives in the proposal 4.2.3.  On the other hand, the proposal 4.2.2 is to discuss possible solutions for the potential ambiguity issue on switching period, and the purpose and framework are similar to the proposals 4.1/4.2.1.  Therefore, the moderator thinks these proposals should be separately discussed.  The proposal 4.2.3 can be discussed in RAN1 or RAN4, but in previous round, there was concern on asking RAN4 considering it will take a time. So, we can discuss this proposal in RAN1 and possibly we can ask RAN4 to check RAN1’s agreed assumption.  It seems multiple companies prefer Alt.2-1 and hence we can check if Alt.2-1 can be informed to RAN4 as RAN1 assumption.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3**   * **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**   + **RAN1 assumes that the resulting switching period is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs in such case**   + **Send LS to ask RAN4 to check above RAN1 assumption** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 4.2.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Support |
| Vivo4 | We are fine with sending a LS to RAN4.  But if the ambiguity issue is to be discussed in RAN1 as proposed in 4.2.3, is this proposal only cover the case without ambiguity? If yes, it would be helpful if we can give more details to RAN4:   * **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**   + **RAN1 assumes that the resulting switching period is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs ~~in such case~~ when there is no ambiguity on the TX switching, including at least the following cases**     - **CASE1: switching from band A-> band C+ switching from band B-> band C,**     - **CASE2: switching from band A-> band B+ switching from band C-> band D**   **Send LS to ask RAN4 to check above RAN1 assumption** |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support the updated proposal 4.2.3.  In addition, our understanding for this proposal is that for any switching case in Rel-18, the resulting switching period can be determined as the max of switching periods for the involved all band pairs for that switching case. Under this understanding, we think this proposal covers the proposal 4.2.2. For example, in the Vivo2’s example in the second round discussion, the max of all switching periods corresponding to both option1 and option2 can be considered as the resulting switching period for that switching. In this case, option1 or option2 may be UE implementation.  Lastly, we are not sure it hould be needed to confirm such RAN1’s decision by RAN4. |
| ZTE | We prefer to discuss the switching period determination in RAN1 since RAN4 has already decided candicate values of switching periods. What we are discussing here which value of switching period is used and how to indicate it, from our perspective, this can be decided in RAN1.  However, if RAN1 couldn’t decide in the end of this meeting, we are ok to send both two proposas to RAN4 and ask RAN4 to decide. In addition to the above proposal 4.2.3, the following proposal should also be sent to RAN4.  BTW, we use “resulting switching period” to align with the wording used in proposal Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.2**   * **For the case where three or four bands are involved for a switching, down-select one of following alternatives for how to determine the resulting switching period**    + **Alt.1: Resulting switching period is determined based on the predefined rule ~~e.g., minimum or maximum among possible switching periods~~**     - **Alt.1-1: it is max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.1-2: it is sum of max of switching periods for the involved band pairs**     - **Alt.1-3: it is indicated/configured by the network**   + **Alt.2: Resulting switching period is determined based on gNB indication or configuration** * **FFS on other potential case where the ambiguous issue regarding switching period duration exists** |
| OPPO | We share QCM’s view in earlier round. Tx chain mapping is in RAN 4’s scope. To speed up discussion, we could compromise to reach a working assumption in RAN1 and send LS to RAN4 to check working assumption.  We also like to ask for a clarification on “the involved band pairs” in the proposal. Taking band A**+**B switched to band B+C in a 3-bands of {A,B,C} setup as an example: the “involved band pairs” in the proposal include all of {A,B}, {A,C} and {B,C}. If this understanding is correct, we could accept **Updated Proposed agreement 4.2.3** as working assumption. |
| Samsung | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As commented before, it should be clear in the main bullet that the proposal is only applicable to dualUL configuration. For switchedUL, the existing mechanism should be reused for the reaons we commented previously.   * **For UL-CA Option 1, the Rel-17 mechanism to determine the length of switching gap is reused, i.e. the switching gap in TS 38.214 is determined by the reported switching period only**   The existing R16/17 principle for per-band pair reporting should be reused, i.e. the UE is supposed to report a proper value of switching period to cover all possible UE implementations of Tx chain management for a switching band pair.  For dual UL, it should be clarified whether “**involved band pairs**” refers to only current triggered UL Tx switching or both the current and previous UL Tx switchings. In our understanding, it is the former.  Understand FL’s view that the proposal may depend on the outcome of proposal 4.3. Then we suggest to discuss proposal 4.3 first before agreeing the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We shared our views above in last round and think this is a RAN4 issue.  Given anyway we would need to ask RAN4 to provide insights, we propose we only include the ambiguity cases and don’t provide any solution(s). We would leave sufficient flexibility to RAN4. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Google | Support and we are ok with sending a LS to RAN4. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems almost all companies are fine with the direction of the proposal i.e., sending LS to RAN4.  Considering vivo’s, ZTE’s, QCM’s and OPPO’s comment, following alternative proposal is provided. It is just to provide the identified issues and ask RAN4 to discuss and decide.  **Alternative Proposed agreement 4.2.3**   * **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**   + **Send LS to ask RAN4 to discuss and decide how to determine the resulting switching period**      - **Example#1 (no ambiguity issue on switching pattern for each Tx chain): when switching from 2T on band A to 1T-1T on band B and C is performed, if UE reported different switching periods between band pair A-B and band pair A-C, how to determine the resulting switching period?**     - **Example#2 (there is ambiguity issue on switching pattern for each Tx chain): when switching from 1T-1T on band A and B to 1T-1T on band C and D is performed, if UE reported different switching periods among band pairs A-C, A-D, B-C and B-D, how to determine the resulting switching period?** |

**Alternative Proposed agreement 4.2.3**

* **For the case where two Tx chains perform switching for different band pairs with different reported switching periods,**
  + **Send LS to ask RAN4 to discuss and decide how to determine the resulting switching period** 
    - **Example#1 (no ambiguity issue on switching pattern for each Tx chain): when switching from 2T on band A to 1T-1T on band B and C is performed, if UE reported different switching periods between band pair A-B and band pair A-C, how to determine the resulting switching period?**
    - **Example#2 (there is ambiguity issue on switching pattern for each Tx chain): when switching from 1T-1T on band A and B to 1T-1T on band C and D is performed, if UE reported different switching periods among band pairs A-C, A-D, B-C and B-D, how to determine the resulting switching period?**

#### 6th round Feedback form for 4.2.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | support |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal. |
| Apple | Support |

## 4.3 detailed switching cases and mechanisms for Switched UL and for Dual UL

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding detailed switching cases and mechanisms for Switched UL.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Proposal 1:*** *Reuse the R17 triggering mechanism of UL Tx switching specified in S6.1.6.2 of TS 38.214 for UL-CA Option 1 for dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands.* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 8****: Adopt the following two tables for Rel-18 UL Tx switching as baseline.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of Tx Chains  (Band A + Band B + Band C) | Number of antenna ports for UL transmission  Band A(Carrier 1)+Band B(Carrier 2)+Band C(Carrier 3) | | Case 1-1 | 1T+1T+0T | 1P+0P+0P, 1P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+0P | | Case 1-2 | 0T+1T+1T | 0P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+1P, 0P+0P+1P | | Case 1-3 | 1T+0T+1T | 1P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+1P | | Case 2-1 | 2T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P | | Case 2-2 | 0T+2T+0T | 0P+2P+0P, 0P+1P+0P | | Case 2-3 | 0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+1P |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of Tx Chains  (Band A + Band B + Band C+Band D) | Number of antenna ports for UL transmission  Band A(Carrier 1)+Band B(Carrier 2)+Band C(Carrier 3) +Band D (Carrier 4) | | Case 1-1 | 1T+1T+0T+0T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+0P | | Case 1-2 | 0T+1T+1T+0T | 0P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 1-3 | 0T+0T+1T+1T | 0P+0P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 1-4 | 1T+0T+0T+1T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 1-5 | 1T+0T+1T+0T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 1-6 | 0T+1T+0T+1T | 0P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 2-1 | 2T+0T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P+0P | | Case 2-2 | 0T+2T+0T+0T | 0P+2P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+0P | | Case 2-3 | 0T+0T+2T+0T | 0P+0P+2P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 2-4 | 0T+0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+0P+1P |   ***Proposal 9****: At least introduce the following new switching cases for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.*   * *1-port transmission on carrier/band A + 1-port transmission on carrier/band B <-> 1-port transmission on carrier/band C* * *1-port transmission on carrier/band A + 1-port transmission on carrier/band B <-> 2-port transmission on carrier/band C* * *1-port transmission on carrier/band A + 1-port transmission on carrier/band B <-> 1-port transmission on carrier/band A or B + 1-port transmission on carrier/band C* * *1-port transmission on carrier/band A + 1-port transmission on carrier/band B <-> 1-port transmission on carrier/band C + 1-port transmission on carrier/band D* |
| [5] | **Proposal 4: The Tx switching between different cases for 3 or 4 bands can at least include these scenarios that are almost identical to the Tx switching cases between 2 bands specified in Rel-16/Rel-17.**   * **Scenario 1: Switching between the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band B, and the case of 0 Tx on band A and 2 Tx on band B, while 0Tx on band C (and band D if configured).** * **Scenario 2: Switching between the case of 0 Tx on band A and 2 Tx on band B, and the case of 2 Tx on band A and 0 Tx on band B, while 0Tx on band C (and band D if configured).** * **Scenario 3: Switching among the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band B, the case of 0 Tx on band A and 2 Tx on band B, and the case of 2 Tx on band A and 0 Tx on band B, while 0Tx on band C (and band D if configured).**   Proposal 5: The following Tx switching between different cases for 3 or 4 bands can be supported in Rel-18:   * **Scenario 4: Switching between the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band B, and the case of 0 Tx on band A/B and 2 Tx on band C, (while 0Tx on band D if configured).** * **Scenario 5: Switching between the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band B, and the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band C, (while 0Tx on band D if configured).**   Proposal 6: The following Tx switching between different cases for 4 bands can be supported in Rel-18:   * **Scenario 6: Switching between the case of 1 Tx on band A and 1 Tx on band B, and the case of 1 Tx on band C and 1 Tx on band D.** |
| [6] | **Proposal 1: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 bands each supporting maximum 2Tx chain, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports for inter-band UL CA Option 1 with and without SUL band is defined as follows.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** for Band A+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band B+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band C | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band A+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band B+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band C | | Case 1 | 2T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P | | Case 2 | 0T+2T+0T | 0P+2P+0P, 0P+1P +0P | | Case 3 | 0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+1P |   **Proposal 2: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 4 bands each supporting maximum 2Tx chain, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports for inter-band UL CA Option 1 with and without SUL band is defined as follows.**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** for Band A+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band B+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band C+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band D | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band A+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band B+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band C+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band D | | Case 1 | 2T+0T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P+0P | | Case 2 | 0T+2T+0T+0T | 0P+2P+0P+0P, 0P+1P +0P+0P | | Case 3 | 0T+0T+2T+0T | 0P+0P+2P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 4 | 0T+0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+0P+1P |   **Proposal 3: For inter-band UL CA Option 1, if Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is configured, the switching period is only applicable when the UL transmissions are switched between different bands.**  **Proposal 5: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 bands each supporting maximum 2Tx chain, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports for inter-band UL CA Option 2 is defined as follows.**   * **If there is(are) SUL band(s) within band A, B, C, D, subset of the cases applies.**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** for Band A+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band B+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band C | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band A+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band B+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band C | | Case 1 | 2T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P | | Case 2 | 0T+2T+0T | 0P+2P+0P, 0P+1P+0P | | Case 3 | 0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+1P | | Case 4 | 1T+1T+0T | 1P+0P+0P, 1P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+0P | | Case 5 | 1T+0T+1T | 1P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+1P | | Case 6 | 0T+1T+1T | 0P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+1P, 0P+0P+1P |   **Proposal 6: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 4 bands each supporting maximum 2Tx chain, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports for inter-band UL CA Option 2 is defined as follows.**   * **If there is(are) SUL band(s) within band A, B, C, D, subset of the cases applies.**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** for Band A+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band B+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band C+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band D | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band A+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band B+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band C+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band D | | Case 1 | 2T+0T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P+0P | | Case 2 | 0T+2T+0T+0T | 0P+2P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+0P | | Case 3 | 0T+0T+2T+0T | 0P+0P+2P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 4 | 0T+0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 5 | 1T+1T+0T+0T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+0P | | Case 6 | 1T+0T+1T+0T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 7 | 1T+0T+0T+1T | 1P+0P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 8 | 0T+1T+1T+0T | 0P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+0P | | Case 9 | 0T+1T+0T+1T | 0P+1P+0P+0P, 0P+1P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P | | Case 10 | 0T+0T+1T+1T | 0P+0P+1P+0P, 0P+0P+1P+1P, 0P+0P+0P+1P |   **Proposal 7: For inter-band UL CA Option 2, if Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is configured, the switching period is applicable in the following cases:**   * **If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on one band and 0Tx on other bands, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on one of other bands.** * **If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on one band and 0Tx on other bands, the next UL transmission has simultaneous 1-port transmission on two bands each on at least one carrier.** * **If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on one band and 0Tx on other bands, the next UL transmission only has a 1-port transmission on at least one carrier on one of other bands.** * **If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on one band and 1Tx on another band, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on a band.** * **If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on one band and 1Tx on another band, the next UL transmission has simultaneous 1-port transmission on two bands each on at least one carrier, at least one of the next transmitting two bands is different than the two current 1Tx bands.** * **If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on one band and 1Tx on another band, the next UL transmission only has a 1-port transmission on at least one carrier on a third band.** |
| [8] | **Proposal 12: For inter-band UL CA option 1 with 3 or 4 carriers, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains can be supported as follows.**  **Mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains for inter-band UL CA option 1 with 3 carriers**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Number of Tx chains**  **(carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3)** | **Number of antenna ports for UL transmission**  **(carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3)** | | **Case 4** | **0T+0T+2T** | **{0P+0P+2P},{0P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 5** | **0T+2T+0T** | **{0P+2P+0P},{0P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 6** | **2T+0T+0T** | **{2P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P}** |   **Mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains for inter-band UL CA option1 with 4 carriers**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Number of Tx chains (carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3 + carrier 4)** | **Number of antenna ports for UL transmission (carrier 1 + carrier 2+ carrier 3 carrier 4)** | | **Case 7** | **0T+0T+0T+2T** | **{0P+0P+0P+2P},{0P+0P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 8** | **0T+0T+2T+0T** | **{0P+0P+2P+0P},{0P+0P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 9** | **0T+2T+0T+0T** | **{0P+2P+0P+0P},{0P+1P+0P+0P}** | | **Case 10** | **2T+0T+0T+0T** | **{2P+0P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P+0P}** |   **Proposal 13: For inter-band UL CA option 2 with 3 or 4 carriers, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains can be supported as follows.**  **Mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains for inter-band UL CA option 2 with 3 carriers**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Number of Tx chains**  **(carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3)** | **Number of antenna ports for UL transmission (carrier 1+ carrier 2 + carrier 3)** | | **Case 1** | **0T+1T+1T** | **{0P+0P+1P}, {0P+1P+0P}, {0P+1P+1P}** | | **Case 2** | **1T+0T+1T** | **{0P+0P+1P},{1P+0P+0P}, {1P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 3** | **1T+1T+0T** | **{0P+1P+0P},{1P+0P+0P},{1P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 4** | **0T+0T+2T** | **{0P+0P+2P},{0P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 5** | **0T+2T+0T** | **{0P+2P+0P},{0P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 6** | **2T+0T+0T** | **{2P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P}** |   Mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains for inter-band UL CA option 2 with 4 carriers   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Number of Tx chains (carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3 + carrier 4)** | **Number of antenna ports for UL transmission (carrier 1 + carrier 2 + carrier 3 + carrier 4)** | | **Case 1** | **0T+0T+1T+1T** | **{0P+0P+0P+1P},{0P+0P+1P+0P},{0P+0P+1P+1P}** | | **Case 2** | **0T+1T+0T+1T** | **{0P+0P+0P+1P},{0P+1P+0P+0P},0P+1P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 3** | **0T+1T+1T+0T** | **{0P+0P+1P+0P},{0P+1P+0P+0P},{0P+1P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 4** | **1T+1T+0T+0T** | **{0P+1P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P+0P},{1P+1P+0P+0P}** | | **Case 5** | **1T+0T+1T+0T** | **{0P+0P+1P+0P},{1P+0P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 6** | **1T+0T+0T+1T** | **{0P+0P+0P+1P},{1P+0P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 7** | **0T+0T+0T+2T** | **{0P+0P+0P+2P},{0P+0P+0P+1P}** | | **Case 8** | **0T+0T+2T+0T** | **{0P+0P+2P+0P},{0P+0P+1P+0P}** | | **Case 9** | **0T+2T+0T+0T** | **{0P+2P+0P+0P},{0P+1P+0P+0P}** | | **Case 10** | **2T+0T+0T+0T** | **{2P+0P+0P+0P},{1P+0P+0P+0P}** |   **Proposal 14: The mapping rule between Tx chains and antenna port for inter-band UL CA option1 (*SwitchedUL*)** **with 3 or 4 carriers can be reused for 1 SUL with 3 or 4 carriers scenario.**  **Proposal 16: For uplink Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, if the UE is configured with option 2 (*DualUL*) and only two carriers are involved in Tx UL switching, the uplink Tx switching scheme in Rel-16/Rel-17 can be reused.**  **Proposal 17: For uplink Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, if the UE is configured with option 2 (*DualUL*) and three carriers are involved in Tx UL switching; the following two cases shall be applied uplink switching period**   * **Switching between “2-port transmission on first uplink carrier” and “1-port transmission on second uplink carrier and 1-port transmission on third uplink carrier”** * **Switching between “1-port transmission on first uplink carrier and 1-port transmission on second uplink carrier” and “1-port transmission on first or second uplink carrier and 1-port transmission on third uplink carrier”.**   **Proposal 18: For uplink TX switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, if the UE is configured with option 2 (DualUL) and four carriers are involved in Tx UL switching; the following one case shall be applied uplink switching period,**   * **Switching between “1-port transmission on first uplink carrier and 1-port transmission on second uplink carrier” and “1-port transmission on third uplink carrier 1-port transmission on fourth uplink carrier.”**   **Proposal 19: All UL Tx switching cases are supported in R18 specification, and gNB can configure sub-set of switching cases according to reported UE capability.** |
| [9] | **Proposal 2**   * For mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain:   + Consider Table 1 for Tx switching across 3 bands for CA Option 1 without or with SUL   + Consider Table 2 for Tx switching across 3 bands for CA Option 2 without SUL   + Consider Table 3 for Tx switching across 4 bands for CA Option 1 without or with SUL   + Consider Table 4 for Tx switching across 4 bands for CA Option 2 without SUL |
| [10] | ***Proposal 1: There should be no restrictions on the band pairs for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.*** |
| [11] | **Proposal 1. If dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 and 4 bands is supported, the following switching cases can be considered.**   * **For UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in inter-band UL Option 1 CA without SUL scenarios, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports can be defined as in Table 1 and Table 2.** * **For UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in inter-band UL Option 2 CA without SUL scenarios, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports can be defined as in Table 3 and Table 4.** * **For UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in inter-band UL CA with 1 SUL band, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports can be defined as in Table 5 and Table 6.** |
| [17] | **Proposal 5: For Rel-18 switched UL scenario, whether switching cases where Tx chains are on the different bands are supported or not should be discussed.** |
| [18] | **Table 1 General switching cases for Rel-18**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Tx status of each band, may be contiguous CA of some band (Band A, B, C, D) |  | | Case 1 | aT + bT + cT + dT | Two out of {a, b, c, d} are “1” and the rest are “0” | | Case 2 | aT + bT + cT + dT | One out of {a, b, c, d} is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | | Case 3 | aT + bT + cT + dT | Another one of {a, b, c, d} is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” |   **Proposal 2: Use the switching cases in Table 1 for Rel-18 UL Tx switching discussion.**  **Table 3 CA Option 1 mapping between Tx state and Tx layers**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Tx state of each band, may be contiguous CA of some band (Band A, B, C, D) |  | Transmission layers | | Case 2 | aT + bT + cT + dT | The anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Anchor band: ≥1 layer | | Case 3 | aT + bT + cT + dT | A non-anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Non-anchor band: ≥1 layer |   **Proposal 4: Adopt Table 3 for CA Option 1 without SUL mapping between Tx state and Tx layers.**  **Table 5 CA Option 2 mapping between Tx state and Tx layers**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Tx state of each band, may be contiguous CA of some band (Band A, B, C, D) |  | Transmission layers | | Case 1 | aT + bT + cT + dT | The anchor and one non-anchor band are “1” and rest are “0” | Anchor band: 1 layer  Non-anchor band: 1 layer | | Case 2 | aT + bT + cT + dT | The anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Anchor band: ≥ 1 layer | | Case 3 | aT + bT + cT + dT | The non-anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Non-anchor band: ≥ 1 layer |   **Proposal 5: Adopt Table 5 for CA Option 2 without SUL mapping between Tx state and Tx layers.**  **Proposal 6: For inter-band UL CA Option 1 with SUL, adopt following for UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands.**   * **Leverage CA Option 1 without SUL as baseline** * **The anchor band should be identified among NUL bands. Direct switching is between anchor and non-anchor bands, and indirect switching between non-anchor bands.** * **FFS: whether allowing direct switching between SUL and other NUL rather than its serving cell.**   **Table 7 CA Option 1 with SUL mapping between Tx state and Tx layers**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Tx state of each band, may be contiguous CA of one NUL band |  | Transmission layers | | Case 2 | aT + bT + cT + dT | The anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Anchor band: ≥1 layer | | Case 3 | aT + bT + cT + dT | A non-anchor band is “1” or “2” and the rest are “0” | Non-anchor band: ≥1 layer |   **Proposal 7: Adopt Table 7 for CA Option 1 with SUL mapping between Tx state and Tx layers.** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Reuse R17 triggering mechanism of UL Tx switching (specified in S6.1.6.2 of TS 38.214) for Switched UL [2], [6]   + Switching period is only applicable when the UL transmissions are switched between different bands * Reuse R17 triggering mechanism of UL Tx switching for Dual UL when only two bands are involved in a switching [8] * New switching instances need to be specified for Dual Ulwhen more than two bands are involved in a switching [2], [6], [8] * Support all the switching cases such as 6 cases for 3 bands and 10 cases for 4 bands [3], [5], [6], [8], [9], [10], [11], [17]   + For Switched UL, only cases with 2T (3 cases for 3 bands and 4 cases for 4 bands) are supported [6], [8], [9], [11]   + Even for Switched UL, cases with 1T+1T may be supported e.g., when 2 ports transmission is not supported in some band(s) [3], [5], [17]   + Subset of switching cases can be configured by gNB according to the reported capability [8] * Use the new generalized table for the switching cases in Rel-18 [18] |

It seems that many companies consider switching cases and triggering mechanisms based on Rel-16/17. However, if we consider some complexity reduction options such as option 1 and 2, possible switching cases may need to be considered case by case. The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 4.3**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**
  + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**
  + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**
    - **At least for dual UL, following new conditions are considered**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on one band (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**
    - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 4.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with this proposal.  There are also some spec impacts for switched UL and SUL, e.g., ambiguity issue for them and how to determine the switching period. But these can be discussed separately. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 4.3. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal.  Depending the results for FFS, some switching cases may be skipped from the mapping table. But, agreeing on the mapping table for all switching cases should be first. |
| Vivo | We are generally fine with the proposal. But there is one missing case for the new condition, i.e., 1T+1T+0T🡪1T+0T+1T: “when the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on one band (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)”?   * + - **At least for dual UL, following new conditions are considered**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**       * **when the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on one band (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**   **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on one band (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)** |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed agreement 4.3 |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal 4.3. |
| Ericsson | We are OK w the proposal |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| Google | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Only for dualUL, new switching triggering conditions are needed. For switchUL, the existing ones can be reused. Therefore, please remove the last FFS point under the second bullet and add “for dualUL only” to the second bullet. |
| China Telecom | We suggest the last new case to be modified as:  **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on one band (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (~~3~~~~rd~~ ~~and 4~~~~th~~ ~~band~~ at least one of them is different from the 1st and 2nd band)** |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the proposal |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority supports this proposal, and one case can be added as vivo and CTC pointed.  Regarding Huawei’s comment, it is FFS since some companies consider to support 1T+1T switching cases even for switched UL as in [3], [5], [17]. For example, if only up to 1 port transmission is supported for band A/B among 4 bands, 2T on band A and 2T on band B would not be necessary while 1T+1T on band A+B would be necessary. Then, the 1st and 2nd cases in the proposal would also be applicable to such case even it is switched UL. **Updated Proposed agreement 4.3**  * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**   + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**   + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**     - **At least for dual UL, following new conditions are considered**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**     - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2** |

**Updated Proposed agreement 4.3**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**
  + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**
  + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**
    - **At least for dual UL, following new conditions are considered**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**
    - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**

#### 2nd round Feedback form for 4.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the updated FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We share similar view as moderator on this proposal, it may be applicable to switched UL. We are ok with this proposal. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the updated proposal |
| Samsung | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the updated proposal in principle.  For new condition cases, where the involved band number exceeds 2, it is likely that the memory sharing is required and the longer switch period (including time for memory sharing) is also needed. So if RAN1 would anyway setup “existing condition” and “new condition”, it could simplify the discussions on complexity reduction Option-3 if these two conditions can apply over there (especially when the RAN1 discussion on memory usage is hard/complicated to proceed).  With above in mind, we suggest to add a FFS as the following:  FFS the same or different switch period for existing conditions and new conditions |
| Apple | We support the updated proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks FL for your reply.  It has been discussed in Rel-16 as well, and no particular handling is needed. For example, 1Tx Band A+ 2Tx Band B, the first slot is on 1Tx band A, then 1 port PUCCH is at the second slot on 2Tx Band B, then PUSCH at the third slot on Band A. The decision in Rel-16 is that the switching gap is always needed between the second slot and the third slot because whether 1Tx or 2Tx is used for the 1-port transmission is up to UE implementation and the gNB has no information for it. We prefer not to reopen the discussion for UL-CA Option 1 and keep the same freedom of UE implementation.  Please remove the last FFS point under the second bullet and add “for dualUL only” to the second bullet. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  FFS suggested by OPPO can be added.  Regarding Huawei’s comment, i.e., whether 1T or 2T for 1 port transmission can be up to UE implementation, I think such principle would cause the ambiguity issue as discussed in 4.1. In addition, some companies consider the combination between switchedUL and complexity reduction option 2 would be specific case where new condition may be applicable. So, it should be fair to keep the point as FFS for now.  The updated proposal will be provided In the GTW session.  **Updated Proposed agreement 4.3**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**   + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**   + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**     - **At least for dual UL, following new conditions are considered**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**     - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**     - **FFS the same or different switch period for existing conditions and new conditions** |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following proposal was agreed at the GTW session.  **Proposed agreement 4.3**  **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**   * + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**   + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**     - **For dual UL, following new conditions are considered**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**       * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**     - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**     - **FFS the same or different switch period for existing conditions and new conditions**   Based on the agreement and other agreements on complexity reduction option 1/2, we can further discuss more details about switching cases for switched UL and dual UL with or without complexity reduction options. Clarification on supported switching cases would facilitate the discussion on potential ambiguity issues in section 4.1/4.2.  For example, we can discuss following points.   * For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed (like 2T-2T mode in Rel-17) or switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T can also be assumed? * For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands, for the band where 2 ports UL transmission is not supported, switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T can be assumed (like 1T-2T mode in Rel-16/17) or only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed? Especially if there are 2 bands or more out of 3 or 4 bands supporting only up to 1 port UL transmission, assuming switching case (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T instead of switching cases with 2T for each band can reduce the number of switching cases? * For dual UL, if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s), corresponding switching case(s) with 1T+1T for the band pair(s) are not assumed or can still be assumed? * Maybe more discussion points can be added if any   So, companies are encouraged to provide their views on above discussion points. |

#### 3rd round Feedback form for 4.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | For the 1st discussion point, we don’t think that for switchedUL, only switching cases with 2T should be assumed, 1T+1T can also be assumed. Similarly for the 2nd discussion point as well, no restriction for switchedUL needs to be assumed. On the 3rd discussion point, 1T+1T shall not be assumed for the band pair(s) on which UE doesn’t supporte concurrent transmission |
| New H3C | In eneral, if possible, R16/R17 mode rule should be reused. |
| Xiaomi | For the first discussion point, I guess ‘1T+1T’ should be 1T-1T? Otherwise, we don’t get the point to support concurrent transmission for switched UL. If this is the intention, we think 1T-1T should also be assumed.  For the other discussion points, we share same views with Apple. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding Xiaomi’s question, we have same understanding that 1T+1T here means one Tx chain is associated with one band and another Tx chain is associated with another band, not related to concurrent transmission.  Regarding the 1st discussion point, we are fine with only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T to be assumed as in Rel-17 if majority prefers so. We think switching cases with 1T+1T even for switched UL may be beneficial to reduce the number of switchings e.g., when 1port on band A and 1port on band B are frequently used. But it is same for Rel-17 2 band case and some companies said it was discussed and concluded that only switching cases with 2T are sufficient for switched UL. Hence we can accept applying the same conclusion for 3 or 4 bands if UE supports up to 2 ports on all bands.  Regarding the 2nd discussion point, however, it is clearly beneficial to assume some switching cases with 1T+1T since some bands do not support 2 ports transmission and switching case with 2T for the band seems unnecessary.  Regarding the 3rd discussion point, similar to above our comment for 1st discussion point, it may be beneficial to assume 1T+1T even for band pair which is not available for concurrent transmission e.g., when 1 port on each band is frequently used. |
| ZTE | For the 1st and 2nd bullet, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands, then the Rel-16/17 mechanism should be reused. The Rel-16/17 UL Tx switching WID and the corresponding RAN4 spec are copied below, it is clear that 1T+1T are supported for SUL and switchedUL CA. When a carrier is only capable to support 1Tx, it should not be a UE implementation issue to support any 2Tx operation on that carrier. As specified, it should be assumed that only up to 1Tx can be assigned to that carrier. Therefore, there are ambiguity issues also for switchedUL. We need to discuss how another “unused” Tx is assigned so that we can align the understanding between network and UE on whether/which band-pair specific switching gap should be applied.  ----------Rel-16 UL Tx switching WID-----------------   * *Specify UE requirements to allow switching between case 1 and case 2 as below for two uplink carriers case inter-band EN-DC without SUL, inter-band UL CA and standalone SUL for UE supporting maximum two concurrent transmission*  |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Case 1* | *1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1 Tx on carrier 2* | | *Case 2* | *0 Tx on carrier 1 and 2 Tx on carrier 2* |   ------------ Rel-17 UL Tx switching WID ---------------   * + *Specify UE requirements to enable Tx switching between cases, where 1 carrier on band A and 2 contiguous aggregated carriers on band B, and band A is for SUL or non-SUL and band B is a non-SUL band*     - *The scenarios include*       * *For Tx switching based on SUL band combination, or uplink CA band combination*  |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | ***Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)*** | | *Case 1* | *1T+1T* | | *Case 2* | *0T+2T* |   *and*   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | ***Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)*** | | *Case 2* | *0T+2T* | | *Case 3* | *2T+0T* |  * + - * *For Tx switching based on uplink CA band combination*  |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | ***Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)*** | | *Case 1* | *1T+1T* | | *Case 2* | *0T+2T* | | *Case 3* | *2T+0T* |   ------------ RAN4 spec --------------- **6.3A.3.3.2 Time mask for switching between two uplink carriers** In addition to the requirements in 6.3A.3.3.1 and the maximum output power requirement specified in Table 6.2A.1.3-1 with uplink assigned to two NR bands, the switching time mask specified in this clause is applicable for an uplink band pair of a inter-band UL CA configuration when the capability *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod* is present, and is only applicable for uplink switching mechanisms specified in clause 6.1.6 of TS 38.214 [10], where NR UL carrier 1 is capable of one transmit antenna connector and NR UL carrier 2 is capable of two transmit antenna connectors with 3dB boosting on the maximum output power for CA power class 3 when the capability *uplinkTxSwitching-PowerBoosting* is present and the IE *uplinkTxSwitchingPowerBoosting* is enabled, and the two uplink carriers are in different bands with different carrier frequencies. The UE shall support the switch between single layer transmission with one antenna port and two-layer transmission with two antenna ports on the two uplink carriers following the scheduling commands and rank adaptation, i.e., both single layer and two-layer transmission with 2 antenna ports, and single layer transmission with 1 antenna port shall be supported on NR UL carrier 2.  Regarding the third bullet, it depends on whether the switchedUL and dualUL can be configured simultaneously for one band combination. To us, it is not allowed. |
| China Telecom | For the 1st discussion point, the Rel-17 rule should be extended applying 2T for each band.  For the 2nd discussion point, how can the number of switching cases be reduced assuming switching case (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T? As long as the UL transmissions are switched between different bands, switching period is necessary.  For the 3rd discussion point, if switched UL is configured for the band pair(s), Tx can be switched between the band pair(s). Otherwise, Tx can not be switched between the band pair(s). |
| CMCC | For switched UL, the switching mode in Rel-17 can be extended for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. For dual UL, there is no need to assume the switching case(s) with 1T+1T for the band pair(s) if UE does not support concurrent transmission on the corresponding band pair(s). |
| Qualcomm | In general, we think the example cases might be over complicated  In Rel-16 discussion we already reached the consensus that Tx chain is not visible in RAN1, RAN1 can only schedule 1 port or 2 ports on carriers/bands. This is also the reason Rel-16 SwitchedUL only supports 1 port Tx for Case 1 (1T+1T). We would suggest we use same interpretation of SwitchedUL in Rel-18. Please find our considerations below for the above cases.   * SwitchedUL only indicates transmission from single band cases, not simulatenous transmission from any two bands. It would be good it’s not cover 1T+1T even no real simulatenous transmission. Otherwise, it would be over complicated to determine when the switching period should be placed.   If some concurrent Tx of DualUL is precluded, 1T+1T should not be assumed for the specific band pairs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks FL for your summary and questions.  In our view, the triggering mechanism specified in Rel-17 (as copied below) can be reused for Rel-18 SwitchedUL.   * *When the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band and if the preceding uplink transmission is a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier on another band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the carriers.*   *- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band and if the preceding uplink transmission is a 2-port transmission on another uplink carrier on another band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the carriers.*  *- For the UE configured with uplinkTxSwitchingOption set to ‘switchedUL’, when the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier on another band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the carriers.*  Regarding FL’s questions for switched UL, they have been discussed in Rel-16. 2Tx should be assumed on the current carrier after a triggered UL Tx switching according to the spec. Otherwise, additional switching gap is needed between slot#2 and slot#3 in the following scheduling pattern which is not in line with the spec, 1 port transmission at slot#1 on band A, then 1 port transmission at slot#2 on band B, then 2-port transmission at slot#3 on the same band B. |
| LG Electronics | For all three discussion points, 1T+1T can be assumed as long as the useless case is not identified. |
| OPPO | For the 1st and 2nd discussion point, we don’t think only switching cases with 2T should be assumed. It introduces some unnecessary switching periods.  For 3rd discussion point, although concurrent transmission is not supported in specific band, 1T+1T mapping still can avoid unnecessary switching period. So any specific Tx chain mapping restriction is not necessary.  Generally, limitation on the number of Tx chain mapping status could be one way to balance UE complexity and gNB scheduling efficiency. For example, UE reports the following information:   * Supported band for Tx switch: e.g. A,B,C * Supported Tx switch mode: e.g. Dual UL and Switched UL * Supported concurrent band pair for Tx switch: A+B, A+C,B+C * Supported band for up to 2 ports transmission: B * Supported number of Tx chain status: 3   With the above UE capability and carrier status and scheduling requirement in gNB , gNB configures a band combination sets {A,B,C} such that carrier in band A has low-frequency with reliable transmission status and large coverage, carrier in band B or C is high frequency with high data rate. Band combinations {A,B} and {A,C} are similar so only one of the two is necessary. Assume only {A,B} and {B,C} are maintained:  For {A,B}, {1T in band A +1T in band B} and {2T in band B} are supported.  For {B,C}, {1T in band B +1T in band C} and {2T in band B} are supported. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems there are some misunderstandings and it would be good to have clarifications.  First, 1T+1T here means one Tx chain is associated with one band and another Tx chain is associated with another band, not related to concurrent transmission. Sorry for confusion.  Second, it is moderator’s understanding that we made the working assumption to support Alt.1 mechanism at the last meeting and the Alt.1 mechanism means there is no restriction on switching-from and switching-to. Even if switchedUL or dualUL is reported/configured per band pair in the band combination as discussed in 3.1, switching between any bands in the band combination is possible. It is Alt.1 principle.  Third, regarding 2nd discussion point, if there are 3 bands and only 1 band out of 3 bands support up to 2 ports transmission, there are 3 switching cases if we assume only switching cases with 2T (i.e., 2T-0T-0T, 0T-2T-0T, 0T-0T-2T) while there can be only 2 switching cases if we can assume 1T-1T (i.e., 1T-1T-0T, 0T-0T-2T). It is similar to Rel-16/17 1Tx-2Tx switching assumption.  Then, for each discussion points, following could be observed (the moderator may misunderstand companies’ preference).   * For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed (like 2T-2T mode in Rel-17) or switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can also be assumed?   + Only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed     - New H3C, (DCM), ZTE, CTC, CMCC, QCM, HW   + Switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T (one Tx chain is associated with one band and another Tx chain is associated with another band) can also be assumed     - Apple, Xiaomi, (DCM), LG, OPPO * For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands, for the band where 2 ports UL transmission is not supported, switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T can be assumed (like 1T-2T mode in Rel-16/17) or only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed? Especially if there are 2 bands or more out of 3 or 4 bands supporting only up to 1 port UL transmission, assuming switching case (Tx chain states) with 1T+1T instead of switching cases with 2T for each band can reduce the number of switching cases?   + Only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed     - QCM, (HW)   + Switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T (one Tx chain is associated with one band and another Tx chain is associated with another band) can also be assumed (especially if the number of switching cases can be reduced)     - Apple, (New H3C), Xiaomi, DCM, ZTE, (CMCC), LG, OPPO * For dual UL, if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s), corresponding switching case(s) with 1T+1T for the band pair(s) are not assumed or can still be assumed?   + Switching case(s) with 1T+1T for the band pair(s) where concurrent transmission is not supported should not be assumed (i.e., reduce the number of switching cases)     - Apple, Xiaomi, CMCC, QCM   + Switching case(s) with 1T+1T for the band pair(s) where concurrent transmission is not supported can still be assumed     - DCM, (LG), OPPO   We can have further discussion. |
| ZTE | For companies who think that 2T should be switched to each band in case of switchedUL, can you clarify how can the 2T be switched to a carrier where only maximum 1-port transmission is supported? |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check the proposal based on discussion so far. |

**Proposed working assumption 4.3.1**

* **For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed**
  + **In case of 3 bands, 3 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T}) are assumed**
  + **In case of 4 bands, 4 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,0T,2T}) are assumed**
* **For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands, for the band where 2 ports UL transmission is not supported, switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can be assumed**
  + **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed with different number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission**
* **For dual UL, if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, corresponding switching case(s) with 1T-1T for the band pair(s) are not assumed**
  + **FFS: if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 4.3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG Electronics | Not support the 1st bullet. As NTT DOCOMO commented in the previous round discussion, 1T-1T may be beneficial even for switched UL, e.g., when 1 port on band A and 1 port on band B are frequently used.  Support the 2nd bullet.  Not support the 3rd bullet at this stage. It would be better to consider that whether allowing 1T-1T can be beneficial or not, as NTT DOCOMO commented in the previous round. In addition, we think what this bullet is saying may be oncern to Proposal 3.1.1/3.1.2. It would be better to discuss about it after Proposal 3.1.1/3.1.2. |
| Vivo3 | For the first bullet, we have concerns. We think the switching cases in 2nd bullet should be a subset of that of the first bullet. If the first bullet is adopted, then the switching cases related to 1-port transmission capability are not supported for 2-port transmission capability.  For the second bullet, we are OK with adding the interpretation of “1T-1T “as “the Tx chain is associated with one band supporting 1-port tramission and another Tx chain is associated with another band supporting 1-port transmission or 2 -ports transmission”.  For the third bullet, for the similar reason as switchedUL, we still have oncern. |
| China Telecom | For the 1st bullet, support it as the extension of the Rel-17 rule.  For the 2nd bullet, in Rel-16/17 1Tx-2Tx switching with SwitchedUL, 1Tx on band A and 1Tx on band B state only supports 1 port transmission on band A. When 1 port transmission is to be on band B, it should be switched to 2Tx on band B. We think Rel-18 1T-1T should also be mapped to 1 port transmission only on one band. When the UL transmissions are switched between different bands, the switching period is applicable.  **Agreement:**  For Rel-17 1Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for SUL and UL CA Option 1 is defined as follows.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (band A + band B) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (band A (carrier 1) + band B (carrier 2 + carrier 3)) | | Case 1 | 1T+1T | 1P+(0P+0P) | | Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+(2P+0P), 0P+(0P+2P), 0P+(2P+2P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+2P), 0P+(2P+1P) |   For the 3rd bullet, support. We think it means if concurrent transmission is not supported for band A and B, Case 4 is removed in the following table for 3 bands DualUL.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Number of **Tx chains** for Band A+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band B+ Number of **Tx chains** for Band C | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band A+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band B+ Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission in Band C | | Case 1 | 2T+0T+0T | 2P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+0P | | Case 2 | 0T+2T+0T | 0P+2P+0P, 0P+1P+0P | | Case 3 | 0T+0T+2T | 0P+0P+2P, 0P+0P+1P | | ~~Case 4~~ | ~~1T+1T+0T~~ | ~~1P+0P+0P, 1P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+0P~~ | | Case 5 | 1T+0T+1T | 1P+0P+0P, 1P+0P+1P, 0P+0P+1P | | Case 6 | 0T+1T+1T | 0P+1P+0P, 0P+1P+1P, 0P+0P+1P | |
| ZTE | We are ok with the first bullet and second bullet.  We still propose to postpone the discussion of the last bullet because we don’t think such case will happen.  For example, if UE supports concurrent transmission on band pair A+B and A+C, but not for band pair B+C. Then network will configure band combination A+B+C for the UE and will schedule the UE to perform UL Tx switching (dualUL) between A+B, or between A+C, but won’t schedule the UE to perform UL Tx switching (switchedUL) between B+C. We need to first confirm whether this mixed switchedUL and dualUL case exists or not and then come back to it. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks FL’s clarification and we know the case more clearly now.  We are ok with proposal #1 and #3, but not ok with #2 as it violates the switchedUL design principle of Rel-16 & 17.  For a SwitchedUL UE, any transmission on another band would require UL interruption during the switching periods. I paste the spec (Section 6.1.6.2, TS 38.214) below for your convenince.   |  | | --- | | - For the UE configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to ‘switchedUL’, when the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier on another band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the carriers. | |
| Samsung | We share Qualcomm’s view. #2 is not how we interpret existing Rel-16/17 behavior. #1 and #3 okay. |
| Apple | We share similar view as Qualcomm and don’t support #2 |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems companies’ views are still split between two groups for each bullet. However, the current proposal is for working assumption, is based on supports from larger number of companies, and is based on a consistent principle that the number of switching cases should be minimized as much as possible.  Therefore, taking the proposal as working assumption would be reasonable approach especially considering the RAN1 completion schedule.  **Proposed working assumption 4.3.1**   * **For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed**   + **In case of 3 bands, 3 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T}) are assumed**   + **In case of 4 bands, 4 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,0T,2T}) are assumed** * **For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands, for the band where 2 ports UL transmission is not supported, switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can be assumed**   + **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed with different number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission** * **For dual UL, if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination, corresponding switching case(s) with 1T-1T for the band pair(s) are not assumed**   + **FFS: if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands**   If just listing alternatives can only be agreeable at this meeting, following alternative proposal can be considered.  **Alternative Proposed agreement 4.3.1**  **Consider following alternatives on the supported switching cases (Tx chain states) for each scenario**   * **Scenario#1: For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination,**    + **Alt.1-1: only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed**     - **In case of 3 bands, 3 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T}) are assumed**     - **In case of 4 bands, 4 switching cases ({2T,0T,0T,0T}, {0T,2T,0T,0T}, {0T,0T,2T,0T}, {0T,0T,0T,2T}) are assumed**   + **Alt.1-2: switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can also be assumed**     - **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed** * **Scenario#2: For switched UL, if UE supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands,**    + **Alt.2-1: for the band where 2 ports UL transmission is not supported, switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can be assumed**     - **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed with different number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission**   + **Alt.2-2: only switching cases (Tx chain states) with 2T are assumed**     - **Assumed switching cases are same as Scenario#1** * **Scenario#3: For dual UL, if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission on all the bands in the band combination,**    + **Alt.3-1: corresponding switching case(s) with 1T-1T for the band pair(s) are not assumed**     - **FFS: if UE does not support concurrent transmission on specific band pair(s) and supports up to 2 ports UL transmission only on some of the bands**   + **Alt.3-2: corresponding switching case(s) with 1T-1T for the band pair(s) are assumed**     - **Assumed switching cases are same as the case where UE supports dual UL for all band pairs in the band combination** |

#### 5th round Feedback form for 4.3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | We are fine to alternative proposal listing all alternatives for each scenario. |
| CATT | We are ok with the updated proposal. |
| Vivo4 | We are ok with the updated proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the alternative proposal in general.  But, considering concerns from companies at 3rd and 4th round discussion, we think the following suggested wording for Alt.2-1 and Alt.3-2 can be sufficient at this stage.   * OK with the Scenario#1 * Alt.2-1 in Scenario#2 can be changed as follows   + **Alt.2-1: switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can also be assumed**     - **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed** * Alt.3-2 in Scenario#3 can be changed as follows   + **Alt.3-2: switching cases (Tx chain states) with 1T-1T can also be assumed**     - **FFS: detailed switching cases to be assumed** |
| CMCC | We are fine to further discuss the Alternative Proposed agreement 4.3.1 |
| ZTE | Thanks moderator for the summary. We understand the intention of this proposals. But we have to reiterate our comments in the last round.  We still propose to postpone the discussion of the last bullet (Scenario#3) because we don’t think such case will happen.  For example, if UE supports concurrent transmission on band pair A+B and A+C, but not for band pair B+C. Then network will configure band combination A+B+C for the UE and will schedule the UE to perform UL Tx switching (dualUL) between A+B, or between A+C, but won’t schedule the UE to perform UL Tx switching (switchedUL) between B+C. We need to first confirm whether this mixed switchedUL and dualUL case exists or not and then come back to it.  To move forward, we propose mark the whole Scenario#3 as FFS in Alternative Proposed agreement 4.3.1 . |
| OPPO | Regarding **Proposed working assumption 4.3.1,** we are fine to #1 and #3 bullets but have concern on #2 bullet as it violates the switchedUL design principle of Rel-16 & 17.  We are fine to **Alternative Proposed agreement 4.3.1**. |
| Samsung | We are ok and can support the altenrative proposed agreement 4.3.1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t agree the proposal for switchedUL for the following reasons,   * The proposal is not in line with the RAN4 agreement on switching period which does not rely on previous scheduled UL Tx switching but only the current switching band pair. * In the first place, the top reason to report per-band pair switching period by a UE is to tell a gNB how much scheduled gap the UE needs for an UL Tx switching between the band pair which is not conditional on any UE implementation including the implementation that the remaining 1Tx is still on a band beyond the band pair like the scenario#2 assuming. In other words, by its definition, the UE is supposed to report a proper value of switching gap to cover all possible implementations of Tx chain management (the existing Rel-16/17 solution). * Only how much switching gap does matter, whether zero or the reported value for the band pair. Further discussion on the exact Tx chain state for 1Tx-1Tx v.s. 2Tx-0Tx will not result in any spec impact because the only thing needs RAN1 spec impact is when and how much switching gap is needed, as in the current Rel-16/17 RAN1 specs. We suggest to focus on the potential spec impact. * The existing solution is also the friendliest to UE implementation. For example, for a BC {1Tx, 2Tx, 2Tx} and a comparison between a scheduled pattern band C -> A -> B and the other scheduled pattern band B->A->B, it does not make any sense if the UE does not report the same switching period for the same band pair A->B for both the scheduled patterns. Reporting different values do NOT release any UE burden but only disclose more implementation details than necessary. We believe UE vendors are smart enough to report the max switching periods, if needed, between the periods required in the two scheduled patterns and don’t need any additional spec impact.   We would like to invite proponents to help us clarify for the following two questions,  Q1: What is the issue to reuse the existing solution (i.e. UE is supposed to report a proper value of switching period to cover all possible implementations of Tx chain management for a switching band pair)?  Q2: Why is the semi-static reported value not sufficient but a dynamic value adapting to previous run-time scheduling instance is needed?  For dualUL, since switchedUL is a subset of dualUL (the UE can always be scheduled by a gNB with single carrier transmission only), the same principle above is expected to be reused, but we are open to discuss it, if needed, since there are more switching cases than switched UL.  In summary, we suggest to remove the bullets for switched UL and conclude it as  **Proposed conclusion:**  *For a Rel-18 UE only capable of switchedUL in a band combination with 3 or 4 bands, as same as Rel-16 UL Tx switching, the UE is supposed to report a proper value of switching period to cover all possible UE implementations of Tx chain management for a switching band pair, which is unchanged irrespective of previous triggered UL Tx switching.* |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with updated FL’s proposal as compromise for this meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal for the progress considering the completion of WI, although some parts are not our preference. If the proposal is not agreeable, we are fine with alternative proposal to list up alternatives to facilitate companies’ investigation towards next meeting. At least such alternative proposal is necessary considering that the next meeting is the last meeting for RAN1 towards RAN1 completion of this WI. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems all companies are fine with the alternative proposal except HW/HiSi.  It is FL’s understanding that in Rel-16/17, WID clearly defined supported switching cases for switchedUL/SUL and dualUL, respectively. So, defining the supported switching cases is the principle of Rel-16/17 and the proposal is in line with such principle although it would not be specified in the specification. It does not conflict with reporting different switching periods for different band pairs in the band combination. According to HW’s comment, it seems there is following two potential interpretations on the switching period reporting for each band pair. It would be necessary to check other companies’ understandings.   * Interpretation#1: the switching period is reported for the band pair of switching-from and switching-to (e.g., 140 us for switching between A and B (A to B and B to A), 210 us for switching between B and C (B to C and C to B)) * Interpretation#2: the switching period is reported for the band pair after the switching (e.g., 140 us for switching to A-A irrespective of previous state, 210 us for switching to A-B irrespective of previous state)   Once we can reach common understanding on above, the alternative proposal 4.3.1 would be agreeable as it is just to facilitate further discussion in next meeting to complete RAN1 work. |

#### 6th round Feedback form for 4.3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Vivo5 | Our understanding is switching period is depended on the band pair of switching-from and switching-to (i.e., Interpretation#1) |
| Qualcomm | Our understanding on switching periods should be a value when UE switches from certain band(s) to another certain band(s) as target. The certain bands could be single band or two bands, the target band(s) could also be single band or two bands.  For both SwitchedUL and DualUL, our understanding & interpretation of the switching period is Interpretation #1. One addition to current examples listed by FL, the switching period should also include band pair composited of 3 or 4 bands, like from A+B to C; or from A+B to C+D.  We understand the above discussion is trying to identify when the switching period is needed, when is not. Our proposal is to reuse Rel-16/17 switching mechanism as much as possible, which are switching period is required when defined switching cases changed.  Anyway, we can live with current FL’s proposal for this meeting even we have clear preference.  If above proposal is not acceptable, we are also ok to send LS to RAN4 as Tx chain availability is only visible in RAN4, not RAN1. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal and share similar understansing as QC |

1. Discussions on other general aspects for Rel-18 multi-carrier UL Tx switching

## 5.1 Whether to specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding whether to specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 1:*** *For dynamic UL Tx switching among 4 bands, UL-CA Option 1 can bring average UPT gain up to 44.8% compared with Rel-17 UL Tx switching. However, UL-CA Option 2 has small additional average UPT gain compared with UL-CA Option 1.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *UL-CA Option 1 should be specified because it has small specification impacts and provided most of potential performance gains.* |
| [9] | **Proposal 1**   * Multi-carrier Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands is supported in Rel-18. |

Although not so many companies are proposing to agree on specifying Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, most of companies submitting contributions may be fine to agree on it as they proposed many details on the Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed working assumption 5.1**

* **Specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 4 bands in Rel-18**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 5.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Qualcomm | As far as our concern on complexity issue could be solved, we are ok with FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE | We are supportive of this proposal considering the previous simulation results from companies.  However, if companies want to introduce additional processing delay or interruption time, new simulations are needed to justify the potential performance gain. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 5.1. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | In principle, are okay, but would prefer to come back to this proposal once we have agreed on the restrictions for Alt 1 |
| CATT | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed WA 5.1 |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Intel | Support |
| Ericsson | We think we should wait until the discussion is section 3 and 4 are progressed. At this stage, nothing is clear to us (except a WA on Alt1 regarding switching mechanism).  Therefore, it is better to wait until important aspects are more clear a bit. Then, it would be easy to support this proposal 😊 |
| Google | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There is no critical complexity issue at least for UL-CA Option1, as confirmed by RAN4 LS reply. If companies still have concerns on UE memory, we suggest to agree it for UL-CA Option 1 first, then come back with UE memory solution for UL-CA Option 2, i.e.   * **Specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 4 bands in Rel-18 at least for “switchedUL”**   + **For “dualUL”, it is specified if UE memory issue is resolved with a solution.**   @ZTE, since RAN1#110 meeting, such simulations with longer processing time and corresponding restriction were provided by us in R1-2205863 and R1-2208427. The results still showed sufficient gains. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | We can agree. There will be quite a major simplification if we could limit the spec support to 3 bands, but it would not be a good idea to come back in Rel-19 toi define the 4-band support. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems majority supports this proposal, but similar to the proposal 3.6, it may be better to have the proposed working assumption after making some progress on proposals in section 3 and 4. |
| ZTE | @Huawei, we checked the todcs you cited. Unfortunately, there is nothing about “longer processing time” or “longer interruption time”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @ZTE, the table below and results can be found in R1-2205863. In R1-2208427, the same preparation times are assumed.  **Table 1** The simulation parameters of three schemes   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Baseline** | **Alt 1** | **Alt 3** | | UE preparation procedure time | 1ms | 1.5ms | 1.5ms | | Switching period | 35us | 35us、140us、210us | 35us、140us、210us | | Time interval of two successive switching | 0.5ms | 1ms | 1ms |     **Figure 11** Simulation results for 4-bands scenario |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check if the proposed working assumption is agreeable now. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following working assumption was made.  **Proposed working assumption 5.1**   * **Specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 4 bands in Rel-18** |

**Proposed working assumption 5.1**

* **Specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 4 bands in Rel-18**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 5.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Vivo3 | support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal especially considering the following content in the RAN4 LS.  *RAN4 has not identified any technical difficulty for UE to prevent realizing Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands.* |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| CATT | Support |

## 5.2 Whether to support Switched UL and/or Dual UL for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding whether to support Switched UL and/or Dual UL for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 1:*** *For dynamic UL Tx switching among 4 bands, UL-CA Option 1 can bring average UPT gain up to 44.8% compared with Rel-17 UL Tx switching. However, UL-CA Option 2 has small additional average UPT gain compared with UL-CA Option 1.*  ***Observation 3:*** *For UL-CA Option 2, the following specification impacts need to be considered,*   * *Tx state ambiguity after Tx switching* * *Switching ambiguity issue* * *4 new switching instances, i.e. current UL transmission band(s) and the preceding band(s) involve 3 or 4 bands, should be specified* * *Supporting only some concurrent UL transmission cases by UE reporting.* * *Switching location configuration issue for 4 new switching instances* * *Switching period issue for 4 new switching instances*   ***Proposal 4:*** *UL-CA Option 1 should be specified because it has small specification impacts and provided most of potential performance gains.* |
| [3] | ***Proposal 1****: If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported, both inter-band CA Option 1 (switchedUL) and inter-band CA Option 2 (dualUL) are supported.* |
| [5] | Proposal 7: Option 1(*switchedUL*) and option 2 (*DualUL*) are both supported in Rel-18 Tx switching. |
| [13] | ***Proposal 6: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, support both options including switchedUL (option 1) and dual UL (option 2)*** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support at least Switched UL for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18? [2] * Support both Switched UL and Dual UL for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18 [3], [5], [13] |

The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed working assumption 5.2**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, both Switched UL and Dual UL are supported**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 5.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Qualcomm | We support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal, which is aligned with the RANP guidance. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 5.2. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| CATT | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Samsung | We support FL proposed WA 5.2 |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Intel | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Google | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No.  In our R1-2208427, simulation results and comparisons are provided for both SwitchedUL and dualUL, which are summarized in the table below. More detailed analysis can be found in our tdoc.  **Table 5** The comparison of UL-CA Option 1 and UL-CA Option 2   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Specification impacts | Performance gain | UE complexity reduction | | UL-CA Option 1 | Very minor | Up to 44.8% | Option 2 (Option 3 is useful but not essential) | | UL-CA Option 2 | large | Up to 50.1% | Option 2 & Option 3 & **Option 1 / 4** |   Clearly, SwitchedUL (UL-CA Option1) has advantages over UL-CA Option2 in all perspectives, i.e. spec impacts, the trade-off between performance gain and UE complexity. However, it cannot be agreed just because of the UE memory issue (complexity reduction) that is critical but dedicated to dualUL, as the discussion under the FL proposal 5.1. On the other hand, the concerns of critical memory issue suddently does not matter any more for some companies in proposal 5.2 and the fact of different UE complexity between switchedUL and dualUL is ignored. It seems not reasonable and thus provides no value for progress. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  Although all companies except one company supports the proposal, it may be better to discuss this proposal after having some progress on the proposals in section 3 and 4 especially addressing complexity/spec impact concerns on dual UL. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | We can check if the proposed working assumption is agreeable now. |

**Proposed working assumption 5.2**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, both Switched UL and Dual UL are supported**

#### 4th round Feedback form for 5.2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | | Comment |  | |
| LG Electronics | | Support the proposal |  | |
| MediaTek | | Support |  | |
| Vivo3 | | support |  | |
| China Telecom | | Support. |  | |
| ZTE | | We support the proposal to follow the guidance of RANP.   |  | | --- | | **Agreements:**  RAN provides following guidance to RAN1/2/4.   * If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported,   + RAN1/2/4 shall focus on defining necessary mechanisms and requirements for UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 different bands in Q3 2022     - Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) and Option 2 (i.e., dual UL) without SUL band     - Inter-band UL CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s)       * UL CA framework where UL CA is performed between NULs according to current RAN4 specifications should not be changed       * Note: switching across any band in this scenario is not precluded     - Intra-band two contiguous aggregated carriers within one non-SUL band out of 3 or 4 bands   + Further check additional scenarios in RAN#97e, e.g.,     - {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band}     - Simultaneous transmission across 2 bands in {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s) (excluding simultaneous transmission between SUL and corresponding NUL)   + Mechanisms/requirements should not introduce restrictions on what were already supported in current specifications for UL Tx switching | | | |
| Qualcomm | We support FL’s proposal | | |
| Samsung | Support | | |
| Apple | Support | | |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Following working assumption was made.  **Proposed working assumption 5.2**   * **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, both Switched UL and Dual UL are supported** | | |
| CATT | Support. | | |

## 5.3 Whether to support additional target scenarios for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding whether to support additional target scenarios for UL Tx switching schemes across up to 3 or 4 bands in Rel-18.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [2] | ***Observation 2:*** *For UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands, UL-CA Option 1 with or without SUL has minor specification impacts by reusing existing Rel-16/17 mechanism.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *Reuse the R17 triggering mechanism of UL Tx switching specified in S6.1.6.2 of TS 38.214 for UL-CA Option 1 for dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Current CA framework can be directly reused in UL Tx switching among 3 or 4 bands for the scenarios with or without SUL, where the current CA framework is that the same UE behaviors across serving cells are applied irrespective of FDD/TDD/SUL band, e.g. UL Tx chain sharing across cells, and the UE behavior between SUL and paired NUL within a serving cell refers to the UE behaviors specified on the context of one serving cell.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *The following three scenarios are confirmed within the scope for Rel-18 UL Tx switching:*   * *Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 without SUL band* * *Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s)* * *Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band}* |
| [8] | **Proposal 15: From RAN1 perspective, following SUL configurations will not introduce extra switching cases for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. Whether it is supported or not depends on RAN4.**   * **{SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band}.** * **Simultaneous transmission across 2 bands in {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s) (excluding simultaneous transmission between SUL and corresponding NUL).** |
| [11] | **Proposal 1. If dynamic UL Tx switching across 3 and 4 bands is supported, the following switching cases can be considered.**   * **For UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in inter-band UL CA with 1 SUL band, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports can be defined as in Table 5 and Table 6.** * **For UL Tx switching across 4 bands in inter-band UL CA with 2 SUL bands, the mapping between Tx chains and UL transmission antenna ports can be defined as in Table 7 and Table 8.** |
| [18] | **Proposal 1: Following RAN#96 guidance, RAN1 #110bis only focus inter-band UL CA Option 1 and 2 without SUL, and inter-band UL CA Option 1 with 1 SUL, and does not discuss other additional scenarios before further guidance.** |
| [20] | **Proposal 7: Postpone the discussion on the UL Tx Switching with a SUL cell in a CA configuration until after UL Tx Switching for 3 or 4 bands in the CA configuration has gained more maturity** |

Based on above, the situation can be summarized as below.

|  |
| --- |
| * Support Switched UL for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} [2], [11]   + Whether to support or not depends on RAN4 while no extra switching case exists from RAN1 perspective [8] * Support Dual UL for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} [11]   + Whether to support or not depends on RAN4 while no extra switching case exists from RAN1 perspective [8] * Support Dual UL for inter-band UL CA with 1 SUL band [11]   + Whether to support or not depends on RAN4 while no extra switching case exists from RAN1 perspective [8] * Additional target scenarios should not be discussed before further guidance from RAN [18] * Postpone the discussion on scenarios with SUL in a CA configuration until after maturity for scenarios without SUL in a CA configuration [20] |

Based on the discussion and situation at RAN#97-e, the moderator thinks that additional target scenarios should not be discussed before completing the design for current target scenarios. The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above summary and proposals in the contributions.

#### 1st round Feedback form for 5.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We support FL proposal to follow RAN#96 guidance, RAN1 #110bis only focus inter-band UL CA Option 1 and 2 without SUL, and inter-band UL CA Option 1 with 1 SUL, and does not discuss other additional scenarios before further guidance. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the moderator’s assessment |
| Samsung | We should follow existing RANP guidance in RAN1, therefore we prefer no discussion on additional scenarios until completion of inter-band UL CA Option 1 and 2 without SUL, and inter-band UL CA Option 1 with 1 SUL. |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Moderator |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Technically, the switching mechanism under development in RAN1 does not differentiate TDD, FDD and SUL bands. We prefer not to repeat the RANP discussions in RAN1. But we just want to remind that the scenarios summaried above in still in the scope and not precluded. In this sense, the title of S5.3 seems a bit misleading by stating “support” instead of “focus on”. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the moderator’s view. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems companies are fine with the moderators suggestion. |

## 5.4 Clarifications on UL Tx switching among bands with intra-band CA

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following observations and proposals were made regarding clarifications on UL Tx switching among bands with intra-band CA.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [6] | **Proposal 10: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, the same number of Tx chain is applied to intra-band UL carriers in one band.** |
| [11] | * **For UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands in intra-band two contiguous aggregated carriers within one non-SUL band scenarios, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chains can be similar to Rel-17 2Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B.** |
| [13] | ***Proposal 5: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands, RAN 1 should agree to support only up to 1 band with up to 2 contiguous carriers*** |

It seems proposals for the clarification on intra-band CA are straightforward. Therefore, the moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above proposals in contributions and following potential FL proposal.

### **Proposed agreement 5.4**

* **For Rel-18 UL Tx switching across up to 3 or 4 bands, the same number of Tx chains is applied to intra-band UL carriers in one band similar to Rel-17**
  + **Up to two Intra-band contiguous aggregated carriers can be within only one non-SUL band out of 3 or 4 bands**

#### 1st round Feedback form for 5.4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| MediaTek | We are not sure if there is a need for RAN1 agreement given that similar thing was agreed in RAN#96.   |  | | --- | | RAN provides following guidance to RAN1/2/4.   * If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported,   + RAN1/2/4 shall focus on defining necessary mechanisms and requirements for UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 different bands in Q3 2022     - Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) and Option 2 (i.e., dual UL) without SUL band     - Inter-band UL CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s)       * UL CA framework where UL CA is performed between NULs according to current RAN4 specifications should not be changed       * Note: switching across any band in this scenario is not precluded     - Intra-band two contiguous aggregated carriers within one non-SUL band out of 3 or 4 bands   + Further check additional scenarios in RAN#97e, e.g.,     - {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band}     - Simultaneous transmission across 2 bands in {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s) (excluding simultaneous transmission between SUL and corresponding NUL)   + Mechanisms/requirements should not introduce restrictions on what were already supported in current specifications for UL Tx switching | |
| Qualcomm | We support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 5.4. |
| New H3C | Support |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| CATT | We support FL proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| vivo | Not sure if this proposal is needed |
| Samsung | We don’t think such an agreement is necessary. The RAN#96 approved WF already captures this assumption. |
| Intel | Support, although it was already agreed in RAN#96 |
| Ericsson | This is already addressed by plenary. However, maybe in terms of logistic and for the purpose of drafting specifications, it can be documented from RAN1 as well. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not necessary as other companies commented. |
| China Telecom | Support the first bullet. The second bullet can be removed if companies think it is not necessary. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | Thank you very much for the feedbacks!  It seems there is no problem on the contents but some companies do not prefer to agree on the proposal as it was already agreed/clarified.  Therefore, unless some companies can clarify the necessity to agree on the proposal, we do not need to agree on the proposal. |

## 5.5 Other proposals

In contributions in AI 9.9.2, following other proposals were made.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [11] | **Proposal 4. Multiple PUCCH cells can be configured for Rel-18 UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 bands.** |
| [12] | **Proposal #8: Consider additional UL Tx switching conditions to handle the case when simultaneous UL transmissions occur on more than 2 bands (e.g. based on the priority of the transmitted UL channels).** |
| [13] | ***Observation 1: When UL Tx switching is triggered for PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK, the margin provided by the PDSCH symbols plus PDSCH processing timeline is not sufficient to perform the triggered switching for the scenarios when (also shown in Table):***   * ***the scheduling DCI and corresponding PDSCH are overlapping*** * ***and/or reported switching gap value is higher*** * ***and/or higher numerology is applied***  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **μ** | **N1** | **N1 + 4**  **(** | **N2** | **N2 +**  **(** | | | |  |  |  |  | **35μs** | **140μs** | **210μs** | | 0 | 8 | **12** | 10 | 11 | 12 | **13** | | 1 | 10 | **14** | 12 | 13 | **16** | **18** | | 2 | 17 | **21** | 23 | **25** | **31** | **35** |   ***Proposal 7: For supporting NR Rel-18 UL Tx switching, RAN1 should consider supporting switching gap to the PDSCH processing timeline***   * ***FFS whether switching gap applied to only specific PDSCH scheduling scenarios*** |

The moderator would like to ask companies to provide feedback if any on the above proposals in contributions.

#### 1st round Feedback form for 5.5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | As the proponent of this proposal, we support to discuss the introduction of switching gap when UL Tx switching can be triggered for PUCCH with HARQ-ACK. In some PDSCH scheduling scenarios, there is not sufficient margin provided by PDSCH symbols and the gap between scheduling DCI and PDSCH, therefore, switching gap would be beeded, otherwise PDSCH processing timeline can be quite critical |
| LG Electronics | As pointed out in our contribution [12], for more than 2 bands configured to UE, it can be beneficial to schedule or configure UL transmissions on more than two bands. Unlike Rel-17, since the number of bands is larger than the number of Tx chains in Rel-18, not allowing more than two configured/scheduled UL transmissions would be too restrictive from gNB perspective, which may reduce performance gain obtainable from 3 or 4 bands. In our view, allowing to configure/scheduled more than two concurrent ULs and selecting up to two of them for actual UL transmission based on the existing priority for UL channels in the spec, would be useful in terms of scheduling flexibility without additional UE complexity.  Regaring proposal by Apple, we are open to discuss. But, it should be noted that this may give a spec impact even for the Rel-16 UL Tx switching. |
| Moderator (NTT DOCOMO) | It seems companies other than proponents are not so interested in these proposals at this moment. So, we can resume the discussion after making progess on other proposals. |

1. Summary of proposals

TBD

1. Conclusion

Following agreements/working assumptions/conclusions were made.

Proposed agreement 3.1

**If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band pairs for concurrent UL transmission based on UE capability**

* + **The supported band pair for concurrent transmission requires the support of UL CA** **on the corresponding band pair(s) by the UE**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as how to report the support of dual UL and the supported band pair(s) for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as how to indicate the band pair(s) UE should expect for concurrent UL transmission are further discussed**
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all band pairs for concurrent transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands with dual UL does not impose any restriction**

Proposed agreement 3.2

**If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, UE is allowed to support only some of band(s) for up to 2 ports UL transmission based on UE capability**

* + **Further down-select from the following alternatives**
    - **Alt.1: no restriction for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.2: at least one band should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
    - **Alt.3: at least two bands should support up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands**
  + **Details on the UE capability such as whether existing per-FS UL-MIMO capability can be reused or not are further discussed**
  + **Details on the gNB configuration/indication such as whether/how to additionally indicate 2 ports UL transmission mode for a band/cell are further discussed**
  + Existing MIMO mechanism for MIMO mode indication should be reused
  + **Note: UE is also allowed to support all bands for up to 2 ports UL transmission, and the design of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands does not impose any restriction**

**Proposed agreement 4.3**

**If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, following is considered as baseline.**

* + **Existing conditions where the switching period is required can be reused for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when only two bands are involved in a switching**
  + **New conditions where the switching period is required should be introduced for Rel-18 UL Tx switching with 3 or 4 bands when more than two bands are involved in a switching**
    - **For dual UL, following new conditions are considered**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port or 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on one band (1st band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (2nd and 3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 2T on a carrier on another band (3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on one of the bands and another different band (1st or 2nd band, and 3rd band)**
      * **When the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on different bands (1st and 2nd band) and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on a carrier on other different bands (3rd and 4th band)**
    - **FFS for switched UL and/or for the case with complexity reduction option 1 or 2**
    - **FFS the same or different switch period for existing conditions and new conditions**

Conclusion:

No consensus in RAN1 on complexity reduction option 3

**Proposed agreement 3.1.2**

* **Consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options**
  + **Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination**
  + **Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination**
* **Consider following alternatives for gNB configuration regarding dual UL**
  + **Alt.1: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} in CellGroupConfig**
  + **Alt.2: configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for each band pair (combination of serving cells?)**
  + **Alt.3: at least configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission**
  + **Alt.4: No configuration of supported band pair (combination of serving cells) for concurrent transmission, i.e., UE just assumes as it reports**

**Proposed working assumption 5.1**

* **Specify UL Tx switching schemes across up to 4 bands in Rel-18**

**Proposed working assumption 5.2**

* **If Rel-18 UL Tx switching for 3 or 4 bands is supported, both Switched UL and Dual UL are supported**

TBD