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1. Introduction

Per chairman’s instruction, the goal and pertinent contributions for this email discussion is as follows:

* Goal: Find a way forward on the proposed scope revisions.
* Input contributions covered:  1470, 1839, 1895

Table 1 Summary of the identified input contributions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tdoc** | **Summary of issue and proposals** |
| RP-201470 | Issue: Telefonica and UIC requested to be added as supporting companies right after the WID was endorsed in RAN#86. The request has not yet fulfilled since the WID has not been revised.  Proposal: Add Telefonica and UIC as supporting companies per their past and not-yet-fulfilled requests |
| RP-201839 | Issue: It is claimed that Rel-16 multi-DCI multi-TRP requirement of receive timing difference within a CP is in general too restrictive and therefore should be relaxed for Rel.17 inter-cell mTRP work (item 2b of the WID).  Proposal:   * “Clarify that a target deployment scenario (both FR1, FR2) for inter-cell operation in Rel-17 should consider non-ideal cell-phase synchronization (timing error) between the two cells.” |
| RP-201895 | Issue: On item 2b of the WID, in RAN1 #102-e, some companies argued that synchronization and timing aspects for inter-cell multi-TRP are out of scope while others think it is a natural part of the practical scenarios.  3 “factors” that require consideration for inter-cell mTRP:   * Propagation delay difference is at least similar to that of Rel-16; in addition, * Synchronization offset between multiple cells; an   + Note that inter-cell synchronization accuracy is up to 3us (TDD only) per RAN4 requirements * Backhaul between the cells can be non-ideal with certain amount of delay   + This requires separate uplink transmissions to multiple TRPs of different cells   Proposal:   * “To proceed Rel-17 inter-cell multi-TRP work, there are 2 alternatives:   + Alt. 1: Only consider factor A, same as in the case of intra-cell     - The applicable scenarios will be very limited: very tightly synchronized cells with very fast backhaul and small cell sizes.   + Alt. 2: Consider all factors A, B, and C     - Applicable to more practical scenarios * RAN Plenary to determine between Alt. 1 and Alt. 2.” |

Evidently, RP-201470 (Samsung, rapporteur) neither requires nor solicits any additional inputs - unless some other companies not listed as supporters would like to add their support as well (which is doable by online or personal emails directly to the rapporteur). Therefore, the proposed amendment on the list of supporting companies is readily accepted and requires no discussion.

Both RP-201839 (Intel) and RP-201895 (Futurewei) attempt to address the same issue raised in RAN1#102-e pertaining to item 2b of the WID.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Enhancement on the support for multi-TRP deployment, targeting both FR1 and FR2:    1. ...    2. Identify and specify QCL/TCI-related enhancements to enable inter-cell multi-TRP operations, assuming multi-DCI based multi-PDSCH reception    3. ... |

Intel’s proposal is essentially Alt2 of Futurewei’s proposal. Since some companies voiced their preference on Alt1 in RAN1#102-e, Futurewei’s proposal seems to be a good starting point for discussion. In addition, whether the current WID on item 2b should be refined (and, if needed, how) is to be decided.

1. Summary and moderator proposals

[Observation]

...

**Proposed way forward**: Revise the WID for Rel.17 NR\_FeMIMO as follows:

* Add two additional supporters per their requests as indicated in RP-201470
* [...]

1. Compilation of companies’ inputs

During the initial round, interested companies are encouraged to share their view on the following issue brought up by Intel and Futurewei:

|  |
| --- |
| 3 “factors” that require consideration for inter-cell mTRP:   * Factor A: Propagation delay difference is at least similar to that of Rel-16; in addition, * Factor B: Synchronization offset between multiple cells; an   + Note that inter-cell synchronization accuracy is up to 3us (TDD only) per RAN4 requirement * Factor C: Backhaul between the cells can be non-ideal with certain amount of delay (due to non-ideal cell-phase synchronization)   + This requires separate uplink transmissions to multiple TRPs of different cells   On item 2b of the NR\_FeMIMO WID, consider and choose between the two alternatives:   * Alt. 1: Only consider factor A, same as in the case of intra-cell   + The applicable scenarios will be very limited: very tightly synchronized cells with very fast backhaul and small cell sizes. * Alt. 2: Consider all factors A, B, and C   + Applicable to more practical scenarios |

Table 1 Inputs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | We are supportive of “Add two additional supporters per their requests as indicated in RP-201470”  However, we are not supportive of relaxing the inter-cell MTRP timing difference to exceed 1 CP.  In RP-193186, it is explicitly captured that    Relaxing the timing difference to be more than 1 CP will require UE to use two FFT window to process two TRP transmission. Similar discussion has been carried out in V2X as well and prohibited there. We also discussed this with our RAN4 team, similar discussion is also carried out for the DAPS hand over in which there is no UE requirement for multiple FFT window. Even though the MRTD can be up to 6 us for DAPS, it is only the performance lower bound. For NW who cares about the UE performance, NW should strive to reduce the MRTD to be within CP.  Furthermore, as captured in RP-193186, multiple bullets were removed due to the compromise needed for the WID approval and to fulfill the down scoping request from the plenary Chair. Every single bullet has its own justification. If we ever want to discuss to extend the WID scope at this stage, we think it is fairer to reconsider all the past proposals instead of restricting to only a single proposal. |
| Qualcomm | It is a bit unclear why the above items are called ‘Factors’. Factor A, for example, is a particular solution, it is not a factor for consideration. So we might misunderstand some details of what is being proposed.  We acknowledge that limiting the timing differences to very small values limits the applicable scenarios. However, we believe that this was discussed before.  In our view, adding the larger timing offset scenario should only be considered if it doesn’t result in up-scoping of the WID.  From the DL baseband perspective, adding larger timing offsets would not seem a significant up-scoping; however, when FR1 is considered where the TRPs are received with the same antenna/RF, then additional RF aspects, such as AGC setting, etc. would need to be also considered.  Perhaps as a compromise, a limited FR2-only scenario could be further considered, where the signals from the two TRPs are received by the UE with two different antenna panels. We note that in the case of FR2, larger timing offsets are already considered for L1/L2-centric mobility, where the UE is expected to switch between cells with the larger timing offset between them. |
| Nokia | We are supportive of Alt 2 above, i.e. consider all factors A, B, and C listed above and ensure that Rel-17 mTRP is applicable to more practical scenarios. While the discussion document cited by Apple above was the understanding at that point of time, it is also true that overall understanding of the limitations in Rel-16 solution has evolved since then, and hence it is timely to update the WID to clarify that these scenarios are in scope of the Rel-17 WID, thus ensuring that the applicability of Rel-17 mTRP is not restricted by Rel-16 assumptions. Having said that we agree with Qualcomm above that the impact of such clarification should not result in significant up-scoping of the WID. |
| ZTE | We agree that we should avoid up-scoping of the FeMIMO WI at current stage. This is the most critical factor for assessment as we have many other items to be completed.  We have similar understanding that the non-synchronized issue has been discussed during drafting process of the WID. The current WID clearly indicates item 2b should focus on QCL/TCI enhancements based on M-DCI framework, where the existing M-DCI framework in Rel-16 is established assuming timing difference <= 1 CP.  In our view, to include DL aspects of larger timing difference will lead to significant up-scoping. UE needs separate IFFT windows for reception of two PDSCHs. If UE only has single IFFT operation, it is hard to implement such inter-cell MTRP to receive two PDSCHs at a time. How the current M-TRP structure works especially when two PDSCHs overlap in time and frequency domain is not clear.  Regarding QC’s suggestion to focus on FR2 multi-panel UEs, if timing difference issue for such UEs is anyway to be discussed and addressed in item 1 for L1/L2-centric mobility, there is no need to update the current scope of item 2b.  So our suggestion is to keep item 2b as it is now, or to clarify it assumes timing difference <= 1 CP for multiple TRPs. |
| Intel | 1. We agree with Nokia and Qualcomm that the scenarios with larger timing offset should be considered in Rel-17 MIMO WID. As explained in [RP-201839.zip](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_89e/Docs/RP-201839.zip) such scenarios have high practical importance and are already considered in other WIs such as Rel-16 DAPS. It is very hard to image deployment of inter-cell multi-TRP feature allowing only very small timing differences at the UE, resulting into 3x, 6x, 24x tighter requirement for the NW (at SCS 15 kHz, 30 kHz and 120 kHz respectively) than existing TDD synchronization requirement.  2. Though we don’t think the proposed clarification in Alt. 2 is up-scoping of WID, we are OK with Qualcomm proposal to consider the corresponding scenarios for FR2 only with multi-panel UEs, where the synchronization restriction would be more limiting.  3. We also have comment on Factor A in Alt 2. In our understanding there is no justification to inherit Rel-16 restrictions (originating from intra-cell multi-TRP) in Rel-17 work focusing on inter-cell multi-TRP operation. We think some further clarifications on Factor A in Alt. 2 may be needed.  In summary, we are supportive of Alt 2, with some clarifications/modifications to Factor A and possible restrictions of the scenarios to FR2 only. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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|  |  |
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