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# Introduction

This document summarizes the discussions on the 38.212 draft CR on NR MIMO Evolution for Downlink and Uplink, and aims to stabilize the 38.212 draft CR.

[Post114-38.212-NR\_MIMO\_evo\_DL\_UL] Email discussion on Rel-18 draft CRs by September 7 – Editors

# First round discussions

This section summarize the first round email discussions on draft CR v00. Companies are encouraged to provide the first round views by 09/05 (Tuesday), 6:00am UTC, then we can update the draft CR accordingly for the next step discussions.

## Multi-TRP enhancements

Please provide your comments/suggestions on Multi-TRP enhancements here, including unified TCI framework and two TAs for multi-DCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Editor | The changes are marked with author “Yan Cheng\_post RAN1#114” on top of the version R1-2306315 endorsed in RAN1#113, which are to reflect the agreements RAN1#114. |
| QC | For two TAs for multi-DCI, our understanding is that the following agreements should be implemented in 38.212, Section 7.3.1.2.1 (DCI format 1\_0, the part that describes PDCCH order):  **Agreement (RAN1 #114)**  For inter-cell multi-DCI based Multi-TRP operation with two TA enhancement, support indication of additionalPCI in the PDCCH order   * as baseline capability: support PRACH triggering towards servingCell PCI or active additionalPCI.   **Agreement (RAN1 #112-b)**  For intercell multi-DCI based Multi-TRP operation with two TA enhancement, support indication of which PRACH configuration to be used in the RACH procedure in the PDCCH order.   * FFS: Whether *additionalPCI* or a generic identifier is indicated in PDCCH order * FFS: The detail of the indication in PDCCH order in terms of whether to support PRACHtriggered for inactive *additionalPCI*. |
| Samsung | We would like to suggest the following change to unify the field(s) name in 1\_1 and 1\_2.   |  | | --- | | 7.3.1.2.2 Format 1\_1  - TCI ~~states~~ selection – 0 bit if higher layer parameter *tciSelection-PresentInDCI* is not enabled; otherwise 2 bits according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-11. | |

## CSI enhancements

Please provide your comments/suggestions on CSI enhancements here, including CSI enhancement for high/medium UE velocities and coherent JT (CJT).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Editor | The changes are marked with author “Yan Cheng\_post RAN1#114” on top of the version R1-2306315 endorsed in RAN1#113, which are to reflect the agreements RAN1#114. |
|  |  |

## Reference signal enhancement

Please provide your comments/suggestions on Reference signal enhancements here, including increased number of orthogonal DMRS ports and SRS enhancements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Editor | The changes are marked with author “Yan Cheng\_post RAN1#114” on top of the version R1-2306315 endorsed in RAN1#113, which are to reflect the agreements RAN1#114. |
|  |  |

## Enhanced uplink transmission

Please provide your comments/suggestions on enhanced uplink transmission here, including UL precoding indication for multi-panel transmission and SRI/TPMI enhancement for enabling 8TX UL transmission.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Editor | The changes are marked with author “Yan Cheng\_post RAN1#114” on top of the version R1-2306315 endorsed in RAN1#113, which are to reflect the agreements RAN1#114. |
| QC (STxMP) | **Comment 1**: Based on the following agreement in RAN1 #114, the multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH is enabled by a new RRC configuration (“enableSTx2PofmDCI”) in addition to configurations of two coresetPoolIndex values and two SRS resource sets. We suggest to also add this condition in various places where multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH is discussed.  **Agreement**   * Regarding how to configure multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH in RRC, * Introduce a new RRC parameter to indicate the multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH. The multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH is configured when the new RRC parameter is configured, two different *coresetPoolIndex* values are configured and two SRS resource sets for CB/NCB are configured.   When multi-DCI based STxMP PUSCH+PUSCH is configured, the DCI field SRS resource set indicator is not present.  **Comment 2**: The last codepoint of SRS resource set indicator in Table 7.3.1.1.2-36 should be reserved / not used for SDM/SFN schemes based on the following agreement. A note can be added to the Table to capture this.  **Agreement**  When the single-DCI based PUSCH SDM/SFN is configured, the codepoint ‘11’ of the DCI field SRS resource set indicator is reserved.  **Comment 3**: In Section 7.3.1.1.3 (DCI format 0\_2), there are a couple of instances (copied below), where instead of DCI format 0\_2, DCI format 0\_1 is mentioned (typo):  - is the number of configured SRS resources in the SRS resource set associated with the *coresetPoolIndex* value for the CORESET used for the PDCCH carrying the DCI format 0\_1, if the UE is not provided *coresetPoolIndex* or is provided *coresetPoolIndex* with value 0 for the first CORESETs, and is provided *coresetPoolIndex* with value 1 for the second CORESETs,  **…**  When the UE is not provided *coresetPoolIndex* or is provided *coresetPoolIndex* with value 0 for the first CORESETs, and is provided *coresetPoolIndex* with value 1 for the second CORESETs, and there are two SRS resource sets configured by *srs-ResourceSetToAddModListDCI-0-2* and associated with *usage* of value '*codebook*' or '*nonCodeBook*', the Precoding information and number of layers field is associated with the SRS resource set that is associated with the *coresetPoolIndex* value for the CORESET used for the PDCCH carrying the DCI format 0\_1.  **Comment 4**: Some of the editor’s notes may not be needed anymore given the outcome of RAN1 #114, like the followings notes:  “Editor’s note: No agreement on “11” yet, will further update later if needed depending on further agreement”  “Editor’s note: There is no agreement on what to do when *multipanelScheme* is configured to *sfnScheme. Further update will be done once there is further agreement.*” |

# Second round discussions

TBD