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# Introduction

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

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

The WI also includes corresponding justification point:

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

This contribution summarizes contributions submitted in RAN1#112 under AI 9.14.3 – Dynamic switching between DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM.

Here is the color code used in this summary:

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

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

# Contact information

Please input the contact information for each company below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| InterDigital | Paul Marinier | paul.marinier at interdigital.com |
| Panasonic | Tetsuya Yamamoto | yamamoto.tetsuya001 at jp.panasonic.com |
| Nokia/NSB | Quang Nhan | nhat-quang.nhan@nokia.com |
| Nokia/NSB | Karim Kasan | karim.kasan@nokia.com |
| LG | Duck Hyun Bae | Duckhyun.bae@lge.com |
| Ericsson | Ling Su | Ling.a.su@ericsson.com |
| CMCC | Yongchang Liu | liuyongchang@chinamobile.com |
| Samsung | Carmela Cozzo | carmela.c@samsung.com |
| Sharp | Toshi Nogami | nogami.toshizoh@sharp.co.jp |
| Sharp | Hiro Takahashi | takahashi.hiroki@sharp.co.jp |
| China Telecom | Hang Yin | yinh6@chinatelecom.cn |
| ZTE | Junfeng Zhang | Zhang.junfeng@zte.com.cn |
| Transsion | Xingya Shen | xingya.shen@transsion.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Collection of agreements in RAN1#112bis-e

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementFor DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 containing dynamic waveform indication, bit width of each field is set to the maximum between the bit width of the field if transform precoding is disabled and the bit width of the field if transform precoding is enabled, if different.* If, for the waveform indicated in the DCI, the bit width N of a field would be smaller than the bit width of the field set as per the above, UE decodes the field using N least significant bits. If N=0, the UE ignores the field for the indicated waveform.
 |

# Proposals

## Proposals for 1st GTW (Monday)

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1**: For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 containing dynamic waveform indication, bit width of each field is set to the maximum between the bit width of the field if transform precoding is disabled and the bit width of the field if transform precoding is enabled, if different.* If, for the waveform indicated in the DCI, the bit width N of a field would be smaller than the bit width of the field set as per the above, UE decodes the field using N least significant bits. If N=0, the UE ignores the field for the indicated waveform.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1**: For potential enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining waveform switching, RAN1 to select between following options:* Option 1: Reporting of power headroom information for a reference PUSCH using target waveform different from waveform of actual PUSCH.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 2: New trigger of power headroom report based on waveform switching event.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 3: Both Option 1 and Option 2.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 4: No enhancement.

  |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 4-1**: Dynamic waveform switching is configured separately for each BWP, within *PUSCH-Config*. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-2r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, and *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Option 2 (UE only uses *resourceAllocation* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies resource allocation according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
* Size of FDRA field is aligned between size for type 1 resource allocation and size according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-3r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.

Option 2 (UE only uses *dmrs-Type* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type according to *dmrs-Type*.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-4r1**: For UE configured with multi-PUSCH scheduling in time domain in a carrier *(*i.e. *pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH*), DCI format 0\_1 supports 1-bit field for dynamic waveform switching indication. * When configured, 1-bit field indicates waveform for all scheduled PUSCH transmissions.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposed conclusion 1-1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy at least if the UE does not use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure. * FFS: UE enables transform precoding for PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 if the UE uses multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure.
 |

## Proposals for 2nd GTW/checkpoint

## Proposals for 3rd GTW/checkpoint

# Topic #1: Applicability of dynamic waveform switching

A set of issues is related to the type of transmission concerned by dynamic waveform switching.

In RAN1#110bis-e, RAN1 made agreement that dynamic waveform switching is applicable to PUSCH channel only. RAN1 made a further agreement that it is applicable to PUSCH dynamically scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2. In RAN1#112, RAN1 agreed that dynamic waveform switching is not applicable to PUSCH transmissions with a Type 1 configured grant and concluded that there is no consensus to support PUSCH transmissions with a Type 2 configured grant.

The following cases are considered separately:

* PUSCH dynamically scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0
* Msg3 PUSCH scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0
* Other cases/scenarios

## [LP][Closed] Issue #1-1: Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0

Yes: Oppo [4], ZTE [7], Nokia [10], Mavenir [15]

[Justifications]

* No ambiguity after the UE is connected to network [4]
* Need to maximize applicability of dynamic waveform switching [7]
* DCI format 0\_0 is used in coverage-limited scenarios [4][7][10][15]
* Always configuring DFT-S-OFDM for DCI format 0\_0 inefficient [7]
* Using DFT-S-OFDM more resource-efficient than using PUSCH repetitions [10]

[Proposed solutions]

* Add 1 bit [15] if number of bits for DCI format 0\_0 before padding is smaller than DCI format 1\_0 [7]
* Add column to default TDRA table [4]

Open: NTT DOCOMO [28]

* Cannot use 1 additional bit in DCI [28]

No: Spreadtrum [5], CATT [6], Intel [8], InterDigital [12], China Telecom [13], Panasonic [14], Lenovo [16], ETRI [18], CMCC [19], Mediatek [20], Qualcomm [23], Sharp [24], Ericsson [26], LG [29]

* Supporting format 0\_0 has small benefit, e.g. other formats can be used [6][12][20]
* Can configure DFT-S-OFDM for format 0\_0 if coverage is limited [12]
* Better if interpretation remains stable during RRC reconfiguration [5][12][13][18]
* Better not to increase payload size of DCI format 0\_0 [16][14][8][18][19][23][26], cannot change size for CSS [14][24]
* Format 0\_0 only has mandatory fields, should not add bit [5]
* Format 0\_0 only supports basic scheduling/fallback operation [8][13][16][19][23], e.g. only RA type 1 [5][6], DMRS configuration/port is fixed [5].
* Indication in DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 cannot be used to indicate subsequent transmissions [5]
* Would require different solution for this DCI format [23][29], significant specification impact [13]

**Observations on applicability to PUSCH scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0**

4 companies support applicability to PUSCH scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0. 1 company is open. On the other hand, 14 companies do not support any applicability to PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0.

Majority of companies think there is little, or no benefit given that other formats can be used, and that this DCI format is intended for basic operation and for robustness during RRC reconfiguration. There are also concerns about introducing a field linked to an optional feature to this format and potentially increasing the size.

Moderator does not see how further discussion can change the situation for this issue, and recommends taking the following conclusion:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposed conclusion 1-1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy. |

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please feel free to provide any feedback on FL proposed conclusion 1-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We support FL proposed conclusion 1-1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposed conclusion. |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the FL proposed conclusion 1-1. |
| Lenovo | We support FL proposed conclusion 1-1. |
| Apple | We support Proposal 1-1. |
| vivo | Fine. In our view, waveform of all PUSCH transmissions scheduled by fallback DCI should be the same as legacy. It would be preferred to conclude this together with section 5.2 so that we can focus on discussions on waveform indication of PUSCH scheduled by non-fallback DCI. |
| Transsion | We support this conclusion. |
| LG | Support the proposed conclusion 1-1. It is natural enough to switch waveforms semi-statically via higher layer parameter, i.e., *msg3-transformPrecoder*, since there might be no additional space allowed for the new 1-bit field as the size constraint of the fallback DCI. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposed conclusion. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ETRI | Support the conclusion. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to clarify that if DWS is supported for DCI format 0\_0 then another solution should be considered for not increasing the size of fallback DCI. As discussed in our Tdoc and previous meetings, we do see the motivation for supporting DWS using DCI format 0\_0.  |
| MediaTek | Support in principle. Although we would suggest different wording for simplicity. Since this conclusion doesn’t include anything new, we prefer to say: “There is no conclusion to support PUSCH scheduled by C-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 for R18 dynamic switching between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM” |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | @Mediatek: Thanks for the suggestion. However, I am concerned it would be more confusing because it could be interpreted as “DCI format 0\_0 cannot be used if DWS is configured”. I think the wording “as in legacy” makes it clear enough that nothing changes for this DCI format. |

##  [LP][Open] Issue #1-2: Applicability to msg3 PUSCH

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Applicability to PUSCH scheduled by RAR and/or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0

* Yes**:** Oppo [4], ZTE [7], Intel [8], Sony [9], Nokia [10], (Panasonic [14]), Mavenir [15]

[Justification]

* + Enables selection based on UE’s channel conditions instead of cell-level [4][8][10]
	+ Improve reliability of msg3 retransmission [8]
	+ Other msg3 coverage enhancement techniques not sufficient [9]
	+ Cell-level configuration is not always DFT-S-OFDM [10]
	+ Support for msg3 retransmission even more important than initial transmission [10]
	+ Msg3 repetitions may not be sufficient [10]

[Proposed solutions]

* + Add column to default TDRA table [4]
	+ Set waveform to DFT-S-OFDM if number of repetitions is >1 [7]
	+ Same waveform for msg3 initial transmission (RAR) and retransmission (TC-RNTI) [7]
	+ Override SIB field for UE in connected or inactive mode [9]
	+ Indicate in MAC CE or PDCCH order for RACH for UE in connected/inactive state [9]
	+ Use reserved bits or CSI request bit of RAR for idle state UE [9]
	+ Use DFT-S-OFDM if using/capable of multiple PRACH transmissions [9]([10])[14]
	+ Solution should not impact DCI format 0\_0 [10][13]
	+ Add 1 bit to DCI format 0\_0 [15]
* Study: NTT DOCOMO [28]
	+ Cannot use 1 additional bit in DCI [28]
* No**:** Spreadtrum [5], CATT [6], InterDigital [12], Lenovo [16], Samsung [17], CMCC [19], Mediatek [20], Qualcomm [23], Ericsson [26], LG [29]
	+ Additional preamble partitioning required [5][6][12]
	+ gNB does not have sufficient channel/power information to select [5][16][17][19][23][26]
	+ Would require PRACH resources for identification of capability [17][23]
	+ Difficult to introduce indication in RAR and DCI format 0\_0 [6][19][29]
	+ Msg3 repetitions are specified and sufficient, latency not a concern [23]
	+ Unclear benefit [6][20], gain of using CP-OFDM for msg3 PUSCH is small [12]

In addition, no company proposes to support dynamic indication for msgA, and two companies [5][6] explicitly proposes to not support it.

**Observations on applicability to msg3 PUSCH**

7 companies support applicability to msg3 PUSCH for either or both initial transmission by RAR or retransmission by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0. 1 company is open to study. 10 companies do not support. Non-supporting companies think that the benefit is unclear given that the network has not enough information on the UE situation and have concerns about complexity of supporting indication from RAR or DCI and potential additional RACH partitioning required for indication of capability.

A few companies suggested that the selection of waveform could be tied to the capability or use of PRACH repetitions to be supported in R18. The simplest solution would be that a UE that uses PRACH repetitions also uses DFT-S-OFDM for the transmission or retransmission of msg3. In moderator’s understanding, this solution could address concerns about reliability of msg3 transmission for UE’s capable of PRACH repetition while not requiring any other mechanism for the capability or waveform indication. Thus, it may be worth considering as a potential compromise. This is reflected by the proposal below.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy at least if the UE does not use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure. * FFS: UE enables transform precoding for PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 if the UE uses multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure.
 |

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please feel free to provide any feedback on FL proposal 1-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We support FL proposal 1-2. |
| Intel | We do not support this proposal. We have not even discussed any interaction between PRACH and Msg3 coverage enhancement yet under AI 9.12.1.Our concern is mainly regarding the Msg3 repetition, which was defined in Rel-17 for Msg3 coverage enhancement. If UE clearly needs repetitions for Msg3, it is not reasonable to still apply CP-OFDM waveform for Msg3 transmission. In this case, dynamic waveform indication should be applied.  |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the FL proposal 1-2. We also support the FFS point. For the UE who uses multiple PRACH transmission needs coverage enhancement for Mgs.3 PUSCH transmission. Therefore, to enable DFT-s-OFDM even if CP-OFDM is configured via *msg3-transformPrecoder*.is reasonable. In PRACH repetition, separate RACH resource is supported for PRACH repetition and if multiple values are configured PRACH resource between PRACH repetitions with different number of repetitions are differentiated. Therefore, there is no additional PRACH resource is necessary for the waveform selection for Msg.3 PUSCH. |
| Lenovo | We don’t support dynamic waveform switching for Msg 3 initial transmission or re-transmission. We think DWS and PRACH repetition is two separate methods to realize coverage enhancement for different channel, always bundle them is not reasonable. |
| Apple | OK with Proposal 1-2. |
| vivo | Do not support dynamic waveform switching for Msg3 considering this would require early feature indication and also other impacts that are summarized by feature leader. Msg3 waveform determination should be same as other normal PUSCH transmissions scheduled by fallback DCI. |
| ZTE | Our original intention is if msg3 PUSCH is with repetition, the transform precoding should be enabled and UE will ignore the *msg3-transformPrecoder*, and msg3 PUSCH retransmission will follow the same waveform of the first msg3 PUSCH. From this aspect, we share the same view with Intel.But if the compromise proposal is supported by majority, we can live up with this proposal. |
| Transsion | We support this proposal as a compromise. |
| LG | We don’t support the proposal 1-2. It seems the proposal has too much consideration effort for Msg.3 transmission, i.e., DWS support that UE capable of Msg.3 repetition. The semi-static waveform configuration that currently support looks sufficient, in this regard we prefer not to support DWS to all the Msg.3 transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the main bullet. Regarding the FFS, we think there is no need to link between Msg1 repetition and DWS for Msg3 PUSCH. The benefit is not clear compared to Msg3 PUSCH repetition. Thus, it is not necessary to use dynamic waveform switching for Msg3 PUSCH. It is enough to determine the waveform according to the current configuration of high-level parameters *msg3-transformPrecoder*.  |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. For the FFS part, we think same procedure as in legacy should also be support. Introducing new mechanism like “set transform precoding enabled when UE use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure” seems out of scope in this agenda. |
| Ericsson | The FFS is to allow gNB to configure Msg3 waveform aggressively, e.g., CP-OFDM for *msg3-transformPrecoder*. UEs triggering multiple PRACHs will transmit Msg3 with DFT-S-OFDM, and those with single PRACH transmission will use CP-OFDM for Msg3 transmission. However, gNB may make sure a reliable Msg3 transmission by setting *msg3-transformPrecoder* as DFT-S-OFDM. The difference between this gNB configuration and the FFS is that UEs with single PRACH transmission (e.g., cell-center UEs) can use CP-OFDM, rather than the RRC configured DFT-S-OFDM for Msg3 transmission. Is there a coverage gain?In addition, we have concern of combining two features as one UE capability. Determination of the number of PRACH transmissions is still open in AI 9.12.1.  |
| ETRI | We support the proposal but have a question about the FFS. When PRACH repetition is performed, the Msg3 UL grant always indicate one waveform (DFT-s-OFDM) by implementation. Is it correct understanding?  |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL proposal 1-2 in general. The FFS can be further discussed. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support the FFS point. Dynamic switching and multiple PRACH are separate features. If a UE is only capable of multiple PRACH but not dynamic switching, this FFS point would contradict with such case.  |
| Samsung | We support the first part of the proposal as follows, without any connection of the DWS feature with PRACH transmission(s). A conclusion would be more appropriate.**FL proposal 1-2**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy |
| Moderator | @CATT, QC, Panasonic, Apple, ZTE, Transsion, Sharp, ETRI, Nokia/NSB: Thanks for support.@Intel: the linkage with PRACH is just an FFS at this point. Regarding potential solution linking msg3 waveform with msg3 repetition, my understanding is that there is still the problem that gNB does not know if the UE requesting msg3 repetition is R17 or R18.@vivo: the idea of linking to PRACH repetition is that it would remove need for additional early indication for the waveform.@Ericsson: for the FFS, agree that there is no coverage gain if network anyway configures msg3-transformPrecoder with DFT-S-OFDM for all UEs. The gain would be that the network can now configure CP-OFDM for msg3 for single PRACH transmission UE.@ETRI: the grant for msg3 (RAR or F0\_0/TC-RNTI) does not indicate any waveform. In the FFS, the UE would automatically apply DFT-S-OFDM if it used multi-PRACH.@Mediatek: For the FFS, my understanding is that it would be independent from the 1-bit DWS indication capability. Any UE that transmits multiple PRACH would apply DFT-S-OFDM for msg3. |

### 2nd round

Based on 1st round comments, about half of companies are supportive of FL proposal 1-2 but the other half has concerns about potential linkage to multiple PRACH capability/usage. Some companies think that it is too early to suggest a solution considering current progress for multiple PRACH functionality. In view of this, moderator suggests modifying as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 1-2r1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy at least if the UE does not support/use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure. * ~~FFS: UE enables transform precoding for PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 if the UE uses multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure.~~
* FFS: if the UE supports/uses multiple PRACH transmissions.
 |

Please indicate if FL proposal 1-2r1 is acceptable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open. No strong view on FFS point.  |
| ZTE | As the msg3 repetition can be differentiated through the PRACH preambles, why not to directly link the proposal to msg3 repetition? For example, the proposal can be revised as:**FL proposal 1-2r1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy at least if the UE does not support/use ~~multiple PRACH transmissions~~ PUSCH repetition scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 in RACH procedure.* FFS: UE enables transform precoding for PUSCH repetition transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 if the UE uses ~~multiple PRACH transmissions~~ PUSCH repetition transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI in RACH procedure.
 |
| Intel | We share similar view as ZTE. This is mainly for Msg3 repetition, which can be decoupled from PRACH coverage enhancement. We are fine with the update from ZTE to make compromise and move forward.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL’s proposal for the sake of progress.  |
| QC | Intel and ZTE need to respond to Ericsson’s question on why a gNB is not able to set msg3-transformPrecoder to indicate DFT-S-OFDM for all UEs. We have had this same question too.FL proposal is okay for now. Edits by ZTE/Intel go a step too far.  |
| Panasonic | We support FL proposal 1-2r1. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. We don’t think the FFS part has benefits since msg3 has small number of bits and network can always configure DFT-s-OFDM if coverage is the issue of the network, but we can live with it here. |
| Moderator | @ZTE, Intel: I have a question about linking with msg3 repetition. If network gets PRACH resource that requests repetitions, how does the network know if this is from R17 UE or R18 UE? Do you suggest further PRACH partitioning or blind detection of waveform by network? |
| CATT | We prefer to remove the FFS and conclude that DWS is not applicable to Msg3 (re)transmissions. We are also fine with the FL’s proposal for the sake of progress except that we think ‘support’ should be removed since gNB cannot tell whether a UE using single PRACH transmission supports multiple PRACH transmissions or not. |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Don’t support. We think the waveform determination of PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 is unrelated to whether multiple PRACH transmissions are used or not. They are two separate methods to realize coverage enhancement for different channels. |
| ZTE2 | Response to QC, gNB can set msg3-transformPrecoder to indicate DFT-S-OFDM or CP-OFDM, there is no restriction on the two alternatives from specification. Response to Moderator, we have a consensus in PRACH enhancement agenda that Rel-17 framework of feature combination (*FeatureCombination-r17*) and additional RACH configuration (*AdditionalRACH-Config-r17*) can be reused for Rel-18 multiple PRACH transmissions to realize the corresponding PRACH resource partitioning, at least in separate case, in the new additional RACH occasion for multiple PRACH, the preambles for msg3 PUSCH repetition (using *FeatureCombination-r17*) can be configured, these preambles can be the identification both for the R18 UE and supporting msg3 PUSCH repetition. Further PRACH partitioning will cost less specification effort as the whole structure of the reusing Rel-17 framework of feature combination and additional RACH configuration has been built. |
| Ericsson | As commented in 1st round, compared with the semi-static DFT-S-OFDM configured for Msg3 PUSCH transmission, the dynamic waveform for Msg3 determined by the number of PRACH transmissions doesn’t improve Msg3 coverage. If the dependency of Msg3 PUSCH waveform on the number of PRACH transmissions is supported, it should have a new RRC parameter to enable/disable it, and it can only be enabled when CP-OFDM is configured for *msg3-transformPrecoder*. Our first preference is to remove the FFS. Our 2nd preference is to update the proposal as follows. **FL proposal 1-2r1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy at least if the UE does not support/use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure. * ~~FFS: UE enables transform precoding for PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or by TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0 if the UE uses multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure.~~
* FFS: if the UE supports/uses multiple PRACH transmissions and CP-OFDM is configured for *msg3-transformPrecoder*.
 |
| LG | We don't think the current proposal is not the mechanism strictly respect to the ‘dynamic’ waveform switching. As some companies commented from earlier round, the linkage of Msg.3 to the PRACH transmission/repetition should be discussed sufficiently first in AI 9.12.1.Meanwhile, it seems rather better to leave it out the same phrase in the main text even if mention that multiple PRACH to the FFS.**FL proposal 1-2r1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy ~~at least if the UE does not support/use multiple PRACH transmissions in RACH procedure~~.FFS: if the UE supports/uses multiple PRACH transmissions. |
| Samsung | We are fine to agree to the first part of the proposal as follows. We don’t support to add a connection with single/multiple PRACH transmissions in this proposal. It can be a separate discussion.**FL proposal 1-2r1**: For PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR or TC-RNTI with DCI format 0\_0, UE considers transform precoding enabled or disabled according to *msg3-transformPrecoder* as in legacy  |

## [LP][Closed] Issue #1-3: Other issues related to requirements and scenarios

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

For the scenario of uplink carrier aggregation:

* Nokia [10] proposes to further study whether/how DWS feature is enabled for UL CA
	+ Largest MPR is considered for intra-band contiguous CA, CC in poor coverage cannot take advantage of larger Pcmax
* Panasonic [14] proposes to discuss whether dynamic waveform switching is supported in CA/DC scenario.
	+ Dynamic waveform switching is to be used not in real cell edge but closer to the cell center, therefore should be supported [14]
* Mavenir [15], Ericsson [26] propose that UL CA is assumed to be supported with dynamic waveform switching
	+ R17 coverage enhancements features can all be supported in UL CA scenario.
* Ericsson [26] proposes to study whether/how the power sharing across UL carriers affects UL transmission power after waveform switching.

Configured grant type 2

Sony [9] and Mavenir [15] proposes to adopt dynamic waveform switching for Type 2 CG-PUSCH:

* For CG re-activation when a new talk spurt occurs [9]
* Can be used for URLLC, small specification effort [15]

Other

* Spreadtrum [5], LG [29] propose that PUSCH transmission in RRC-connected can support dynamic waveform switching.
* Nokia [10] proposes to further study whether/how DWS feature is enabled for mTRP scenario.

**Observations on other issues related to requirements**

Moderator assumes that dynamic carrier switching is supported in uplink carrier aggregation, although it does not imply that dynamic waveform switching indication will be supported in DCI format 0\_X.

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Before starting CA consideration here, we’d suggest clarifying the detailed functions of DWS in DCI 0\_1 for self-cell scheduling. More specifically, * Is the feature of DWS configured (i.e., turned on/off) by a new RRC parameter?
	+ DCM’s view: Yes
* If above is the case, then what configuration type is assumed for the new RRC parameter? Cell-common? UE-specific? BWP-specific?
	+ DCM’s view: Open. Needs to decide. We thought UE-specific and BWP-specific is a kind of common understanding.
* What is the exact meaning of DWS field indication?
	+ DCM’s view: Needs to decide.

We see the first two points are treated in section 8.1.1. We’d suggest preparing the place to discuss the last point above under section 6.  |
| Intel | Our view is that dynamic waveform switching feature is not directly related to coverage enhancement. This can also be used for capacity improvement. For instance, when UE switches from DFT-s-OFDM waveform to CP-OFDM waveform, rank>1 transmission can be scheduled, which help improve the data rate. In this case, our understanding is that dynamic waveform switching can be supported for UL CA case.   |
| Lenovo | Support to study the potential issues for supporting DWS in UL CA case. |
| Vivo | Thanks for FL’s good summary. Our views are actually also provided when discussing the DWS signalling for multiple TB transmissions.In our understanding, we do not see the reason to not allow dynamic waveform switching for each serving cell when DC/CA is supported. When multiple PUSCH transmissions are scheduled by single DCI 0\_x, DWS for each PUSCH should be treated independently at least for inter-band CA case. |
| ZTE | Support the FL’s observations. |
| LG | We think UE with RRC\_CONNECTED would have clear condition to support DWS, and additionally RRC parameter that enable/disables dynamic waveform switching, e.g., introduce ‘dynamicWaveform’ value in ‘*transformPrecoder*’, can be adopted for on-demand DWS operation. |
| Spreadtrum | Support dynamic waveform switching in UL CA case. We think the PUSCH transmission waveform can be different in different carrier. For multi-carrier scheduling by DCI 0\_X, there are some remaining issue have not been decided yet. Thus, it is too early to consider the possibility of supporting DCI format 0\_X. In addition, we don’t understand why it has to change PUSCH waveform for more than one co-scheduled cells. It should be discussed under further MC enhancement WI. |
| Ericsson | Yes, it was correct. |
| Moderator | @All, thanks for feedback.@NTT DOCOMO, regarding “What is the exact meaning of DWS field indication?”. Do you mean the mapping between 0 / 1 and which waveform? (There is a proposal from Huawei on this under 6.1.) |

# Topic #2: Dynamic switching mechanism

## [HP][Closed] Issue #2-1: DCI size alignment between CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Option 1: Per-format

* Preferred or acceptable: Huawei [2], InterDigital [12], (Samsung [17]), (Ericsson [26]), (NEC [27])

[Impact on DCI construction/parsing][2][8][12][26]

* + Only requires bit padding at end of DCI [2]
	+ Reuse current DCI decoding scheme, lower UE implementation complexity [2][8]
	+ DWS indication precedes any field of the DCI format that has waveform-dependent size [2][17], precedes NDI field [17]
	+ Can ensure that fields before NDI (e.g. FDRA) are aligned by specification [12]
	+ Do not configure simultaneously with Type 0 resource allocation to avoid waveform-dependent fields before NDI [26]
	+ Same principle as cross-carrier scheduling [2]
	+ Would not prevent usage of CG type 2 PUSCH [2], UE needs to parse DWS field for CG retransmission anyway [2]

[Potential size benefit if new fields are introduced][2][12][27]

* + Easy to introduce new fields, e.g. FDSS for DFT-S-OFDM, smaller DCI size [2][12]
	+ Beneficial if there is one field that is larger for DFT-S-OFDM compared to CP-OFDM [27]
* Concerns: OPPO [4], Spreadtrum [5], ZTE [7], Nokia [10], Apple [22], Qualcomm [23], Google [25], NTT DOCOMO [28]

[Impact on DCI construction/parsing][4][5][7][8][10][22][23]

* + New 1-bit field needs to be in the beginning of format (or after NDI) [4][5][8][10]
	+ Potential additional complexity when considering other features [23], e.g. multi-cell scheduling [8][23], multi-PUSCH scheduling [23], dynamic switching of TRP transmission modes [23]
	+ Requires reading DWS bit before parsing [5][23], adding more features with dynamic DCI parsing increases complexity of DCI decoding [23]
	+ FDRA field is before NDI and may have size that depends on resource allocation type configuration [5]([10])[22]
	+ Alt-B requires that waveform-dependency of field size is not introduced in future releases before NDI [7][10]
	+ *[Additional concerns/observations on decodability of DCI scrambled by CS-RNTI [10] – however moderator thinks they may not be correct because we have alignment between C-RNTI and CS-RNTI]*

[DCI size benefit unclear or negligible][4][5][7][8][24][25][29]

* + UL DCI typically smaller than DL DCI [5][8]
	+ Not much difference between payload of CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM in practice because CP-OFDM will use small rank [18]
	+ Negligible overhead decrease even if some fields are larger for DFT-S-OFDM in future [24]
	+ New field specific to DFT-S-OFDM is hypothetical [29]

Option 2: Per-field

* Preferred or acceptable: vivo [3], OPPO [4], Spreadtrum [5], CATT [6], Intel [8], Nokia [10], (InterDigital [12]), China Telecom [13], Panasonic [14], Lenovo [16], (Samsung [17]), ETRI [18], Transsion [21], Sharp [24], Google [25], (Ericsson [26]), (NEC [27]), NTT DOCOMO [28], LG [29]

[Lower complexity, more robust approach]

* + Clean solution with impact limited to few relevant fields, less complex/risky than per-format [4][6][7][13][14][16][22][23][29]
	+ DCI construction invariant to selection of transmission waveform [23]
	+ Lower specification effort [5][10][25]
	+ No restriction on either position of DWS field nor field size before/after NDI field, more flexible and forward compatible design [3][8][10][16][25]
	+ Same principle as for BWP switching, per-field alignment between current and target BWP [8][18]
	+ Compatible/pairs well with alignment between CS-RNTI and C-RNTI [5][14][23]
	+ Minimize the impact of DWS on type 2 CG PUSCH and its activation/deactivation [28]
	+ No additional size comparison step needed between DCIs with different NDI values [29]

[Lower impact to UE implementation]

* + Least disruptive to UE implementation, CG-PUSCH already deployed in the field [23]
	+ Can still position new field in front to help parsing other fields [4][5], avoids two passes of parsing and decoding [5]

[New field specific to DFT-S-OFDM]

* + Can leverage zero-padded bits to avoid larger DCI size if new DFT-S-OFDM specific field is introduced in future [10]
	+ Beneficial if it is not expected that there is one field that is larger for DFT-S-OFDM compared to CP-OFDM [27]
* Concerns: Huawei [2]
	+ Padding bits cannot be reused by new fields [2]
	+ Larger DCI size when new fields are introduced in DCI only for DFT-S-OFDM [2]
	+ Requires change to current DCI decoding scheme, increases implementation complexity of UEs [2]

Option 3: Per-field alignment for fields preceding NDI field

* Preferred: CMCC [19]
	+ Same advantage as Option 1 if a new field is introduced for DFT-S-OFDM [19]
	+ Almost all fields influenced by waveform are located after NDI
* Concerns: Huawei [2], Spreadtrum [5], CATT [6], ZTE [7], Nokia [10], Apple [22], Qualcomm [23]
	+ More complex, requires both per-field and per-format [2][5][7][22][23]
	+ CG type 2 PUSCH is optional feature, should not impact gNBs and UEs that do not implement it [2]
	+ May impact PDCCH validation [5](?)
	+ Unclear benefit [5][7]
	+ Not relevant if fields preceding NDI are not waveform-dependent [6]
	+ Larger DCI size compared to option 1 [10]

Option 4: Per-field alignment only for DCI addressed to CS-RNTI

* Preferred: Mediatek [20]
	+ Current spec follows per-format alignment for DCI with C-RNTI and per-field alignment for DCI with CS-RNTI [20]
* Concerns: Huawei [2], Spreadtrum [5], ZTE [7], Nokia [10], InterDigital [12], Apple [22], Qualcomm [23], Sharp [24]
	+ More complex, uses two DCI alignment methods [2][5][7][12][22][29]
	+ Unclear benefit [5][6][7]
	+ May remove Option 1 benefit of potentially smaller field size [5]
	+ Fields need to have size for CP-OFDM at least equal to size for DFT-S-OFDM otherwise cannot be used for CS-RNTI and NDI=1 [6][10], limitation undesirable [24]
	+ DWS field need to be located before first waveform-dependent field [10]
	+ Would end up creating two classes of DG-PUSCH [23]
	+ If DWS is disabled, DCI for CS-RNTI fallbacks to legacy mode – effectively becomes new DCI format [23]

Other proposals

* Huawei [2] proposes to use 0 and 1 to indicate the waveforms.
* Nokia [10] proposes Option 5: Per-format alignment for DCI addressed to C-RNTI, per-field alignment for CS-RNTI depending on latest DWS waveform indicated by DCI scrambled by CP-OFDM
* Nokia [10] proposes that DCI contains DWS field only within certain time periods only to avoid overhead
	+ Panasonic [14] has concerns on complexity and thinks it is not needed.
* [4][10] provides a list of waveform-dependent fields:
	+ FDRA, TPMI, Second precoding information, Antenna ports, PTRS-DMRS association, Second PTRS-DMRS association, DRMS sequence initialization
* Sharp [24] thinks it needs to be clarified whether FDRA field size should be set according to *resourceAllocation* for both waveforms, or not [24]
* LG [29] proposes that if CG-PUSCH Type 2 is configured, waveform to be applied should be decided upon its DWS field availability and NDI values at UE.

**Observations on DCI size alignment**

Per-format alignment (Option 1) is preferred by at least 2 companies. 2 other companies did not explicitly express preference in their contributions, but proposals implicitly assume per-format alignment. On the other hand, 8 companies expressed concerns about this option.

Per-field alignment (Option 2) is preferred by 15 companies seems acceptable to 19 companies. 1 company expressed concerns about this option.

In general, companies analyzed the Options on the table from perspective of complexity, forward compatibility, and efficiency.

From the perspective of complexity, majority of companies believe that per-field alignment is generally simpler than per-format alignment because it does not require decoding the DWS field before parsing other fields. Introducing such dependency to the DCI encoding/decoding process is also foreseen to increase the potential for issues when introducing new features in the future. Potential dependency of the position of the NDI field is a drawback from UE perspective because it impacts PDCCH validation for configured grant type 2 activation/release. To address this problem, one sub-option of per-format alignment (Alt. B) imposes condition that no field preceding NDI field has a size that depends on the DWS field. This could be done by aligning fields such as FDRA if necessary. However, companies still have concerns that this is not a robust approach as the condition would have to be maintained in future releases.

From the perspective of efficiency, per-format alignment is more optimal since it guarantees the smallest number of padding bits required for alignment. However, majority of companies noted that this benefit does not exist in practice with currently defined fields since all of them have larger size for one waveform (CP-OFDM). This situation may change if new fields specific to DFT-S-OFDM are introduced, but even if this occurs the overhead benefit is likely to be very small or zero (e.g. if UL DCI is still smaller than DL DCI).

Option 3 and Option 4 were developed as potential compromise solutions during RAN1#112 offline discussions. However, only 1 company showed support for each Option while 7 and 8 companies (respectively) expressed concerns. The concerns are that these solutions further increase complexity by using both alignment methods.

Considering majority view, moderator recommends agreeing on per-field alignment (Option 2).

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-1**: For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 containing dynamic waveform indication, bit width of each field is set to the maximum between the bit width of the field if transform precoding is disabled and the bit width of the field if transform precoding is enabled, if different.* If, for the waveform indicated in the DCI, the bit width N of a field would be smaller than the bit width of the field set as per the above, UE decodes the field using N least significant bits. If N=0, the UE ignores the field for the indicated waveform.
 |

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please feel free to provide any feedback on FL proposal 2-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support 2-1 |
| CATT | We support FL proposal 2-1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. This option is aligned with existing mechanisms on DCI size alignment between DCI format addressed to C-RNTI and CS-RNTI, as well as BWP switching as defined in Rel-15.  |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the FL proposal 2-1. |
| Lenovo | We support FL proposal 2-1. |
| Apple | OK with this proposal. In addition, this DCI size alignment rule should be applied to PUSCH with type 2 CG initial transmission as well, even DWS is not supported to PUSCH with type 2 CG initial transmission. Otherwise, it could not differentiate the CG type 2 PUSCH initial transmission and re-transmission.Considering if PUSCH with CG type 2 is configured for a UE, the per-field alignment is applied to both CG type 2 PUSCH with NDI=0 and NDI=1. So, there are no additional efforts to support DWS to PUSCH with type 2 CG initial transmission from standard and implementation perspectives.Therefore, we propose to re-consider supporting “Dynamic waveform switching to PUSCH transmissions with a Type 2 configured grant” in R18. |
| Vivo | Fine. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal. |
| Transsion | We support this proposal. |
| LG | Support FL proposal 2-1. |
| Spreadtrum | Support this proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. The drawback of option 2 is the overhead for the case that a field for DFT-S-OFDM is larger than that for CP-OFDM, but it should be separately considered since it causes an issue even for current DCI alignment procedure between C-RNTI and CS-RNTI without DWS (e.g. the field of DCI with C-RNTI configured with CP-OFDM may be smaller than the field of DCI with CS-RNTI configured with DFT-S-OFDM).Except for such case, there is no overhead difference between candidate options. |
| CMCC | OK. Per field alignment helps UE decide bit width of each bit field without firstly decoding the DWS field. |
| Ericsson | Considering both per-format and per-field alignment can work, for the sake of progress, we are fine with the proposal. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with FL proposal 2-1. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Either per-format or per-field DCI alignment works. We are fine with the proposal if there is consensus. |

## [MP][Open] Issue #2-2: Handling of FDRA type/DMRS type

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

FDRA type

Several companies [3][5][6][10][12][19][25][28] discuss options for handling of FDRA type configuration when dynamic waveform switching indication is configured, considering that FDRA type 0 is not supported for DFT-S-OFDM. The following alternatives are identified:

* Option 1: *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0* is error case: [5][6][19][28]
	+ MSB of FDRA set to 0 is error case if DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and FDRA type is set to dynamicSwitch [28]
* Option 2: If DFT-S-OFDM is dynamically indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation regardless of how *resourceAllocation* is set or how dynamic indication of FDRA type is set ([6])[10][12][25].

[Benefits]

* + Works regardless of whether the resource allocation type is RRC configured or dynamically indicated and regardless of DCI size alignment solution [10]
	+ Does not require setting *resourceAllocation* to *dynamicSwitch* when network wants to use type 0 for CP-OFDM, saves 1 bit [12]

DMRS type

Two companies [6][28] discuss handling of DMRS type when dynamically waveform switching indication is configured, considering that DMRS type 2 is not supported for DFT-S-OFDM. The following alternatives are identified:

* Option 1: *dmrs-Type* set to *type2* is error case
* Option 2: If DFT-S-OFDM is dynamically indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1 regardless of how *dmrs-Type* is set.

Other waveform-specific configuration aspects

Vivo [3], Spreadtrum [5] discuss the potential issue of indicating rank>1 with DFT-S-OFDM.

Vivo [3] proposes to discuss rules to avoid indicating a waveform not supported with pi/2 BPSK.

Spreadtrum [5] proposes that parameters required by both waveforms are configured when dynamic waveform switching is configured.

Spreadtrum [5] proposes to apply MCS table configured for indicated waveform.

**Observations on handling of FDRA type, DMRS type and other waveform-specific configuration aspects**

The alternatives for the handling of FDRA type are to (1) consider that a configuration or indication incompatible with DFT-S-OFDM (i.e. Type 0) is an error case or (2) ignore the configuration when DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and use Type 1 resource allocation. In moderator’s understanding, the issue only exists for the case where *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured since otherwise resource allocation type 2 is used regardless of how *resourceAllocation* IE is set. This leads to the following proposal:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-2**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, and *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Option 2 (UE only uses *resourceAllocation* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies resource allocation according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
* Size of FDRA field is aligned between size for type 1 resource allocation and size according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
 |

For DMRS type, same options are identified:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-3**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.

Option 2 (UE only uses *dmrs-Type* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type according to *dmrs-Type*.
 |

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please feel free to provide any feedback on FL proposals 2-2 and 2-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | We thank FL for the formulation above, which is indeed a nice starting point. At this stage we support both. We think both options in each issue work. In this sense, both can be acceptable. Besides, we’d like to note that in our understanding, a main usage of DWS is for UE located “not very far from cell center”, to dynamically change its waveform properly, where RRC reconfiguration is NOT suitable. In other cases, just to configure RRC-level transform precoder only is still workable approach. Given above, we slightly prefer not to limit NW-side configuration (i.e., prefer option 2 for each of the issues). With this, UE can be operated with either 1) CP-OFDM with its original flexibility or 2) DFT-S-OFDM with its original e.g., robustness against PAPR, dynamically.  |
| CATT | For Option 1 in FL proposal 2-2, our understanding is that UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*, which is not conditioned on the indicated waveform to be DFT-S-OFDM. Otherwise, it is wired that gNB configures DWS and *resourceAllocationType0* but never indicates DFT-S-OFDM.Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Another Option could be that *resourceAllocation* is applicable to both waveforms except that it is configured as *resourceAllocationType0* and DFT-S-OFDM is indicated.Option X:* If *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0,* size of FDRA field is aligned between size for type 0 resource allocation and type 1 resource allocation
	+ If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

For FL proposal 2-3, similar as above comments to FL proposal 2-2, we suggest the following update to Option 1.Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.
 |
| Intel | We think these should be error cases. In case of dynamic waveform switching, a reasonable gNB configuration should avoid such error case. This would be similar to the case when DFT-s-OFDM waveform is configured for PUSCH transmission, UE does not expect to be configured with *resourceAllocationType0* |
| QC | Support both proposals. Okay with the edits made by CATT above. |
| Panasonic | We support FL proposal 2-2 and FL proposal 2-3. Either Option 1 or Option 2 is acceptable. |
| Lenovo | For the first bullet in option 1 in FL proposal 2-2, we think it is not accurate since a UE first receives the RRC signalling, and then receive a DCI for indicating the waveform and resource allocation type. Besides, we don’t support option 1 in both FL proposal 2-2 and FL proposal 2-3 since the flexibility is reduced for CP-OFDM.We would like to add another method as in the following modified FL proposal 2-2:**Modified FL proposal 2-2**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, and *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated~~, UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Option 2 (UE only uses *resourceAllocation* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies resource allocation according to *resourceAllocation* IE.

Option 3:* Separate resource allocation types for DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM are configured.

Similar for FL proposal 2-3:**FL proposal 2-3**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.

Option 2 (UE only uses *dmrs-Type* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type according to *dmrs-Type*.

Option 3:* Separate DMRS configurations for DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM are configured.
 |
| Apple | For Proposal 2-2, we don’t think this proposal is necessary. If Proposal 2-1 is agreed, we don’t see any restrictions on FDRA usage.For Proposal 2-3, it’s gNB configuration issue, a conclusion is enough.  |
| Vivo | Fine with the FL’s proposal assuming down-selection would be performed in next step. |
| ZTE | For proposal 2-2, we support Option 1, i.e., error case handling. Option 2 need more specification effort on size alignment of FDRA field.For proposal 2-3, we also support Option 1. |
| Transsion | The gNB has all the configuration information of the UE, so the gNB should avoid these error cases at the UE side. Therefore, for both proposals, we support option 1 respectively. |
| LG | We don’t support option 2 in FL proposal 2-3. It looks unnecessary DMRS type determination of UE behavior with additional condition since gNB already can configure properly via ‘dmrs-Type’ and ‘transformPrecodingEnanbled’ in DMRS-Uplinkconfig. |
| Spreadtrum | For Option 1, the gNB needs to ensure that type 0 resource allocation and DMRS type 2 is not used for DFT-S-OFDM. We prefer Option 1, it is easy and up to a proper configuration to solve this problem.We agree with CATT that UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0* cannot conditioned on the indicated waveform to be DFT-S-OFDM. OK with CATT’s modification. |
| Sharp | For FL proposal 2-2, we prefer option 2. In option 1, ‘*resourceAllocationType0’* cannot be configured even for CP-OFDM in DWS case and only ‘*resourceAllocationType1’* or ‘*dynamicSwitch*’ are configurable since ‘*resourceAllocation*’ is semi-statically configured as a common parameter for both waveforms. Basically, ‘*resourceAllocation*’ is a parameter assumed for CP-OFDM and we don’t prefer such configuration restriction.  |
| CMCC | Fine. From our understanding, to activate the dynamic waveform switching, RRC signalling is needed. gNB should have clear understanding about the collision between FDRA and DWS, so it should have opportunity to change the FDRA configuration and activate DWS at the same time. Op-1 seems workable. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposals and prefer Option 1. |
| ETRI | We think that it is an error case. We support Option 1 for both proposals. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support both proposals 2-2 and 2-3 from FL. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Samsung | OK with both proposals. For further discussion whether there is any specification impact. |
| Moderator | @All: thanks for comments.@CATT: agree we can delete “If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated” under Option 1. But, not sure I would like to add Option X at this point unless we have to.@Lenovo: I don’t understand what Option 3 achieves on top of Option 2, since the only possible FDRA type for DFT-S-OFDM is type 1?@Apple: it is not directly related to DCI size alignment issue. It is about interpreting RRC parameters that already exist in the context of DWS. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-2r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, and *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Option 2 (UE only uses *resourceAllocation* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies resource allocation according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
* Size of FDRA field is aligned between size for type 1 resource allocation and size according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-3r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.

Option 2 (UE only uses *dmrs-Type* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type according to *dmrs-Type*.
 |

### 2nd round

Please indicate if FL proposals 2-2r1 and 2-3r1 are acceptable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support.  |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposals. We support treating as error case.An understanding for Option 2 for FDRA to be confirmed. The size alignment between size for type 1 resource allocation and size according to *resourceAllocation* IE is to align to the maximum value? |
| Intel | We are still not convinced why we need to discuss these issues. As mentioned in the first round, a reasonable gNB configuration/implementation should avoid such error case. By default, it should be considered as error case.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal 2-2r1 and 2-3r1 assuming down-selection is the next step.For down-selection, our preference is Option 2 for FDRA. To support resource allocation type 1 only when DWS is configured is restrictive.For DMRS type, we are open for Option1 and Option 2. |
| NEC | If there are two separate PUSCH configurations, one for DFT-s-OFDM and the other for OFDM waveform, similar to separate DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH configuration, then we don’t think the proposal is needed. On the other hand, if only one PUSCH configuration is used for both two waveforms, we can support the proposal. |
| Moderator | @Intel: This means you are in favor of Option 1?From my perspective we should discuss it at least so that we have common understanding of what the UE should expect.@NEC: These parameters don’t have separate configuration per waveform in R17. Note that for DFT-S-OFDM, such configuration would not provide any information because FDRA cannot use type 0 and DMRS type cannot be anything else than DMRS type 1. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. At least for FDRA, our preference is Option 1. The difference between Option 1 with *dynamicSwitch* and Option 2 with *resourceAllocationType0* is just 1 bit and Option 1 can dynamically change the RA type for CP-OFDM while RA type is fixed for Option 2. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposals. We understand the motivation of the current version of Option1, but does it mean that if CP-OFDM is indicated, the UE should still can’t apply the *resourceAllocationType0* or *dmrs-Type2*. |
| Lenovo | Support option 2 in both FL proposal 2-2r1 and FL proposal 2-3r1 since the flexibility is reduced for CP-OFDM in option 1.@FL, we think the difference between option 2 and option 3 is that in option 2 a UE always assume resource allocation type 1 is used for PUSCH transmission with DFT-s-OFDM regardless of the configuration; while in option 3, a UE determine the resource allocation type by the configuration which is same as legacy. But we can accept option2. |
| Ericsson | We support the new proposals and Option 1. |
| LG | We think there should consider the case UE to be configured separately for each waveform through RRC signaling at least as we have similar view with Lenovo’s input earlier round. With the modification Option 3 added, we are fine to live with the proposals.**FL proposal 2-2r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, and *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *resourceAllocation* set to *resourceAllocationType0*.
* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated and *resourceAllocation* set to *dynamicSwitch*, UE does not expect MSB of FDRA field set to 0.

Option 2 (UE only uses *resourceAllocation* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies type 1 resource allocation.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies resource allocation according to *resourceAllocation* IE.
* Size of FDRA field is aligned between size for type 1 resource allocation and size according to *resourceAllocation* IE.

Option 3:* Separate resource allocation types for DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM are configured.

**FL proposal 2-3r1**: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with dynamic waveform switching indication field configured, downselect between following options:Option 1 (configuration restriction with error case handling):* ~~If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated,~~ UE does not expect *dmrs-Type* to be set to *type2*.

Option 2 (UE only uses *dmrs-Type* if CP-OFDM is indicated):* If DFT-S-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type 1.
* If CP-OFDM is indicated, UE applies DMRS type according to *dmrs-Type*.

Option 3:* Separate DMRS configurations for DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM are configured.
 |

## [LP][Open] Issue #2-3: DCI indicating multiple TBs

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Several companies [3][7][8][14][28] discuss whether/how to support dynamic switching indication in case a DCI schedules multiple TBs. Different cases are identified.

Multiple TBs/PUSCHs scheduled in time domain by single DCI for one serving cell [3][8][14][28]

* This case corresponds to multi-PUSCH scheduling using DCI format 0\_1 for shared spectrum access.
* Option 1: Common 1-bit DWS indication for all PUSCHs
	+ Intel [8], Panasonic [14], NTT DOCOMO [28]
	+ The multiple PUSCH typically experience similar channel conditions and scheduler cannot predict change anyway [28]
* Option 2: N-bit DWS indication for N PUSCHs
	+ Vivo [3]

Multiple TBs/PUSCHs on multiple serving cells scheduled by single DCI (format 0\_X)

* Support DWS indication in format 0\_X?
	+ Yes: Intel [8] (FFS bits), (vivo [3]), ZTE [7]
	+ Discuss in multi-carrier AI: Panasonic [14]
* One or multiple DWS?
	+ Multiple bits: vivo [3]
	+ Single bit: ZTE [7]
		- Unified solution with single TB/single DCI
		- Can use DFT-S-OFDM (more conservative) or majority waveform (?)
		- Less overhead, less specification effort

2 TBs on single serving cell with 8Tx UL transmission

* Dynamic waveform switching indication not applied because rank>1: ZTE [7]
* Discuss in MIMO AI: Panasonic [14]

**Observations on DCI indicating multiple TBs**

In general, not many companies contributed on these issues as the focus is on the completion of single TB case.

For the case of multi-PUSCH scheduling in time domain using DCI format 0\_1 for shared spectrum access, 3 companies think it should be supported with single-bit DWS field indicating single waveform applicable to all PUSCHs. 1 company thinks it should be supported with multi-bit DWS field indicating waveform to respective multiple PUSCHs. From moderator’s perspective, it seems that single waveform indication applicable to all PUSCHs would be sufficient for this case and same solution as for single TB can be reused without any issue. The following is therefore proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-4**: For UE configured with multi-PUSCH scheduling in time domain *(*i.e. *pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH*), DCI format 0\_1 supports 1-bit field for dynamic waveform switching indication. * When configured, 1-bit field indicates waveform for all scheduled PUSCH transmissions.
 |

For the case of multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells scheduled by DCI format 0\_X, 3 companies think that DWS should be supported for this case. One company thinks a single DWS bit should indicate single waveform applicable to multiple serving cells, while another company thinks multiple bits are required. During RAN1#112, majority of companies indicated that discussion on supporting DCI format 0\_X should be lower priority.

For the case of 2 TBs with 8Tx UL transmission, one company indicates that DWS indication should not be configured because DFT-S-OFDM does not support rank > 1. Moderator thinks it may depend on whether fallback to 1 TB is supported for this feature. More progress seems needed in MIMO AI before potential applicability of DWS can be discussed for this case.

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please indicate if FL proposal 2-4 is agreeable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | For DCI 0\_X, we’d suggest discussing it under MCE WI, where for any other DCI field, how to treat in case of MC-DCI was extensively discussed. For 8Tx, any discussion seems not necessary for now. Support of DFT-S-OFDM for 8Tx UE itself is still not very clear. Agree with FL that waiting for MIMO progress seems reasonable.  |
| CATT | We support FL proposal 2-4. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. Suggest minor update to avoid confusion with multi-cell scheduling in Rel-18:**FL proposal 2-4**: For UE configured with multi-PUSCH scheduling in time domain in a carrier *(*i.e. *pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH*), DCI format 0\_1 supports 1-bit field for dynamic waveform switching indication. When configured, 1-bit field indicates waveform for all scheduled PUSCH transmissions. |
| QC | Support. Single bit suffices. |
| Panasonic | We support FL proposal 2-4. |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Vivo | Fine with FL’s proposal 2-4 with the update by Intel.Regarding the support of DWS for DCI 0-x, we think this should be discussed with medium priority since some conclusion from this topic is needed to trigger discussions in DC/CA enhancement topic where different DCI field extension types are introduced.For multiple layer transmission, we do not think DWS is necessary either. |
| ZTE | Generally fine with this proposal. And FFS should be added as:FFS: the determination of the waveform for all scheduled PUSCH transmission.FFS: How to apply the assistance information discussed in section 7, if any. |
| Transsion | We support the proposal modified by Intel. |
| LG | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with FL’s proposal 2-4. For multi-PUSCH scheduling using DCI format 0\_1 in NR-U, multiple PUSCH typically experience similar channel conditions, so 1-bit waveform indicated field can be applied to all scheduled PUSCH transmissions.For the case of multiple PUSCHs scheduled by DCI format 0\_X and the case of 2 TBs with 8Tx UL transmission, the applicability of both case can be separately discussed in MC or MIMO AI. |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support.  |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal 2-4 and also fine with the update by Intel. One question for clarification, why do we only consider DCI 0\_1 here? is it because the multi-PUSCH feature is only supported with DCI 0\_1? |
| MediaTek | Support. We agree with Intel’s addition “in a carrier” for clarity. |
| Samsung | OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Moderator | @All, thanks for support and comments.@NTT DOCOMO, Vivo: Is MC WI still on-going or in maintenance phase?@Intel: Thanks for the suggestion. I am fine with it.@ZTE: I think the waveform is determined by the 1-bit DWS bit. What is left to determine? For the assistance information, better to decide first if we have it.@Nokia/NSB: Yes, this is my understanding from looking at 38.212. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 2-4r1**: For UE configured with multi-PUSCH scheduling in time domain in a carrier *(*i.e. *pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH*), DCI format 0\_1 supports 1-bit field for dynamic waveform switching indication. * When configured, 1-bit field indicates waveform for all scheduled PUSCH transmissions.
 |

### 2nd round

Please indicate if FL proposal 2-4r1 is acceptable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes we support. Just to respond to comments below:*[vivo] Regarding the support of DWS for DCI 0-x, we think this should be discussed with medium priority since some conclusion from this topic is needed to trigger discussions in DC/CA enhancement topic where different DCI field extension types are introduced.*[DOCOMO] Yes, we agree some discussions would need to be accelerated to trigger the discussion in MCE. We need to fix some basic aspects of DWS (e.g., the meaning of DWS indicated value 0 or 1, and its relationship with legacy transformPrecoder). *[FL] @NTT DOCOMO, Vivo: Is MC WI still on-going or in maintenance phase?*[DOCOMO] in our understanding MC WI can still work on this issue, if the topic is ready to be discussed in MC WI.  |
| ZTE | Support |
| Intel | SupportFor the discussion of DWS for multi-cell scheduling, we do not have strong view which WI should be treated. Our initial thought is that it may be good to discuss DWS issue in this AI given that we still have some opens for DWS, but MC enhancement is not in the maintenance phase.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Thank you, FL, for the clarification. We support this proposal. |
| QC | Support |
| Panasonic | We support DL proposal 2-4r1. |
| CATT | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Lenovo | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG | Fine with the revised proposal 2-4r1. |
| Samsung | Fine |

## [LP][Closed] Issue #2-4: Other issues

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Two companies [3][18] discuss handling of BWP switching when dynamic waveform switching indication is configured.

* [18] proposes that in case UE switches from a BWP not configured with DWS to a BWP configured with DWS, the 1-bit field for DWS indication is taken from existing field (e.g. MCS).
* [3] proposes to apply RRC-configured waveform of target BWP for PUSCH scheduled by DCI indicating BWP change irrespective of dynamic switching indication in DCI.

Oppo [4] proposes that in configured grant, the PUSCH transmissions other than scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 in PDCCH scrambled by CS-RNTI with NDI=1 should follow the waveform of the earlier transmission.

CMCC [19] proposes to study potential enhancement to enable UE fallback from DWS to legacy DCI.

Samsung [17] proposes to study whether additional timeline is needed for UL scheduling in case of dynamic waveform switching.

Samsung [17] proposes to study whether enhancement is needed for UCI multiplexing in case a PUCCH overlaps with multiple PUSCHs with different waveforms.

**Observations on other aspects**

In moderator’s understanding, the above issues are of lower priority or can be addressed later, e.g.:

* For BWP switching, it should first be decided if DWS is configured per BWP or UE.
* The waveform for CG retransmission is determined according to DWS indication as per RAN1#110bis-e and RAN1#112 agreements.
* Moderator does not expect that timeline relaxation would be needed based on input from companies during RAN1#110bis-e. However, companies are welcome to provide input on this issue.

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with FL’s understanding above  |
| Lenovo | We share same view as FL that these issues can be discussed later. |
| Vivo | Fine with FL’s assessment and we assume the BWP switching case would be taken care of when detailed DWS signaling is discussed. |
| ZTE | Discuss this later. |
| Spreadtrum | OK with FL’s assessment. |
| ETRI | Agree to the way forward. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view as FL, that the above aspects can be considered as lower priority. |
| Samsung | OK to discuss these issues later. |

# Topic #3: Assistance information for switching waveform

## [HP][Open] Issue #3-1: Assistance information for switching waveform

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Support assistance information for a target waveform (“pre-switch assistance”)?

* Yes: Huawei [2], Spreadtrum [5], vivo [3], Xiaomi [11], InterDigital [12], China Telecom [13], Panasonic [14], NEC [27], Lenovo [16], ETRI [18], Ericsson [26], Transsion [21], Apple [22], NTT DOCOMO [28], Nokia [10], Qualcomm [23]
	+ Difference of Pcmax between waveforms function of UE implementation [2][5][12][21]
	+ Data transmission failure may occur if gNB estimate of power boosting is optimistic [2]
	+ Limited performance improvement without enhancement as scheduler cannot decide MCS and RB allocation when switching waveform without power difference info [2][22]
	+ gNB may blindly switch back and forth without assisting information [10]
	+ Help gNB decide when to trigger waveform switch based on how much additional power a UE can deliver using alternate waveform [23][28]
	+ Power headroom related information based on Pcmax,f,c of target waveform [26]
	+ Help gNB schedule PUSCH transmission with target waveform properly by providing accurate FDRA and MCS [26]
* Maybe/study: Mediatek [20]
	+ Need to quantify potential performance gains considering additional overhead [20]
* No: Oppo [4], ZTE [7], Mavenir [15], Samsung [17], Google [25]
	+ Existing PHR sufficient, should be justified by simulation results [4]
	+ Unclear benefit [7][17][25], large effort for a simple feature [17][25]
	+ gNB can estimate rough difference of PHR between waveforms based on current PHR, SRS estimation or other measurement after waveform switching [7]
	+ gNB can learn based on storing history of PHR data [7]
	+ Increases overhead of UL signaling and reduces coverage [7]
	+ gNB knows whether the UE is at cell edge or in cell center [15]
	+ Dynamic switching does not increase need for enhancement compared to RRC switching [15][17]
	+ Not required by WID objective [17]

Assumptions for reference PUSCH (RB allocation, MCS) when reporting PH for a target waveform?

* Same as current PUSCH: Huawei [2], Spreadtrum [5], Xiaomi [11], InterDigital [12], Panasonic [14], Transsion [21], Apple [22], Qualcomm [23]
	+ Need to adjust in case RB allocation not supported for target [14]
* Assume a default value if actual PUSCH RB allocation not compatible with target waveform: Spreadtrum [5]
* Same inner/outer/edge RB allocation and modulation order as actual PUSCH transmission: Ericsson [26]
* Reuse legacy type 1 PHR based on actual PUSCH but Pcmax is based on target waveform: Ericsson [26]
* Consider MPR, A-MPR and P-MPR when computing PH [23]
* Consider both cases, same or different RB allocation and modulation order [10]
	+ To provide precise PH related information of target waveform in different RB regions or for different modulations.
* Virtual PH:
	+ No PH for target waveform in that case: vivo [3], Lenovo [16]
* Assistance information can include Pcmax/PH for target waveform or Pcmax/PH difference between waveforms [5]

Enhance PHR MAC CE to include assistance information?

* Yes: (vivo [3]), (InterDigital [12]), ETRI [18], (Ericsson [26]?), Apple [22], Qualcomm [23], (NTT DOCOMO [28]), Nokia [10], China Telecom [13]
	+ Reuse R17 PUSCH repetition solution (two PHs in single MAC CE) [18]
	+ Report both PH’s (easier gNB implementation) [22][28]
	+ Report Pcmax and PH for both waveforms [23]
	+ Option 1: both PHRs, Option 2: current PH + PH difference of target [10]
* No: Huawei [2]
	+ Information only useful for limited period of time, high overhead [2]
	+ Better to include only for target waveform when necessary [2]

Triggering of assistance information or new PHR trigger

* Network request: (Huawei [2]), InterDigital [12], NTT DOCOMO [28]
	+ Helps gNB make timely waveform switching decision and adjust resource allocation and MCS selection, but requires additional overhead [2]
	+ Better scheduling flexibility [12]
	+ Obtain PHR information in timely manner [28]
* PH value becoming higher (lower) than a threshold: Xiaomi [11], NEC [27], InterDigital [12], Transsion [21], Qualcomm [23]
	+ PH for CP-OFDM becomes higher than X1 while DFT-S-OFDM is used [27]
	+ PH for DFT-S-OFDM becomes lower than X2 while CP-OFDM is used [27]
	+ PH becomes lower than threshold and another waveform with better PH is available [23]
	+ Concerns: Huawei [2]
		- Cannot help gNB make waveform switching decision [2]
		- May result in too frequent PH reporting [2]
* Waveform has switched (“post-switch assistance”): Huawei [2] (existing PHR), ZTE [7] (existing PHR only), China Telecom [13], CMCC [19], Nokia [10], (Mavenir [15]), Google [25]
	+ PHR uses current calculation method [2]
	+ Help gNB indicate suitable RB allocation and MCS index after waveform switching [2]
	+ gNB can use the information to learn error [7]
	+ Send PHR in next uplink transmission after waveform switching [7]
	+ After expiry of timer to avoid unnecessary overhead [10]
	+ Only if there is change in PL and change in PL difference between waveforms compared to previous report [10]
	+ Simplest way to help gNB better evaluate PAPR reduction under different waveforms [25]
* Reuse existing trigger [add assistance info to PHR]: vivo [3], Spreadtrum [5], InterDigital [12], Ericsson [26], Apple [22]
	+ Waveform not supposed to change very frequently, existing events sufficient [26]
	+ Support shorter values of periodic PHR timer: Apple [22]
	+ Additional conditions for including assistance information: vivo [3], Spreadtrum [5], InterDigital [12]
		- Change of waveform since last PUSCH transmission [3]
		- RSRP less than threshold or current path loss is larger than previous moment and exceeds a threshold [5]
		- PH is lower than a threshold [12]
		- PH difference between waveforms is higher than a threshold [12]
* Continuous data error compared with a threshold: Xiaomi [11]
* No enhancement: Oppo [4], Samsung [17]
	+ Existing triggering sufficient, should be justified by simulation results [4]
	+ Benefit unclear, large effort for a simple feature [17]
	+ Not required by WID objective, not specific to dynamic switching (would have been applicable to RRC-based switching) [17]

Recommended waveform or request to switch waveform

* Yes: Spreadtrum [5], Xiaomi [11]
* No: Huawei [2], Ericsson [26]
	+ Requires new MAC CE [2]
	+ Not helpful to decide MCS selection and RB allocation [2]
	+ UE recommended waveform may be based on particular RB allocation and modulation order (current transmission) which gNB may change [26]

Other proposals

* UE reports power reduction due to waveform switching in UE capability reporting [19]
* Discuss scenario when report of PHR for current and target waveforms is close to or overlaps with existing PHR of current waveform [10]
* Study reporting of PHR information considering CA/DC scenario [14]
* Support smaller values of prohibit timer for PHR [15]
* PHR for a target waveform determined from an actual PUSCH using same waveform or reference PUSCH in case no PUSCH uses same waveform [16]
* Support independent open-loop power control parameter for each waveform [29]
	+ To immediately change the transmission power after changing waveform [29]

**Observations on assistance information**

From moderator’s perspective, the proposed enhancements for assisting the network with dynamic waveform switching can be classified in two high-level approaches.

First approach (“Pre-switch assistance”) aims at providing information to the network to help determine whether a change of waveform would be beneficial. The minimum enhancement to support this approach is the reporting of power headroom information applicable to a reference PUSCH using a target waveform different from waveform or actual PUSCH. Additional enhancements for the triggering of PUSCH are also possible, but not all companies think these are necessary.

* Based on contributions, 16 companies are supportive of this approach while 5 companies are not supportive, and 1 company thinks that it should be justified by quantified performance gains.

Second approach (“Post-switch assistance”) aims at providing information to the network about the power headroom situation after the switch so that scheduling adjustments can be made (or perhaps reversion to the earlier waveform). The minimum enhancement to support this approach is a new trigger of power headroom information linked to a waveform switching event.

* Based on contributions, 7 companies are supportive of (or open to) this approach while 3 companies think no new trigger is needed.

As a first step, to further clarify situation, moderator would like to ask companies the following about the above high-level approaches.

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please provide answers to the following questions.

Q1: Which of the two approaches do you think is most useful to support DWS? Are both useful?

Q2: If preferred approach is pre-switch assistance, is it acceptable to support only post-switch assistance? If preferred approach is post-switch assistance, is it acceptable to support only pre-switch assistance?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Q1: Pre-switch is useful, while post-switch also have somewhat benefits. Q2: Yes, post switch is better than nothing. But not sure why post-switch is the starting point? From RAN2 perspective, it seems both have some impacts.  |
| CATT | From our perspective, we think neither is essential. Although dynamic waveform switching is supported, gNB can still use the existing methods/information to determine whether to switch the waveform or not. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer not to support additional enhancement for assistance information for dynamic waveform switching. This seems not in the main scope for dynamic waveform indication. If there are simulation results to clearly demonstrate the performance gain, we can be open to consider pre-switch assistance.  |
| QC | Q1: Open to support both. Q2: Only post-switch assistance (via a new trigger) may also suffice. The cost to switch back to the original waveform is rather small once DWS is enabled.  |
| Panasonic | Q1: We think pre-switch assistance is beneficial in order to the network properly determine the necessity of waveform switching.Q2: We are open to discuss the necessity of post-switching. |
| Lenovo | Q1: We support the pre-switch assistance. For post-switch assistance, the performance of current PUSCH transmission cannot be guaranteed.Q2: We think one method is sufficient and support the pre-switch assistance.  |
| Apple | The first approach, i.e., Pre-switch, is better without any delay on PHR reporting. It seems not necessary to support both approaches.  |
| vivo | Q1: In our view, PHR of new waveform can be put in the same MAC-CE as PHR of RRC configured waveform when the legacy PHR is triggered and when the target waveform is different from the RRC waveform and when the PUSCH is not virtual. This would minimize the specification work and avoid definition of additional triggering mechanism and PHR reporting timeline which are quite complex.Not sure whether above view is aligned with FL’s pre-switch assistance or post-switch assistance. Q2: See answer to Q1. |
| ZTE | Q1: We think the second approach (Post-switch assistance) is enough for the enhancement from power headroom aspect. As we have the consensus that the switching of waveform is not so frequent, then after event adjustment of MCS, RB allocation, even reversion to the earlier waveform is enough to enhance the performance of DWS at the lowest specification impact and lower complexity.Q2: We support post-switching assistance only or no any additional assistance enhancement. |
| Transsion | Q1: We believe that both approaches are useful to support DWS. However, between these two approaches, the first approach (pre-switch) may have less spec impact. If the second approach (post-switch) is supported, then a new trigger mechanism needs to be introduced, and the combination of supporting the new trigger mechanism and the previous trigger mechanism needs to be considered,which will increase the specification workload of RAN2.Q2: We can support either one of them. |
| LG | Q1: We prefer to pre-switch.Q2: We share DOCOMO’s view. |
| Spreadtrum | We think First approach (“Pre-switch assistance”) is most useful to support DWS, which can help gNB to select more appropriate waveform. For second approach, its attention to adjust RB allocation and MCS based on the PHR trigger by waveform switching. It can also provide some power information for the next waveform switching and can be further discussed. But we think only post-switch assistance may not be sufficient. gNB may not make a appropriate decision whether to switch waveform or not without Pre-switch assistance. |
| CMCC | We think both of the approaches are useful. |
| Ericsson | Q1: Post-switch assistance is based on the assumption that PUSCH transmission with the new waveform can be successfully received by gNB. However, this is questionable, because gNB doesn’t know how to schedule FDRA and MCS for the PUSCH with the new waveform without information of the possible UE transmission power, and there is no guarantee that the blind change of waveform and blind scheduling of FDRA and MCS can improve PUSCH reception.Q2: Pre-switch assistance is necessary for a successful dynamic waveform switching. It is not acceptable to support only post-switch assistance. |
| ETRI | Q1: Pre-switch is more useful, because post-switch may have more retransmissions.Q2: We think pre-switch is necessary. |
| Nokia/NSB | Let us clarify that our understanding here is that “pre-switch” means assisting information is provided before the DWS indication. Therefore, we assume that if the assisting information is reported after a first DWS but before a second DWS it still be considered as “pre-switch” (because it’s used for the second DWS). With this understanding, our companies proposal should be captured as “pre-switch”.**Q1&Q2:** We think that pre-switch is not only more useful but also more relevant with the context of “assisting information” in DWS. In addition, if pre-switch is considered then post-switch is not needed, because PHR information of the new waveform is already included in the pre-switch. Therefore, we support only pre-switch. |
| MediaTek | Q1: in our view, pre-switch assistance could be more useful than post-switch. However, we have not evaluated this by simulations. Supporting both approaches seems unnecessary to us intuitively. We tend to think that it’s not quite clear to any of the companies how often UE will actually switch between two waveforms back and forth in a real network using dynamic switching. Depending on the duration between two successive dynamic switches, it is possible that neither approach is useful. Q2: We think, either one approach or no approach is preferred. It is not easy to conclude how much can be gained by either approach without numerical evaluation results. |
| Samsung | Q1/Q2: Before/after a dynamic waveform switch is inessential as the timing when the indication is sent is up to the network. Introducing mechanisms for PHRs associated to each waveform dynamic switch may not be useful and adds complexity to both UE and gNB, besides it can have a large impact on specifications. In principle, if the gNB would receive some PHR information for both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM, the gNB may use this information when dynamically indicating or configuring the waveform but performance gains remain unclear. It is also noted that the discussion is not within the scope of the WID (it is not specific to DCI-based DWS switching). |
| Moderator | @All, thanks for the comments.@NTT DOCOMO: From my perspective, “post-switch” is not starting point. I agree that both approaches have some impact.@Intel, Mediatek, Samsung: I agree that it would be nice to quantify gains, but I am not sure if it is realistic since it depends on scheduling assumption and would require large effort. I doubt that all (any?) PHR enhancements introduced in the past were backed by simulation results, and it seems a bit stringent to now impose this requirement.@Samsung: the objective of the WID simply states “specify enhancements to support DWS” – any enhancement required to support it (not just dynamic indication) is thus in scope. All companies may not agree on how essential each potential enhancement is, but I don’t think it can reasonably be argued that it is out of scope. Also, even if PHR assistance could also be interesting for RRC-based switching, it seems more needed for dynamic switching. |

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 3-1**: For potential enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining waveform switching, RAN1 to select between following options:* Option 1: Reporting of power headroom information for a reference PUSCH using target waveform different from waveform of actual PUSCH.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 2: New trigger of power headroom report based on waveform switching event.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 3: Both Option 1 and Option 2.
	+ Details FFS.
* Option 4: No enhancement.

  |

### 2nd round

During GTW on Monday, FL proposal 3-1 was presented but not agreed due to concern that the possibility of reporting both legacy PHR and PHR for target waveform at the same time could be precluded. In moderator’s understanding, this behaviour is not precluded by the proposal under Option 1 (it is part of the Details in FFS). Suggestions for stabilizing proposal are welcome, but it may be better to avoid long and detailed list of FFSs at this stage.

Please indicate if FL proposal 2-4r1 is acceptable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | To clarify: as Nokia mentioned in GTW, having multiple PCMAX or PHR, one for configured waveform and the other for target waveform, is included in option 1, or preclude? We originally thought such aspect can be considered according to “Details FFS”.  |
| ZTE | Support. Option 2 or 4 is preferred. |
| Intel | We can be open to discuss the proposal. For the main bullet, is this the intention to down-select one option from the 4 options?  |
| Nokia/NSB | Thank you, FL, for the clarification! But we do not think the current wording of Option 1 includes the option of reporting PH info for both waveforms. We can not interpret this as FFS since there is no guarantee that all companies will have the same understanding without spelling it out explitcitly. The case of reporting PH info of both waveforms deserves to be treated explicitly as one option. We also would like to clarify that, for Option 1 or the option of reporting PH info of both waveforms, we need to discuss on the triggering of such reporting. Though this can be discussed/considered as to be included in FFS. Can you confirm if this understanding is correct? |
| QC | Support. Our read on Option 1 is that it does not preclude reporting for both waveforms in one PHR. If Option 1 is agreed, we can definitely consider doing that as it will be the most efficient manner to carry information for both waveforms. |
| Panasonic | We agree to the comment during GTW on Monday that reporting both legacy PHR and PHR for target waveform at the same time should also be one possibility for potential enhancement. With the above FL’s explanation that such possibility is under Option 1, we are fine with FL proposal 2-4r1. |
| NEC | Support. |
| Moderator | @All, thanks for comments and support.@NTT DOCOMO, Panasonic: confirm that this is intention.@Intel: Yes, the intention is we first select one of the Options. Otherwise, I feel it will be difficult to progress.@Nokia/NSB: Option 1 does not state or suggest that we remove legacy functionality for PHR. So clearly, legacy PHR can still be reported according to existing mechanisms. Then whether the “target waveform PHR” is reported at the same time or not as the legacy PHR and whether we have new trigger for the new PHR is part of “FFS details”. If no new PHR trigger is supported, then it would most likely have to be reported together with legacy PHR. If we support new PHR trigger(s), then it could be separate or together. If you are worried that one of these possibilities could be interpreted as being precluded, please suggest an alternate wording but at this stage I would prefer not adding complexity/sub-options to the main options. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| China Telecom  | Support.  |
| Lenovo | Support. We prefer option 1 since the performance of the scheduled PUSCH by the DCI which indicates a different waveform may not be guaranteed in option 2. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal and Option 1.It is not clear to us how a power headroom report of Option 2 will affect gNB.With Option 2, if a UE reports a power headroom for the new waveform (DFT-S-OFDM), which is much larger than the one before waveform switching, what’s the point of reporting it to gNB?If the power headroom of the new waveform is very close to the one before waveform switching, shall gNB switch the waveform back to leverage multiple layer gain? This goes against our understanding on infrequent waveform switching. |
| LG | We respect FL's opinion. As mentioned by contributions, reference PHR for different waveform could be estimated/calculated by gNB if the same power control parameters are used. Thus, it should be addressed how to make the difference between waveforms in terms of PHR. To apply differences between two waveforms, one easiest way is to configure separated open-loop power control parameter for each waveform, which also can represent different *PCMAX* of each waveform. In this regard, we would like to add how the network can help the UE as a FFS point in Option 1.* Option 1: Reporting of power headroom information for a reference PUSCH using target waveform different from waveform of actual PUSCH.
	+ FFS: how UE calculates reference PHR of the different waveform
		- E.g., using different power control parameters
 |
| Samsung | A follow up on FL’s response in the first round about “any enhancement required to support it (not just dynamic indication) is thus in scope.” Although we were open to studying enhancement, despite not expecting any gain, no company has shown that there is any benefit - only proposals were made. It is not clear that the enhancement is required. |

# Topic #4: RRC parameters

## [MP][Open] Issue #4-1: Configuration of DWS

**Summary of company views from contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e**

Several companies (ZTE [7], InterDigital [12], Panasonic [14], Lenovo [16], Samsung [17], ETRI [18], LG [29]) discuss RRC configuration to enable dynamic waveform switching functionality.

All the above companies identify the need for configuring by RRC whether dynamic waveform switching is enabled. However, several issues still need to be discussed.

Configurability level

Two companies [12][18] propose that dynamic waveform switching is configurable per BWP. One company [16] proposes that parameters applicable to both waveforms are configured within one PUSCH-Config, which implies configurability per BWP. At the beginning of RAN1#112, moderator also asked this question to companies and majority of companies were preferring per-BWP. From moderator’s perspective, configurability per BWP seems natural since parameter *transformPrecoder* which controls the waveform for dynamic grant in R17 is under *PUSCH-Config* which is configured by BWP.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 4-1**: Dynamic waveform switching is configured separately for each BWP, within *PUSCH-Config*. |

Two companies [12][16] propose that presence of the 1-bit dynamic waveform switching indication can be configured separately for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2. Other companies [7][14][17][29] discussing RRC enabling/disabling the indication do not discuss this aspect. Some additional discussion may be needed on this.

For the RRC indication, options include (1) additional value to *transformPrecoding* parameter indicating dynamic switching [14][17] or (2) additional RRC parameter indicating if dynamic switching is enabled or disabled [7][14][29]. Both options can be further studied.

One company [16] proposes that parameters for CP-OFDM and DFT-S-OFDM are included under a same PUSCH-Config parameter instead of separate PUSCH-Config parameters. In moderator’s understanding, parameters for both waveforms are already included within PUSCH-Config. In case some parameter for one waveform or the other is missing, it seems reasonable to continue with the same approach.

### 1st round

Please indicate if your company position was incorrectly captured or if you would like to add your company position to the summary above. Please indicate:

* If FL proposal 4-1 is agreeable
* If you think presence of dynamic waveform switching indication can be configured separately for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes, we agree with 4-1. We are open for common/separate configuration for DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2. Meanwhile, we think the reason of having two separate DCI formats is to enable UEs to decode two DCI formats with different purpose. DWS’s need could also be different in between in our view. Thus separate configuration seems reasonable to us.  |
| CATT | We support FL proposal 4-1.We agree with separate configuration of presence of dynamic waveform switching indication for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| Intel | It may be good to first discuss dynamic waveform switching in case of BWP switching. If this is supported, then we are fine with FL proposal 4-1 |
| QC | Support. We too think separate configuration for formats 0\_1 and 0\_2 will be needed. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with FL proposal 4-1; and we think the presence of dynamic waveform switching indication can be configured separately for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| Apple | We support Proposal 4-1, and DWS is separately configured for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| vivo | Fine with FL’s proposal. And in this case, we assume DWS bit(s) in a DCI would be reserved when BWP switching is indicated by the DCI. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal 4-1. |
| Transsion | We support this proposal.We believe that the presence of DWS indication can be separately configure for DCI format 0\_1 adn 0\_2.  |
| LG | Support the proposal 4-1. But, we are questionable for the necessity of supporting each format indicated separately for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2. |
| Spreadtrum | Support FL proposal 4-1 and DWS can be separately configured for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Support FL proposal 4-1. |
| Ericsson | Separate RRC configurations are needed for C-RNTI in *PUSCH-Config* and CS-RNTI with NDI=1 in *ConfiguredGrantConfig*.No need to have separate RRC parameters for DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal 4-1. The compact DCI format may or may have different fields. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with FL proposal 4-1. On separate configurations for format 0\_1 and 0\_2, does it mean that if DWS is not enabled for one DCI format then the DWS indication field is considered as reserved for the DCI format? Otherwise, what is the motivation? |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal. We don’t see a need to have separate RRC parameters for DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| Samsung | OK with proposal. |
| Moderator | @All: thanks for comments and support.@Intel: I think dynamic BWP switching discussion would be next step after we agree on this. |

### 2nd round

Since FL proposal 4-1 seems agreeable to all, moderator would like to submit for email approval. Regarding separate configurability for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2, it seems that more discussion is needed. Moderator’s understanding is that the argument for separate configurability is that the presence of DWS field increases the payload of the DCI compared to semi-static configuration of DFT-S-OFDM, while the objective of DCI format 0\_2 is to have reduced DCI payload compared to DCI format 0\_1. On the other hand, one argument for common configurability is that in R17 we do not seem to have separate configuration for the *transformPrecoding* parameter.

|  |
| --- |
| **FL proposal 4-2**: For configuration of 1-bit dynamic waveform switching indication in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2, downselect between following options:* Option 1: Separate configuration of presence of dynamic waveform switching field for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2.
* Option 2: Common configuration of presence of dynamic waveform switching field for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2.
 |

Please indicate if FL proposal 4-2 is agreeable. Please feel free to indicate any additional motivation for Option 1 or Option 2 in the above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal to suggest down-selection itself is fine for us. As said, we are open to discuss, but for now we feel option 1 seems reasonable. We believe the importance of 1-bit overhead could be quite different between DCI 0\_1 and DCI 0\_2. Compact DCI intends to maximize DCI reliability by prioritize DCI overhead reduction than NW control in our understanding. Then it may be a realistic case that NW wants DWS to be configured in DCI 0\_1 while not to be configured in DCI 0\_2@Ericsson, we do not quite understand why per-RNTI configuration could be beneficial. Do you intend to make a DCI format with different RNTI non-aligned, unlike the legacy spec? @Nokia, in our understanding, alignment between DCI 0\_1 and DCI 0\_2 is not required per the specification now. Or if we overlook something, please let us know. The potential benefit of having separate configuration could rather be to enable independent configuration in between so that one configuration doesn’t affect on the other.  |
| ZTE | Support. Prefer Option 1 |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.We prefer Option 1 with the motivation as mentioned by NTT DOCOMO. DCI format 0\_2 typically has smaller size compared to DCI format 0\_1.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal.@NTT DOCOMO: Thank you for the clarifications. We were wondering if the alignment is constrained by the (3+1) rule on the DCI size budget. We understand your explanation on the motivation and can be open to that. Thank you! |
| QC | Lets go with Option 1. Many other features make a distinction between 0\_1 and 0\_2. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal 4-2 and we prefer Option 1. |
| NEC | Fine with the proposal and prefer option 1. |
| CATT | Support and we prefer Option 1. |
| China Telecom | Support, and we prefer Option 1. |
| Lenovo | Support Option 1 that different DCI formats may indicate different waveforms for different purposes. |
| Ericsson | Support. Option 1 is fine. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. We think option 1 is better way to configure both DCI formats separately to take advantage of the configurable DCI format 0\_2. |
| Samsung | Proposal is fine. No strong motivation for either option.  |
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# Appendix: Previous agreements

RAN1#112

Agreement

For single TB scheduled by single DCI, support new 1-bit field for dynamic waveform indication from UL scheduling DCI.

Note: no change of the current size alignment procedure between UL DCI and DL DCI.

Conclusion

There is no consensus to support “Dynamic waveform switching to PUSCH transmissions with a Type 2 configured grant” in R18.

Agreement

Dynamic waveform switching in R18 is not applicable to PUSCH transmissions with a Type 1 configured grant.

Conclusion

The dynamic waveform indication in a DCI containing a dynamic uplink grant applies only to PUSCH transmission(s) corresponding to the dynamic uplink grant.

RAN1#111

**Agreement**

**For DCI based solution,**

* For supported dynamically scheduled PUSCH, support dynamic waveform switching indication from UL scheduling DCI

Note: “Supported dynamically scheduled PUSCH” is to be confirmed in further discussion

Note: It does not imply that the waveform switching indication applies to other transmission or not

* Indication from non-UL scheduling DCI is not supported.

Note: the working assumption made in RAN1#110b-e for “Support at least one of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18” does not need to be confirmed

Working Assumption

Support new 1-bit field for dynamic waveform indication from UL scheduling DCI

* Note: no change of the current size alignment procedure between UL DCI and DL DCI

Agreement

Study the necessity of the following potential enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining waveform switching:

* Reporting power headroom related information based on PCMAX,f,c applicable to a target waveform
	+ Target waveform can be same or different from waveform of an actual PUSCH transmission
	+ FFS target RB allocation and/or target modulation order can be same or different from respective properties of an actual PUSCH transmission
	+ FFS determination of target waveform, target RB allocation, target modulation order
	+ FFS details, e.g. report PCMAX,f,c or Type 1 power headroom for a waveform, or difference thereof between waveforms
* PHR triggering enhancements, e.g.
	+ Network-triggered PHR
	+ PH becomes lower (higher) than a threshold
	+ PHR triggered by waveform switching
* Reporting of recommended waveform or request to switch waveform
* Other solutions not precluded

RAN1#110bis-e

Agreement

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

**Working Assumption**

Support at least one of the following options for the dynamic waveform indication in R18:

Alt 1: Indication from an UL scheduling DCI

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

Alt 2: Indication from a non-UL scheduling DCI

* FFS: DCI formats that can provide the indication (e.g. Downlink DCI, UE-group common DCI)
* FFS: Types of subsequent transmissions to which indication is applicable

**Agreement**

To study and if necessary, specify, enhancements to assist the scheduler in determining waveform switching, such as:

* Reporting power headroom related information
* Other solutions are not precluded

**Agreement**

Dynamic waveform switching enhancement in R18 is applicable to PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 in PDCCH with CRC scrambled with C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, or CS-RNTI with NDI=1.

* Note: The above does not imply that dynamic switching enhancement in R18 is applicable or not applicable to other cases of PUSCH (e.g. PUSCH transmission with a Type 1 or Type 2 configured grant, PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0).
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