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# Introduction

In RAN #89 e-meeting, a new Rel-17 WID of “RF requirements enhancement for NR frequency range 1 (FR1)” [1] was approved and was revised in RAN #91 e-meeting [2], including following objectives.

* Specify UE requirements to enable Tx switching between different cases across carriers based on SUL and NR inter-band uplink CA for UE supporting maximum two concurrent transmissions
	+ Specify UE requirements to enable Tx switching between cases
		- The scenarios include
			* For Tx switching based on SUL band combination, or uplink CA band combination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Tx chains in WID (carrier 1 + carrier 2)** |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T |

* + - * For Tx switching based on uplink CA band combination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Number of Tx chains in WID (carrier 1 + carrier 2)** |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T |

* + - Specify the following RAN4 requirements for above scenarios
			* Length of switching period
			* Time mask RF requirements
			* Uplink interruption and downlink interruption (RRM) requirements, if needed
		- Minimize the impacts on RAN1
			* Update RAN1 uplink switching for carrier aggregation and supplementary uplink
		- Minimize the impacts on RAN2
			* Update the RRC signaling to indicate the switching period location and length
			* Update the UE capabilities
	+ Specify UE requirements to enable Tx switching between cases, where 1 carrier on band A and 2 contiguous aggregated carriers on band B, and band A is for SUL or non-SUL and band B is a non-SUL band
		- The scenarios include
			* For Tx switching based on SUL band combination, or uplink CA band combination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)** |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T |

and

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)** |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T |

* + - * For Tx switching based on uplink CA band combination

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | **Number of Tx chains in WID (band A + band B)** |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T |

* + - Specify the following RAN4 requirements for above scenarios
			* Length of switching period
			* Time mask RF requirements
			* Uplink interruption and downlink interruption (RRM) requirements, if needed
		- Minimize the impacts on RAN1
			* Update RAN1 uplink switching for carrier aggregation and supplementary uplink
		- Minimize the impacts on RAN2
			* Update the RRC signaling to indicate the switching period location and length
			* Update the UE capabilities

Note 1: Only addressing the case of co-located and synchronized network deployment for the two UL carriers.

Note 2: Only addressing the case of single TAG for the two UL carriers for SUL and for UL CA.

Note 3: The UE is configured with two different uplink carrier frequencies.

This contribution is a summary of the following email discussion:

[106-e-NR-R17-TxSwitching-01] Email discussion on RAN1 Aspects for RF requirements for NR frequency range 1 (FR1) – Jianchi (China Telecom)

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 25
* 3rd check point: August 27

# Email discussion (1st round)

## 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers

#### 2.1.1 Determination of the state of Tx chains for UL CA option 2

In RAN1 #105e, it was discussed how to handle the case that the state of Tx chains after Tx switching may not be unique for UL CA option 2 and the following agreement was achieved.

**Agreement:**

* For a UE configured with 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers and configured with UL CA Option 2, if the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, a rule to determine the state of Tx chains after Tx switching is to be specified.
	+ FFS: The state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g. the carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.

R1-2106500 proposed: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g. the one carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false. R1-2106729, R1-2107122, R1-2107211 proposed if the state of Tx chains after Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed. R1-2107970 proposed if the state of Tx chains after Tx switching is not unique, 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed. R1-2107308 mentioned several options to handle this issue, and prefer that if the state of Tx chains after Tx switching is not unique, 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed.

1. Prioritize one carrier in the sense that allow at least one Tx chain on that carrier and two Tx chains when possible
	* One example is to prioritize Pcell or Spcell which would be configured with UCI and other important channels.
2. Prioritize one switching case
	* One example is to prioritize Case 1 which is more balanced for both carriers.
3. Define rules with pre-conditions
	* One example is to define per channel rules
		1. if the scheduling on target cell is PUSCH, it prefers Case 3 -> Case 2 with 0P+1P, and Case 2 -> Case 3 with 1P+0P
		2. if the scheduling on target cell is PRACH/PUCCH, it prefers Case 3 -> Case 1, and Case 2 -> Case 1, as single port should be sufficient for those channels and the rest port could be on another carrier for future Tx.

Based on companies’ contributions, following proposal is proposed:

**Proposal 1: Down select one of the following options:**

* **Option 1: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g. the one carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.**
	+ Support: Huawei, HiSilicon
* **Option 2: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed.**
	+ Support: ZTE, China Telecom, OPPO
* **Option 3: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed.**
	+ Support: Qualcomm, vivo

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with Option 2. |
| ZTE | We support Option2. For Option1, RAN1 may need to further discuss the definition of “most important uplink carrier”, which is time consuming since different companies may have different understandings on this issue, especially considering the different band combinations. Regarding the carrier with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation configured as false, it may also be the important carrier. For example. FDD+TDD CA, the TDD carrier is configured uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation as false, but this doesn’t mean FDD carrier is less important. The reason is mainly because that TDD carrier has less UL symbols.Between Option2 and Option3, Option2 allows UE to transmit both 1-port and 2-port transmission without unnecessary UL Tx switching, which can improve the overall system performance. Thus, Option2 is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option 1. Compared to Option 2, Option 1 can have more flexibility, but without requiring a new RRC parameter.@ZTE, it is not time consuming bug only reuse the existing RRC parameter. According to current spec, the carrier configured with RRC *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* as false is more important than the other carrier because its transmission is kept in case of overlapping with any transmission on the other carrier. Your example seems self-contradict because a gNB would not configure the TDD carrier as true to drop any overlapping transmission while the gNB regards the TDD carrier is more important. Compared to Option 3, Option 1 can use 2Tx to guarantee performance.  |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 3.For Option 1, we don’t agree with the intention. Our understanding is the UL switching period is configured typically with the carrier with more UL slots, which doesn’t mean the carrier is less important. Take for example the case of a FDD carrier (CC1) + a TDD carrier (CC2), CC1 could be configured with switching period because CC2 has fewer UL slots. Meanwhile, CC1 is with better chance to be the PCell due to the better propagation performance. In this example, CC1 is more important as it carries PUCCH and other important UL transmission.Among Option 2 and 3, we prefer Option 3 as this is more balance for both carriers as it provides equal transmission opportunity when switching ambiguity occurs.  |

#### 2.1.2 TP for UL CA option 1

**FL comments: Regarding the TP corresponding to the agreed switching mechanism for 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers for UL CA option 1. The latest proposal in RAN1 #105e is as follows:**

**Proposal 2: Adopt the following TP to TS 38.214 in principle.**

* **Note: whether new UE capability *“BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-R17”* will be introduced is up to RAN2.**
* **FFS potential new RRC parameters.**

|  |
| --- |
| **<Unchanged parts are omitted – 38.214>****6.1.6.2 Uplink switching for carrier aggregation**For a UE indicating a capability for uplink switching with *BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch* [or *BandCombination-UplinkTxSwitch-R17*] for a band combination, and if it is for that band combination configured with uplink carrier aggregation:- If the UE is configured with uplink switching with parameter *uplinkTxSwitching*, when the UE is to transmit in the uplink based on DCI(s) received before or based on a higher layer configuration(s):- When the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission is a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission is a 2-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers. - For the UE configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL', when the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.- When the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 2-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.- For the UE configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'dualUL', when the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on the same uplink carrier and the UE is under the operation state in which 2-port transmission cannot be supported in the same uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.**<Unchanged parts are omitted – 38.214>** |

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal |
| ZTE | There are still some issues not clear from our perspective.The above TP assumes that Rel-16 and Rel-17 UL Tx switching share the same RRC configuration parameter *uplinkTxSwitchingOption*, which hasn’t been explicitly discussed yet. We prefer to explicitly discuss this issue or add a tentative RRC parameter in the TP for now.Also, the newly added bullet in the above TP is only for Rel-17 UL Tx switching, but not for Rel-16. We prefer to make this clear.Thus, the following is proposed from our perspective.- For the UE configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL' or configured with *[RRC\_R17\_CA Option1\_2carrier]*, when the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.- For the UE configured with *[RRC\_R17\_CA Option1\_2carrier] or [RRC\_R17\_CA Option2\_2carrier]*, when the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 2-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of on any of the two carriers.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. But don’t see any need to introduce new RRC parameter at this stage because in the proposed TP the same UE behaviour is associated with both existing RRC parameter and the proposed new RRC parameter. |
| Qualcomm | From RAN1#105-emeeting, there were some debates on RRC IEs including whether to have a new RRC parameter like “uplinkTxSwitchingOption-R17". Repeating our views in RAN1 105-emeeting, we propose to make all technical agreements first and try to translate them to TPs later. Meanwhile, we think at least specification should clearly say this 2 Tx – 2 Tx switching is Rel-17 capability. |
| FL | Based on companies’ comments, let’s discuss the TP later. |

#### 2.1.3 TP for UL CA option 2 (on hold)

R1-2106729 proposed TP for UL CA option 2.

**FL comments: It is still under discussion how to handle the case if the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique for UL CA option 2. This sub-section is tentatively on hold.**

## Uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B

In RAN1 #104b-e, the following conclusion was reached.

**Conclusion:**

* For uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B,
	+ If the state of Tx chains is 1Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B, 1Tx is available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.
	+ If the state of Tx chains is 0Tx on Band A and 2Tx on Band B, 2Tx are available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.

In RAN1 #105e, the basic principle for uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B was discussed. The latest proposal was as follows:

* For inter-band UL-CA and SUL, for Rel-17 1Tx-2Tx/2Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the contiguous uplink carriers on band B should be considered as a single uplink carrier for the purpose of UL Tx switching, i.e.
	+ FFS: with respect to the determination of uplink switching triggering, the presence of transmission occasion on any one uplink carrier on Band B is equivalent to the presence of transmission occasion on any other uplink carrier(s) on Band B.
	+ FFS: no uplink switching is triggered if the presence of transmission occasion is on one uplink carrier on Band B and the preceding uplink transmission occasion is on other uplink carrier(s) on Band B.
	+ FFS: In evaluating the antenna ports for determination of UL Tx switching, the larger ports number among the scheduling for CC2 and CC3 on band B is used.

In this meeting, R1-2106500, R1-2107308 continued to propose the basic mechanism. R1-2106729, R1-2106925, R1-2107122, R1-2107211, R1-2107388, R1-2107970 proposed the detailed switching mechanism for SUL, UL CA option 1 and option 2. R1-2106500, R1-2106729 provided TPs.

**FL comments: Considering the situation of the discussion in RAN1 #105e and it seems the majority support to discuss the detailed switching mechanism, suggest to discuss the detailed switching mechanism in this meeting. The corresponding TPs can be discussed later.**

**Proposal 3:**

* **For SUL and UL CA option 1, if 1Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching or 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured, the switching period is only applicable when the UL transmissions are switched between band A and band B.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal |
| ZTE | Ok with the above proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer to reuse the existing specified/updated mechanism. But we are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |

**Proposal 4:**

* **For inter-band UL CA, if 1Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured is configured:**
* **For option 2 of mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain**
	+ **The switching period is only applicable in the following cases:**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on band A and 1Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on band B.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 0 Tx on band A and 2Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port transmission on the carrier on band A.**
	+ **For other cases, the state of Tx chains of last UL transmission is assumed.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal |
| ZTE | Ok with the above proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |

**Proposal 5:**

* **For inter-band UL CA, if 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured:**
* **For option 2 of mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain**
	+ **The switching period is only applicable in the following cases:**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on band A and 1Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on the carrier on band A or at least one carrier on band B.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 0Tx on band A and 2Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on the carrier on band A.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on band A and 0Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on band B.**
	+ **For other cases, the state of Tx chains of last UL transmission is assumed.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with FL’s proposal.However, we’d like to note that the current way of progressing this topic is a bit inefficient. We could just make a simple agreement saying the following:“When a carrier is configured with both intra-band carrier aggregation and UL Tx switching then for the purposes of UL switching state determination for that carrier, the maximum number of ports used for uplink transmission on any carrier in the same band is considered to be occurring on the carrier.”Based on the above, the 38.214 editor can have a CR with the necessary changes. Instead of doing this, we keep coming up with separate agreements in multiple meetings, all saying the same.  |
| FL | @Qualcomm, we tried to discuss the basic principle in RAN1 #105e, but it seems companies have different understandings and it is difficult to achieve consensus. With the detailed switching mechanisms and agreements, from FL understanding, editor can still make only necessary changes. |

## Operation with downgraded MIMO setting and/or CA setting

R1-2106500 proposed that if UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with one carrier on Band B as a downgraded UL Tx switching and had the following proposal.

**Proposal 6: Confirm the following,**

* **If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with one carrier on Band B as a downgraded UL Tx switching.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal |
| ZTE | First of all, our first preference is still to discuss this issue under UE feature discussion.If majority companies prefer to discuss it now, then we have the following detailed comments.The main bullet is not clear. We are not sure why we use “confirm” here and what’s to be confirmed.We propose to update the proposal as following.***Proposal:*** *If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with UL Tx switching with one carrier on Band B ~~as a downgraded UL Tx switching~~.* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal.@ZTE, it is to confirm the legacy understanding on CA procedure. It is not proposing anything new. If the FL proposal is not acceptable, do you mean a new CA procedure or restriction of gNB configuration for this case is needed? For example, these three carriers must be configured and activated by a gNB at the same time? Rather than allowing to activate them one by one? |
| Qualcomm | This proposal was discussed in RAN1 #105-emeeting. We still don’t understand why we need to discuss this even though we are in the early discussion of R17 UL Tx switching. We don’t even have the agreement on some basic behavior for the 3CC case - e.g. the triggering mechanism, how to evaluate the Tx ports for UL CA, etc.Before we can clearly understand the Rel-17 UL Tx switching specification structure, we can’t agree or disagree this proposal.We propose to postpone this discussion until we have clear understanding on how Rel-17 UL Tx switching is structured.We think that the fallback cases can be covered with explicit UE capability report. But anyway, this becomes clearer once the Rel-16 vs Rel-17 capability reporting is agreed at the end of the release. |

R1-2106500 proposed the number of ports of configured SRS resources on an uplink completely determines the maximum Tx chain required on the uplink, which can also easily differentiate 2Tx-2Tx from 1Tx-2Tx, and had the following proposal.

**Proposal 7:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources is used to determine the operation mode, i.e. either 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**
* **2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for both uplinks configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **1Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 1 for any one uplink configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode**
	+ **Note: If the switching time capability value for 1Tx-2Tx switching mode is not reported by the UE, the value reported for 2Tx-2Tx switching mode is applied.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We propose to introduce a RRC parameter to explicitly differentiate 1Tx-2Tx vs 2Tx-2Tx switching mode if necessary. The above proposal 7 may not work in the following two cases1) if non-codebook bases transmission is configured, number of SRS ports cannot determine whether it is 1Tx or 2Tx since each SRS is always 1 port. Two 1-port SRS resources are used for two ports PUSCH transmission. 2) if different maximum number of ports are configured for the two carriers on Band B. For example, 2-ports is configured on carrier1 and carrier3, while only 1 port is configured on carrier2. Besides, UE may need to check all the SRS configurations for all the carriers. An explicit RRC signalling can avoid such cross-carrier checking. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal.Since Rel-15, for a carrier that a UE is capable of 2Tx transmission, a gNB is allowed to configure 1-port transmission on the carrier for the UE. This principle gives the gNB freedom to work out the best service strategy for the UE. The same principle is applied to UL Tx switching also.@ZTE Thank you for your comments. Regarding your last comment, in the FL proposal, it is already RRC parameters for a UE to check, which the UE shall check through always. Regarding your second comment, it has been resolved by the FL proposal by the “maximum number” of antenna ports. Regarding your first comment, we feel any non-codebook based PUSCH transmission is considered as two port transmission and there is no different understanding within this group. Therefore, the proposal can be refined simply with one additional subbullet, **Proposal 7-rev:** * **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources is used to determine the operation mode, i.e. either 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**
* **2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for both uplinks configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **1Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 1 for any one uplink configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode**
	+ **Note: If the switching time capability value for 1Tx-2Tx switching mode is not reported by the UE, the value reported for 2Tx-2Tx switching mode is applied.**
* **If any of the above SRS resources is configured with usage “noncodebook”, then 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resource during the determination of operation mode.**
 |
| Qualcomm | We support the views expressed by ZTE. |

## 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2

**This issue was intensively discussed in Rel-16. Many compromised proposals were discussed but unfortunately no consensus was reached. In RAN1 #104b-e, RAN1 #105-e, RAN1 #106-e, some companies raised this issue in Rel-17 again. Based on the discussion in RAN1 #105-e, we can focus on the following two alternatives.**

**Alt 1: supported by ZTE, Qualcomm**

* **For UL CA option 2, DCI format 0\_1 can be used to schedule a UL transmission on carrier 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports and state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2.**
	+ **It’s up to implementation how DCI format 0\_1 to be used.**

**Alt 2: supported by Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, OPPO**

* **1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 is not considered for Rel-17 Tx switching.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We prefer to Alt.2 because it is out of scope in R17 WID. |
| ZTE | In Rel-17 UL Tx switching, all carriers can support 1-port and 2-port UL transmission. In case the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2, if nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2, only fallback DCI can be used to schedule 1-port PUSCH transmission, which is too restrictive. For this issue, Alt.1 is to allow DCI format 0\_1 to schedule 1-port PUSCH in this case. We are also open to other solutions as long as it can reduce the restriction mentioned above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt. 2 is the only option. It is not new proposal and too much time has been wasted on introducing the new MIMO scheme since Rel-16 discussions. |
| Qualcomm | We support the views expressed by ZTE. |

## Back-to-back switching with SRS switching

R1-2107308 mentioned that in Rel-16 UL Tx switching, UE is restricted to support one switch per one slot. However, the switching location could be anywhere inside the slot. For example, if the switch is triggered by SRS transmission, the switching location could be in the middle or even later part of the slot. Therefore, if there is an expected switch on the SRS transmission carrier, there would be two switches in 14 consecutive symbols even these two switches still belong to two slots. Now, when we consider SRS carrier switching and if the UL Tx switching is triggered by SRS carrier switching which means there would be 4 switches (2 for SRS and 2 for UL Tx switch) in 14 consecutive symbols! From UE implementation perspective, we definitely want to avoid this case as too many symbols are costed as switch gap.
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**Proposal 8:**

* **When SRS carrier switching is configured, a maximum of 3 switches (2 for SRS and 1 for UL Tx switching) are supported in 14 consecutive symbols corresponding to the SCS of SRS.**
	+ **Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We think the proponent to clarify it for Rel-17 WID in RAN plenary because we can’t find out any objective of Rel17 WID related to this proposal. This proposal is related to SRS carrier switching together with UL Tx switching in Rel-16 and first of all it is better to discussion about it in Rel-16 AI.In our understanding, gNB can schedule UE for SRS transmission based on UE capability on SRS-*SwitchingTimeNR*. So as shown in the above figure, UE can execute SRS transmission on CC2and CC3 and then go back to CC1. So the motivation isn’t clear to us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If a succeeding uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence, the UE can directly switch to the carrier of the succeeding uplink transmission to avoid unnecessary frequent Tx switching. Thus we can still meet the requirements of R16 without introducing additional restriction on the number of switching.More details and proposal can be found in R1-2106501. |
| Qualcomm | We are supportive |
|  |  |

## CA based SRS carrier switching

**FL comments: This issue is discussed in AI 7.2.12.**

# Email discussion (2nd round)

## 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers

**Proposal 1: Down select one of the following options:**

* **Option 1: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g. the one carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.**
	+ Support: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Have concerns: ZTE, Qualcomm
* **Option 2: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed.**
	+ Support: ZTE, China Telecom, OPPO, CATT
* **Option 3: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed.**
	+ Support: Qualcomm, vivo

**FL comments: Companies’ views are summarized for proposal 1 above. Concerns on option 1 are raised. Considering the majority support option 2, FL suggests to take option 2 as an agreement.**

**Revised Proposal 1:**

* **For a UE configured with UL CA Option 2 and with 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers, if the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed.**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above revised proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We support revised proposal 1. |
| OPPO | support |
| CMCC | Support the revised proposal 1. It articulates the purpose of enhancing the UL throughput by enjoying 2Tx transmission as much as possible. |
| ZTE | We support the Revised Proposal 1 above.@Huawei, it seems that somehow we have some typos in our previous example. The correct example is as below.Regarding the carrier with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation configured as false, it may NOT necessary be the important carrier. For example. FDD+TDD CA, the TDD carrier is configured uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation as false, but this doesn’t mean TDD carrier is more important than FDD carrier. Which carrier is more important is typically decided by operator, not decided by the parameter uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation. Coupling the default state with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation is not necessary from our perspective. |
| Qualcomm | We are more in favour of option 3 over option 2 due to following reason. Option 2 provides higher priority of 2Tx on single carrier even if only one port is scheduled on that carrier. However, this means that there would no Tx on Pcell even when only 1 Tx is required at Scell. This prevents transmitting PUCCH as the next transmission in the same slot, which results in a loss of important control information.  |
| vivo | Agree with QC that the impact to Pcell transmission should be taken into account. And Option 3 is better from this perspective.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @ZTE, it is typically decided by operator with configuring the parameter uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation. May we ask why not let operators have such configuration flexibility for the default state?To address ZTE and QC’s concern, our proposal can be revised to avoid any future discussion on which is important carrier.* **Option 1 -rev: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on ~~the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g.~~ the ~~one~~ carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.**

The RRC parameter uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation was introduced to determine a UE state of Tx chain for overlapping transmissions. The idea is to reuse existing parameter to provide flexibility and minimize the cost of switching gap when the assumed state does not sustain the succeeding transmission..Regarding Option 2, which carrier is assumed by the sentence “**the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed**”? Does it mean the carrier that the latest transmission is on? Suggest to clarify it a bit. |

## Uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B

**FL comments: Proposal 3/4/5 are stable. Please refrain from any further comments.**

**Proposal 3:**

* **For SUL and UL CA option 1, if 1Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching or 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured, the switching period is only applicable when the UL transmissions are switched between band A and band B.**

**Proposal 4:**

* **For inter-band UL CA, if 1Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured is configured:**
* **For option 2 of mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain**
	+ **The switching period is only applicable in the following cases:**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on band A and 1Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on band B.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 0 Tx on band A and 2Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port transmission on the carrier on band A.**
	+ **For other cases, the state of Tx chains of last UL transmission is assumed.**

**Proposal 5:**

* **For inter-band UL CA, if 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between 1 carrier on band A and 2 carriers on band B is configured:**
* **For option 2 of mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain**
	+ **The switching period is only applicable in the following cases:**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on band A and 1Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on the carrier on band A or at least one carrier on band B.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 0Tx on band A and 2Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on the carrier on band A.**
		- **If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on band A and 0Tx on band B, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on at least one carrier on band B.**
	+ **For other cases, the state of Tx chains of last UL transmission is assumed.**

## Operation with downgraded MIMO setting and/or CA setting

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide further comments on proposal 6.**

**Proposal 6: Confirm the following,**

* **If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with one carrier on Band B as a downgraded UL Tx switching.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with this proposal. |
| OPPO | We agree the principle. However, our first preference is to postpone this until the solution for R17 UL Tx swtihign is clear so that we can double check whether there is any inconsistency or not for the downgraded case. Having said that, we can live with it if majority companies support it  |
| CMCC | May we clarify, in what sense that this is “downgraded”? Is it because UE could have been using 2Tx for both carriers in Band B but only uses 1 carrier in reality?  |
| ZTE | We are not ok with the current wording.We are ok if companies prefer to defer the discussion. If companies really prefer to discuss and agree the proposal in this meeting, we will propose our previous version in the 1st round of discussion. Copy it below again.@Huawei, if the intention is to confirm the legacy UE behaviour, we even don’t need to have such an agreement. In addition, the definition of “**downgraded UL Tx switching**” is not clear, we propose to delete this term. Anyway, deleting this term would not cause any confusion.***Proposal:*** *If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with UL Tx switching with one carrier on Band B ~~as a downgraded UL Tx switching~~.* |
| Qualcomm | Seems our comments are ignored. We don’t understand why shall we spend so much time on a UE capability related discussion which should be parts of the discussion when we have clear understanding on Rel-17 capability Vs Rel-16. Without this information, we can’t agree with this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to delete “as a downgraded UL Tx switching”.@Qualcomm, As commented before, we don’t feel it is an UE capability issue because if some UE does not support this, then it would not either support the legacy CA SCell addition/release procedure. For example, a UE has been operated with 2 ULs on Band B and one UL on Band A, then the UE receives a SCell activation command to deactivate the SCell carrier on Band B, the UE should response to it by operating in the way as the FL proposal. If the proposal is incorrect in some company’s view, we are afraid that we have to begin a discussion on new CA procedure as soon as possible other than postponing it till the last meeting of the WI. |

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide further comments on proposal 7-v2.**

**Proposal 7-v2:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources is used to determine the operation mode, i.e. either 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**
* **2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for both uplinks configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **1Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 1 for any one uplink configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode**
	+ **Note: If the switching time capability value for 1Tx-2Tx switching mode is not reported by the UE, the value reported for 2Tx-2Tx switching mode is applied.**
* **If any of the above SRS resources is configured with usage “noncodebook”, then 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resource during the determination of operation mode.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 7 |
| ZTE | Our comments in the 1st round still holds.1. @Huawei, regarding your previous comment “Regarding your last comment, in the FL proposal, it is already RRC parameters for a UE to check, which the UE shall check through always”, which RRC parameters are you referring to?2. Regarding “maximum number is 2 for both uplinks”, it is not clear whether “uplink” here refers to “uplink carrier” or “uplink band”.3. Defining such a complicated rule in the spec to determine whether it is 1Tx-2Tx or 2Tx-2Tx is not worthwhile. RAN1 can simply introduce a new RRC parameter to indicate the switching mode. 4. If a new RRC parameter is introduced, network and UE can directly determine whether the SRS for “noncodebook” should be 1Tx or 2Tx. However, by following the proposal above, network and UE has to consider the SRS for “noncodebook” as 2Tx.For example, Carrier 1 (non-codebook) + Carrier 2 (2-port UL transmission supported), if a RRC parameter is introduced in Carrier 1 to indicate 1Tx-2Tx or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode, network and UE can have the same understanding whether 1Tx or 2Tx should be applied for PUSCH transmission on Carrier 1. However, by following the above proposal, network and UE has to consider it as 2Tx is applied for PUSCH transmission on Carrier 1. The current spec supports non-codebook based 1Tx PUSCH transmission with configuration of one single port SRS resource but the above proposal seems to preclude such operation. It’s also confusing to say 2 antenna ports are counted in this case even 1-port SRS is configured. We don’t see any benefit of defining such complicated rule. We only see possible confusion and ambiguity on the understandings from gNB and UE sides on the operation mode. So we have concern on above proposal.Overall, we propose the following much simpler and clearer proposal.**Proposal 7-v2:** **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, a new RRC parameter is used to indicate 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.** |
| Qualcomm | No, we are not fine with current proposal.A new RRC IE suggested by ZTE would be the most efficient way for the further specification efforts. Therefore, we support ZTE’s proposal to define an explicit RRC signalling to indicate 1Tx-2Tx and 2Tx-2Tx switching. |
| Huawei, HiSiclion | @ZTE, 1) In Rel-16, a gNB has been able to configure a UE with 1Tx+1Tx switching by the existing RRC parameters, we prefer to reuse the same parameters and mechanism. The same parameters include ***uplinkTxSwitching*** and those RRC parameters of UL MIMO on a carrier. For example, if no 2-port SRS resource nor coherent codebook is RRC configured to a UE on a carrier, then it is 1Tx on the carrier. 2) uplink is surely uplink carrier according to current RAN1 spec. 3&4) Since the UE behaviour is the same and corresponds to the existing RRC parameters, if a new RRC parameter is introduced, then it may end up with conflicting RRC parameters, for example, 2Tx-2Tx are configured to the UE by existing MIMO parameter, but the new RRC parameter indicates 1Tx-2Tx mode. |

## 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2

**FL comments: This issue has been discussed for a long time since Rel-16. FL suggests to make the following conclusion.**

**Conclusion:**

* **No consensus on specified solutions can be reached to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 for Rel-17 Tx switching in RAN1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We support making this conclusion on 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 |
| OPPO | * DCI format 0\_1 can support 1-port transmission if the associated SRS is of single port. Thus, we suggest to use “further enhancement”
* We also don’t further enhance the transmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_2

Thus, some changes are suggested as below* **No consensus on ~~specified solutions~~ further enhancement can be reached to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 for UL CA option 2 for Rel-17 Tx switching in RAN1.**
 |
| ZTE | Prefer not to have any conclusion for now. If companies still have different views on this issue, we can defer the discussion. |
| Qualcomm | No. DCI format 0\_1 Rank 1 transmission maybe performed with one port. In case 1, the UE is able to transmit with one port. Therefore, this combination needs to be supported. It can be supported without additional specification change |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Considering it is a proposal that companies disagreed on since Rel-16, the conclusion is necessary. |

## Back-to-back switching with SRS switching

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide further comments on proposal 8 in R1-2107308 and proposal 9 in R1-2106501.**

**Proposal 8:**

* **When SRS carrier switching is configured, a maximum of 3 switches (2 for SRS and 1 for UL Tx switching) are supported in 14 consecutive symbols corresponding to the SCS of SRS.**
	+ **Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

**Proposal 9:**

**For a UE configured with UL Tx switching on two uplinks and configured with SRS carrier switching for a third uplink, if a uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence and the time interval between the first symbol of the uplink transmission and the last symbol of SRS transmission is less than or equal to an interval of 13 symbols plus the RF retuning time required by SRS carrier switching, then the last symbol of PDCCH scheduling the uplink transmission should be no later than at symbol L, where the time interval between symbol L and the first symbol of SRS transmission is larger than symbols plus the RF retuning time.**

* **In case of different SCS between the uplink transmission and the SRS transmission, the 13 symbols are with respect to the smaller SCS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | In principal, we are fine with proposal 9. We suggest firstly focusing on transmission interval rule on TX switching +SRS carrier switching. So we would like to modify proposal 9 as below:**For a UE configured with UL Tx switching on two uplinks and configured with SRS carrier switching for a third uplink, if a uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence and the time interval between the first symbol of the uplink transmission and the last symbol of SRS transmission is no less than or equal to an interval of 13 symbols plus the RF retuning time required by SRS carrier switching~~, then the last symbol of PDCCH scheduling the uplink transmission should be no later than at symbol L, where the time interval between symbol L and the first symbol of SRS transmission is larger than symbols plus the RF retuning time.~~****In case of different SCS between the uplink transmission and the SRS transmission, the 13 symbols are with respect to the smaller SCS.** |
| ZTE | We have concern on the last proposal i.e. Proposal 3 in R1-2106501. More clarification about the last proposal is needed.1. In this case, UE doesn’t need to switch back the source carrier of SRS carrier switching. And UE can directly switch to the carrier with succeeding UL transmission. Is this the correct understanding?2. It may require UE to combine the SRS carrier switching and UL Tx switching into one switching, not sure whether UE vendors have any concern on this or do we need to check this aspect with RAN4?3. This proposal may unnecessarily put restrictions for the PUSCH scheduling when in fact, the additional timeline requirement is not necessary. Take the following figure as an example. If the UE is firstly in case 2 (2Tx @ CC 2), UE first switches to CC 3 to transmit SRS and switches back to CC2 and then switch to CC1 to transmit PUSCH1. Since there are only 3 switching here, there is no need to add any additional timeline requirement for this UE in this case.4. Is this proposal is only for Rel-17 or is this also for Rel-16? If it is only for Rel-17, we need to differentiate UE behaviours between Rel-16 and Rel-17. This makes things complicated. If it is also applicable to Rel-16, it introduces possible NBC issue since it is very likely that early Rel-16 UEs do not assume such switching behaviour. |
| Qualcomm | Good to know companies are willing to discuss how to solve this issue after denying this issue for couples of meetings.We support proposal 8.Furthermore, we are confused with FL’s proposal 9. In Huawei’s 1st round clarification “*If a succeeding uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence, the UE can directly switch to the carrier of the succeeding uplink transmission to avoid unnecessary frequent Tx switching. Thus we can still meet the requirements of R16 without introducing additional restriction on the number of switching.*” Our understanding is it defines a new behaviour and even impacts current SRS carrier switching. We have following questions to the proponents: 1. UE capability: UE is assumed to have the following capability: a) SRS carrier switching between CC2 and CC3, and b) UL Tx switching between CC1 and CC2. Now it seems UE needs support an additional c) UL Tx switching capability between CC1 and CC3. To support proposal 9, UE seems need to support and report capability c) and related parameters (e.g. switching time, switching options and, etc.). 2. In case that UE is capable of direct switching from CC3 to CC1, the feasible switching time from CC3 to CC1 also needs to be studied.Based on above consideration, we don’t see a benefit to introduce the new behaviour.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As commented before, this discussion should focus on R16 other than R17. We prefer to discuss it in R16 session.@CATT, The “then” sub-clause seems missing in your modified proposal. We are not sure if we fully understand your proposal. It may means a gNB scheduling restriction that any 14 symbols after a SRS carrier switching occurrence cannot be scheduled. If it is the case, then UL throughput loss is much higher than our proposal.@ZTE 1) yes, relief UE burden from too frequent RF retunings but also allow a gNB to schedule the succeeding slot so that no UL throughput loss for network operation, the cost is the DCI should be received by the UE earlier. 2) With the help of earlier arrival of scheduling DCI, if a UE prefer to implement two switchings/RF retunings in this case, then it is still up to UE to do it. But it provides the availability to avoid frequent RF retunings. 3) The targeted issue is frequent RF retuning, especially the the two back-to-back switchings. 4) The proposal should be for R16.@Qualcomm, 0) We prefer not to regard it as an overhead issue but an issue of frequent RF retuning/switching. Thank you for confirming that we are addressing the same issue. 1) Without the proposal, according to current spec, a UE has support of a switching between CC1 and CC3 as long as the UE reports supports of both UL Tx switching and SRS carrier switching. Therefore, we don’t feel new UE capability is caused by the proposal. If a UE did not support the switching between CC1 and CC3, then the network performance loss would be large and unaffordable to enable both features, making the features much less valuable. If it is the case, it is no difference from the case where the UE does not report both features together. 2) Without the proposal, the current switching time from CC3 to CC1 in your example is the sum of two reported switching gaps. The switching time can be kept as it is, i.e. the sum of two reported switching gaps. It is a simple solution without UE reporting anything new.  |

# Email discussion (3rd round)

## 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers

**FL comments: I suggest to take proposal 1 as an agreement in this meeting and make down selection in next meeting. In addition, companies are encouraged to provide further analysis for each option in next meeting.**

**@Huawei, regarding the question “which carrier is assumed” for option 2, in my understanding, there is no ambiguity. There are two cases that the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique.**

* **Case 1: The current state of Tx chains is 0T+2T and the next UL transmission is 1-port transmission on carrier 1, the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching can be 2T+0T or 1T+1T. For option 2, the carrier supporting 2Tx transmission must be carrier 1.**
* **Case 2: The current state of Tx chains is 2T+0T and the next UL transmission is 1-port transmission on carrier 2, the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching can be 0T+2T or 1T+1T. For option 2, the carrier supporting 2Tx transmission must be carrier 2.**

**Proposal 1: Down select one of the following options in RAN1#106b-e:**

* **Option 1: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.**
	+ Support: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Have concerns: ZTE, Qualcomm
* **Option 2: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on one carrier is assumed.**
	+ Support: ZTE, China Telecom, OPPO, CATT, CMCC
* **Option 3: If the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed.**
	+ Support: Qualcomm, vivo

**Note: companies are encouraged to provide further analysis for each option in RAN1 #106b-e.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We support revised proposal 1. |
| Qualcomm | We think both Option 2 and 3 are workable, but we are more in favour of option 3 over option 2 for the reasons mentioned before, namely better compatibility with PUCCH transmissions. In particular, we find Option 2 somewhat incompatible with the feature of PUCCH carrier switching because it can result in a state switch for every successive PUCCH transmission when there is no PUSCH.  |
| ZTE | First of all, we still question about the feasibility of Option1. For example, Carrier1 is configured with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation as **true**, if UE is under Case 2 (0T+2T) currently and UE is going to transmit 1P UL transmission in Carrier1 (1P+0P), according to Option1, UE switches to the state with “**the most of Tx chains** on the carrier with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation configured as false” (0T+2T), which is clearly not correct. We still don’t see the necessity of coupling configuration of uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation and default state.Technically speaking, both Option2 and Option3 can work and both of them have both pros and cons. However, considering that Option2 is supported by majority companies and supported by Operators, Network vendors and UE vendors, it is reasonable to go with Option2 for progress. This issue has been discussed for several meetings and companies’ argument hasn’t been changed. We propose to agree Option2 directly. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Suggest that the “one carrier” in Option2 is clarified as the carrier where 1-port transmission is on. @ZTE, the proposal of option 1 means “the most of” possible Tx chains on the carrier configured with “false”, i.e. in your example, it is 1T+1T rather than 0T+2T, it can be clarified and refined as below,In our understanding, Option 1 provides a configurability between Option 2 and Option 3. Could companies who are OK with either Option 2 or Option 3 clarify a bit the reason not to have such configurability?**Proposal**:***Option 1****: For UL-CA Option2, if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then* * *the state of Tx chains supporting 1Tx transmission is assumed on the carrier if the carrier is configured with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation as true*
* *the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission is assumed on the carrier if the carrier is configured with uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation as false*

***Option 2****: For UL-CA Option2, if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on the carrier is assumed.****Option 3****: For UL-CA Option2, if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then the state of Tx chains supporting 1Tx transmission on the carrier is assumed.* |
| CMCC | Can we simplify 3 options as following:* Option 1: 2Tx on configured carrier (uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation = False)
* Option 2: 2Tx on "1 port" carrier
* Option 3: 1Tx on "1 port" carrier

Maybe the question is about: when 1p + 0p is configured for now, how much the chance it becomes 2p + 0p next, and how much the chance it becomes 1p+1p next. If it is very likely to get 2p + 0p transmission immediately after, then going option 2 is better. And vice versa.Option 1 is comparable to option 2 and option 1 is configurable. If having a “2Tx ready” state (option 1 and 2) is better off, then we can make decision between option 1 and 2.  |

## Operation with downgraded MIMO setting and/or CA setting

**FL comments: Based on the comments, proposal 6 is revised as follows.**

**Proposal 6:**

* **If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with UL Tx switching with one carrier on Band B.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT |  We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Based on Huawei’s clarification at 2nd round, the “downgraded” setting is simply the Rel-16 operation. The UE indicates whether it supports Rel-16 UL Tx switching. If it does so, it can be configured with Rel-16 operation. Doesn’t seem any agreement is needed for this. We think the intent is to discuss a capability pre-requisite relationship, i.e. whether Rel-16 UL Tx switching should be pre-requisite for Rel-17 UL Tx switching. We do not think there needs to be any pre-requisite but in any case, this should be discussed together with UE features at the end of the release. |
| ZTE | We are ok with either Proposal 6 or Qualcomm’s suggestion. |
| Qualcomm | Given RAN1 would start UE capability discussion soon. We suggest discussing this together with other UE capabilities. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @Qualcomm, could you provide your response to our previous comment on the issue of CA procedure? How does the existing CA procedure works without this proposal? Would you prefer to introduce new CA procedure at the last minute of the WI? Let us try to resolve your concern by the following revised proposal, which proposal do you prefer?***Proposal 6-rev:*** *No new procedure of CA SCell configuration/de-configuration nor CA SCell activation/deactivation is introduced for supporting UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B.* |

**FL comments: Regarding determination of 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode, some companies propose to indicate 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode via a new RRC parameter. Then we have two option 1 to down select. Companies are encourage to further discuss these two options.**

**Proposal 7-v3: Down select one of the following options**

**Option 1:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources is used to determine the operation mode, i.e. either 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**
* **2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for both uplinks configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **1Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 1 for any one uplink configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode**
	+ **Note: If the switching time capability value for 1Tx-2Tx switching mode is not reported by the UE, the value reported for 2Tx-2Tx switching mode is applied.**
* **If any of the above SRS resources is configured with usage “noncodebook”, then 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resource during the determination of operation mode.**

**Option 2:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, a new RRC parameter is used to indicate 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We support Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 2 as it provides a clean and clear way to serve the purpose. |
| ZTE | We support Option2.It seems that some of our previous comments in last round of discussion are not addressed and they are still hold. We copied it below.Meanwhile, based on HW’s previous comments, “uplink” means uplink carrier, then the above Opton1 is only applicable to 2-carrier case and not applicable to 3-carrier case.------------4. If a new RRC parameter is introduced, network and UE can directly determine whether the SRS for “noncodebook” should be 1Tx or 2Tx. However, by following the proposal above, network and UE has to consider the SRS for “noncodebook” as 2Tx.For example, Carrier 1 (non-codebook) + Carrier 2 (2-port UL transmission supported), if a RRC parameter is introduced in Carrier 1 to indicate 1Tx-2Tx or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode, network and UE can have the same understanding whether 1Tx or 2Tx should be applied for PUSCH transmission on Carrier 1. However, by following the above proposal, network and UE has to consider it as 2Tx is applied for PUSCH transmission on Carrier 1. The current spec supports non-codebook based 1Tx PUSCH transmission with configuration of one single port SRS resource but the above proposal seems to preclude such operation. It’s also confusing to say 2 antenna ports are counted in this case even 1-port SRS is configured. We don’t see any benefit of defining such complicated rule. We only see possible confusion and ambiguity on the understandings from gNB and UE sides on the operation mode. So we have concern on above proposal.----------- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Option1. Fine with FL proposal.@ZTE, we don’t feel a feature of non-codebook UL MIMO is supported in Rel-15/16 with a restriction of 1Tx only. If any, it is appreciate that you could provide the corresponding spec text. Therefore, we don’t feel a UE should support a new RRC configuration 1Tx on a carrier and a configuration of non-codebook UL MIMO on the same carrier. We don’t feel Option 1 is limited to 2-carrier case only, because based on the previous conclusion, 1Tx-2Tx mode covers also the case of 1Tx Band A- 2Tx on Band B.***Conclusion:**** *For uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B,*
	+ *If the state of Tx chains is 1Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B, 1Tx is available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.*
	+ *If the state of Tx chains is 0Tx on Band A and 2Tx on Band B, 2Tx are available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.*

To address your concern, a refinement to Option-1 is “- 2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for ~~both~~ all uplinks configured with uplinkTxSwitching” |

## 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2

**FL comments: Can we take the following as a conclusion?**

**Conclusion:**

* **No additional RAN1 specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on carrier 2 and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 for Rel-17 Tx switching.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the conclusion as long as the combination is supported. |
| ZTE | Is the intention of the above conclusion to support the following* **For UL CA option 2, DCI format 0\_1 can be used to schedule a UL transmission on carrier 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports and state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2.**
	+ **It’s up to implementation how DCI format 0\_1 to be used.**

If not, then we would prefer not having any conclusion for now. We can deprioritize the discussion until most of functionalities of UL Tx switching is finalized and see if we can further convince companies. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer not to further discuss this issue. We cannot agree any “deprioritize” for this because it is out of scope of the WI.The subclause “when” in the proposal is very vague, it can be simplified. We are fine with the FL proposal if the following modification can be accepted.**Conclusion-rev**:**No additional RAN1 specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 ~~when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on carrier 2 and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 for Rel-17 Tx switching~~.** |
| ZTE2 | After some further checking, we can accept the current conclusion from FL. Since the intention of this conclusion is to say, “It’s up to implementation how DCI format 0\_1 to be used” in such case, it would be clearer if we can add the previous bullet in the following conclusion.**Conclusion:*** **No additional RAN1 specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on carrier 2 and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 for Rel-17 Tx switching.**
	+ **It’s up to implementation how DCI format 0\_1 to be used**

@Huawei, the revised proposal provided by you seems not correct. For Carrier 1 + Carrier 2 of 1Tx-2Tx switching, network can of course use DCI format 0\_1 in Carrier1. But you proposal seems to preclude such case. |

## Back-to-back switching with SRS switching

**FL comments: Suggest to continue discussion on the following two proposals.**

**Proposal 8:**

* **When SRS carrier switching is configured, a maximum of 3 switches (2 for SRS and 1 for UL Tx switching) are supported in 14 consecutive symbols corresponding to the SCS of SRS.**
	+ **Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

**Proposal 9:**

**For a UE configured with UL Tx switching on two uplinks and configured with SRS carrier switching for a third uplink, if a uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence and the time interval between the first symbol of the uplink transmission and the last symbol of SRS transmission is less than or equal to an interval of 13 symbols plus the RF retuning time required by SRS carrier switching, then the last symbol of PDCCH scheduling the uplink transmission should be no later than at symbol L, where the time interval between symbol L and the first symbol of SRS transmission is larger than symbols plus the RF retuning time.**

* **In case of different SCS between the uplink transmission and the SRS transmission, the 13 symbols are with respect to the smaller SCS.**

**Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We can’t support proposal 8 because this will increase limitation of gNB scheduling.For proposal9, we understand intention of proposal 9 and for timeline, current N2 has 2 processing time for PUSCH timing capability and for cap1, 10 symbols can be used for PUSCH preparation time. So we slight prefer keeping current PUSCH preparation timeline to meet multiple TX switching and SRS carrier switching case. Of course, we can open to discuss about whether further relaxing PUSCH preparation timeline if critical issue is found. |
| Qualcomm | In response to Huawei’s 2nd round comment: “*a UE has support of a switching between CC1 and CC3 as long as the UE reports supports of both UL Tx switching and SRS carrier switching.*”, we think it misses the point altogether. The point is that the switching time capability is indicated for a given pair of cells and it is not transitive. If the UE indicated it needs a certain gap duration to switch between a pair of cells for a particular purpose, it cannot be assumed that the UE needs the same gap duration to switch between a different pair of cells or for a different purpose. Given UL Tx switching and SRS carrier switching are two separate feature, we can’t agree “*Therefore, we don’t feel new UE capability is caused by the proposal.*” As a result, we don’t know how Proposal 9 would work without a new capability on UL Tx switching between CC3 and CC1. Furthermore, even in case UE can report the switching capability between CC3 and CC1, we don’t see sufficient justification to change the current default UE behaviour, which is RF retuning to source carrier after SRS transmission on target carrier.  |
| ZTE | Regarding our previous comment 3 (copied below for convenience), HW’s previous response is “3) The targeted issue is frequent RF retuning, especially the two back-to-back switchings.”, could UE vendors or chip sets vendor clarify this issue and share your views to our comment 3 below.---------------Previous comments------------3. This proposal may unnecessarily put restrictions for the PUSCH scheduling when in fact, the additional timeline requirement is not necessary. Take the following figure as an example. If the UE is firstly in case 2 (2Tx @ CC 2), UE first switches to CC 3 to transmit SRS and switches back to CC2 and then switch to CC1 to transmit PUSCH1. Since there are only 3 switching here, there is no need to add any additional timeline requirement for this UE in this case. |
| Qualcomm | In response to ZTE, the above illustrative figure (3 switches in 14 consecutive symbols) is already supported in Rel-16. Our proposal is for a more frequent switching case in the figure below (also cited by FL in 1st round discussion, where 4 switches in 14 consecutive symbols. ULDLDLTx SwitchCC1ULCC2DLDLCC3RF tuningUL4 switches within 14 consecutive symbolsSRSRF tuningSRSTx switch |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal.@Qualcomm, regarding the new UE capability, could you provide an example for the capability? It seems to indicate the gap between a switching from CC3 to CC1 in the figure you provided above. For the gap, we feel it is the sum of two gaps, so new capability is not needed. With this size of gap, it is up to UE implementation to have two steps of switchings. Do you need any different value of gap for it? |

# Email discussion (4th round)

## 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers

**FL comments: From FL understanding, the state of Tx chains supporting 1Tx transmission may include two cases, 2Tx or 1Tx. For UE capable of 2Tx, whether using 2Tx or 1Tx for 1-port transmission is up to UE implementation. Hence proposal 1 is revised as follows.**

**Proposal 1: Down select one of the following options in RAN1#106b-e:**

* **Option 1:** For UL-CA Option2, if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then
	+ 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed if the carrier is configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* as true.
	+ the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission is assumed on the carrier if the carrier is configured with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* as false.
* **Option 2:** For UL-CA Option2,
* if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then the state of Tx chains supporting 2Tx transmission on the carrier is assumed.
* **Option 3:** For UL-CA Option2, if UL Tx switching is triggered for 1-port transmission on a carrier and the state of Tx chains after the UL Tx switching is not unique, then 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 is assumed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 1. |
| ZTE | As we commented several times, the necessity of bounding uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation and default state is not clear. If companies prefer to have some configuration flexibility, a new RRC parameter is more appropriate. However, there is a clear majority (7 companies) to prefer no configurability i.e. Option2 or Option3. It has been similar situation since previous meetings. We believe sufficient discussion have been provided to explain why Option1 is not appropriate.We feel that it is not appropriate to drag on the discussion since we have discussed this issue for several meetings. The proponent of Option1 keep updating Option1 and generating new versions for Option1. This already reflected that Option1 is not stable. We don’t see how the proponent of Option1 can change the situation next meeting. To make progress, we would suggest to simply agree on Option 2 or at least to remove the least popular option i.e. Option 1.  |
| OPPO | Ok to down select the option in the next meeting |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The updates to Option 1 was motivated to address company’s concerns but its essence has never been changed, i.e. providing sufficient flexibility to the network operation. Our question has never been answered, i.e. why is such flexibility at almost no cost not necessary.We also provided constructive revisions to Option 2 and Option 3, and they are accepted. A logic seems unfamiliar to us that companies are not encouraged to revise their own proposals in order to address other companies’ comments. If Option 1 is not stable according to ZTE’s logic, then none of them are stable. We’d appreciated it if one option would be selected out this meeting, but it is clearly not good to preclude the flexibility on top of Option 2 and Option 3 if companies still don’t know which one is better than the other because which is better can be left to network operation by Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We support option 3, while we think both option 2 and 3 are workable.In response to Huawei and CMCC’s “Option 1 provides a configurability between Option 2 and Option 3”. We have no intention to revisit the agreements, but we want to remind that “a new RRC IE to indicate the target switching case” was precluded in RAN1 #105. Meanwhile, as we commented above, the UL switching period is configured typically with the carrier with more UL slots, which doesn’t mean the carrier is less important. Take for example the case of a FDD carrier (CC1) + a TDD carrier (CC2), CC1 could be configured with switching period because CC2 has fewer UL slots. Meanwhile, CC1 is with better chance to be the PCell due to the better propagation performance. In this example, CC1 is more important as it carries PUCCH and other important UL transmission. As a result, Option 1 which replies on “*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation*” to decide the target switching case is not workable.In response to CMCC’s “which case is with larger possibility for next slot”. We don’t think there is a mathematic way to predict this as current spec forces UE to per slot check the potential switching order. However, we want to point out Option 3 would guarantee 1 Tx chain for PUCCH which is namely with better compatibility with PUCCH transmissions. |

## Operation with downgraded MIMO setting and/or CA setting

**FL comments: It seems majority are fine with proposal 6. Any further comments?**

**Proposal 6:**

* **If UE support UL Tx switching with two contiguous carriers on Band B, the UE can be configured and operated with UL Tx switching with one carrier on Band B.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 6. |
| ZTE | We don’t have a strong view on this. But if companies still can’t converge, we would suggest to discuss it in next meeting as anyway UE feature discussion will start in next meeting.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.If any company is not fine with it, please also share your view on our revised proposal in the previous round. |
| Qualcomm | With Huawei’s response (Proposal 6-rev) in 3rd round, we are even more confused. As we comment in 3rd round, the above proposal 6 seems is on the UE capability whether Rel-16 UL Tx switching should be pre-requisite for Rel-17 UL Tx switching.Seems Proposal6-rev is with larger scope – including both add and delete a cell on band B. Maybe Huawei can clarify, which switching capability is the baseline – a) 1 carrier per band, b) 1 carrier on band A and 2 contiguous carriers on band B. For any case, we think this should be one part of the UE capability discussion in the near future meetings. |

**FL comments: Can we agree proposal 7-v4 in this meeting and make down selection in next meeting?**

**Proposal 7-v4: Down select one of the following options**

**Option 1:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, the maximum number of antenna ports among all configured P-SRS/A-SRS and activated SP-SRS resources is used to determine the operation mode, i.e. either 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**
* **2Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 2 for ~~both~~ all uplinks configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **1Tx-2Tx switching mode: when the maximum number is 1 for any one uplink configured with *uplinkTxSwitching***
* **the switching gap duration for a triggered uplink switching is equal to the switching time capability value reported for the switching mode**
	+ **Note: If the switching time capability value for 1Tx-2Tx switching mode is not reported by the UE, the value reported for 2Tx-2Tx switching mode is applied.**
* **If any of the above SRS resources is configured with usage “noncodebook”, then 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resource during the determination of operation mode.**

**Option 2:**

* **For a UE configured with UL Tx switching via *uplinkTxSwitching*, a new RRC parameter is used to indicate 1Tx-2Tx switching mode or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT/CATT2 | We support proposal 7-v4 and making the decision in the next meeting.Regarding last sub-bullet of Option1, because only one SRS port for each SRS resource is configured and the number of antenna ports are related to the number of SRS resources, it isn’t reasonable that 2 antenna ports for the SRS resource are always assumed. So we would like to modify the description of last sub-bullet:If any of the above SRS resources is configured with usage “noncodebook”, then the max number of 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resources during the determination of operation mode.* + FFS how to determine the number of antenna ports for SRS resources
 |
| ZTE | It is clear that 1-port non-codebook based UL transmission is allowed in the spec and the spec does not preclude mapping 1Tx to 1-port. If the proponent of Option1 thinks more than 1Tx has to be mapped to 1-port for non-codebook based UL transmission in the spec, please clarify exactly where such restriction can be found in the spec. Again, we are not convinced that we need to define such complicated rule in Option1 to determine whether it is 1Tx-2Tx or 2Tx-2Tx switching mode. We have concerns that such rule would still leave ambiguity between network and UE to have the common understanding on counting the number of antenna ports as we explained earlier. In addition, the number of antenna ports sometimes depends on RRC configuration and sometimes depend on MAC-CE activation (e.g. activated SP-SRS resource). Also, we need to clarify whether configured SRS resources in inactive BWPs/cell should be counted as well. In any case, it is too complicated to require UE and network to sync up counting in different protocol layers. We would suggest to stop the discussion for Option1 and go for Option 2 for simplicity already in this meeting if there is no strong reason to support such complicated rule in Option 1. |
| OPPO | Ok to down select one of them in the next meeting. One comments for the red part of option 1: if the SRS resource for non-codebook only includes 1 single-port SRS resource, then it should be counted as 1 port, rather than 2 ports. Thus we propose to modify it as below* **If any of the above SRS resources is in an SRS resource set configured with usage “noncodebook” and this set is with 2 SRS resources, then 2 antenna ports are counted for the SRS resource during the determination of operation mode.**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal. Thanks CATT for the revision, which is also OK for us.@ZTE, In our understanding, it is up to UE to determine the state of Tx chains (either any 1Tx or 2Tx) for transmitting a non-codebook transmission. The wording has been proposed as “counted as” and **only for** “during the determination of operation mode”, which does not preclude any UE implementation with respect to 1Tx or 2Tx. If any, it is appreciated if you could point out the exact words that causes such confusion.@OPPO, we feel we are on the same page but only different on how to wording out the proposal. Since the UE is allowed to take either one or two Tx chains to transmit non-codebook transmissions, then a gNB should consider the worse case, i.e. two Tx chains when it prepares a sufficient gap according to the 2Tx operation mode. Please note that the counting of maximum number of antenna ports has no impact on the effective non-codebook operation, but only on the determination of operation mode which is used to determine the proper gap that a UE needs. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 2 as a new RRC IE suggested by ZTE would be the most efficient way for the further specification efforts. With all the respect, I want to ask proponents of Option 1 is there any drawback or critical issue to introduce a new RRC IE? If not, why can’t we agree on Option 2 now? |

## 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2

**FL comments: After offline discussion, the proposed conclusion is updated as follows. Really hope companies can be constructive.**

**Conclusion:**

* **For Rel-17 Tx switching between two uplink carriers, ~~No~~ no additional ~~RAN1~~ specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on carrier 1 or carrier 2 and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2 ~~for Rel-17 Tx switching~~.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| ZTE | **We are ok with the conclusion** with the understanding that we will need to further discuss the same issue for the 3-carrier case since the existing conclusion is only for 2-carrier case.If companies agree to add 3-carrier case in this meeting, we are also ok. Then the conclusion can be like the following.**Conclusion:*** **For Rel-17 Tx switching between Band A and Band B, no additional specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on Band B and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B.**
 |
| OPPO | Not support. After further thinking, this conclusion is quite misleading. The conclusion seems to indicate that when *nrofSRS-Ports* is configured as 2 antenna ports on carrier 1 or carrier 2 and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2, DCI format 0\_1 can schedule 1-port transmission. In our understanding, this type of scheduling is not supported in this case. Therefore, we suggest the following modified conclusion based on ZTE’s version:**Conclusion:*** **For Rel-17 Tx switching between Band A and Band B, no additional specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 ~~when nrofSRS-Ports is configured as 2 antenna ports on Band B and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B~~.**

If it cannot be accepted by other companies, we prefer no conclusion and no discussion on this issue in further meetings |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is unfortunate that companies still have different understanding on it. With the FL proposal, we don’t understand why a new proposal specific to 3-carrier case is needed at the last minute. In this situation, a conclusion of no further discussion is the only choice on the table. |
| Qualcomm  | We share the same view as ZTE.* We are fine with current proposal for 2-carrier switching, and we can agree this for now as the baseline for 3-carrier switching
* We are also fine to move one further step to approve 3-carrier conclusion. For ZTE’s proposed conclusion for 3-carrier switching, we made a slight revision as nrofSRS-Ports is per carrier configuration.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion:*** **For Rel-17 Tx switching between Band A and Band B, no additional specification impact to support 1-port transmission via DCI format 0\_1 for UL CA option 2 when maximum nrofSRS-Ports of the carriers on Band B is configured as 2 antenna ports  and the state of Tx chains is 1 Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B.**
 |

 |

## Back-to-back switching with SRS switching

**FL comments: It seems still quite controversial. Suggest to continue discussion on the following two proposals.**

**Proposal 8:**

* **When SRS carrier switching is configured, a maximum of 3 switches (2 for SRS and 1 for UL Tx switching) are supported in 14 consecutive symbols corresponding to the SCS of SRS.**
	+ **Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

**Proposal 9:**

**For a UE configured with UL Tx switching on two uplinks and configured with SRS carrier switching for a third uplink, if a uplink transmission is scheduled after a SRS carrier switching occurrence and the time interval between the first symbol of the uplink transmission and the last symbol of SRS transmission is less than or equal to an interval of 13 symbols plus the RF retuning time required by SRS carrier switching, then the last symbol of PDCCH scheduling the uplink transmission should be no later than at symbol L, where the time interval between symbol L and the first symbol of SRS transmission is larger than symbols plus the RF retuning time.**

* **In case of different SCS between the uplink transmission and the SRS transmission, the 13 symbols are with respect to the smaller SCS.**

**Note: it is applicable to both Rel-16 UL Tx switching and Rel-17 UL Tx switching.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| CATT | We can’t still support proposal 8 due to potentially increasing limitation of gNB scheduling.For proposal9, we can live with this without any change on timeline of PDCCH scheduling. |
| ZTE | Based on companies’ discussion, it seems the burden is from too many switching within 14 consecutive symbols instead of 2 consecutive switching. Then, the following argument is still valid. Some clarification is needed.--------------------------3. This proposal may unnecessarily put restrictions for the PUSCH scheduling when in fact, the additional timeline requirement is not necessary. Take the following figure as an example. If the UE is firstly in case 2 (2Tx @ CC 2), UE first switches to CC 3 to transmit SRS and switches back to CC2 and then switch to CC1 to transmit PUSCH1. Since there are only 3 switching here, there is no need to add any additional timeline requirement for this UE in this case.--------------------------Also, if this is applied to Rel-16 UE, then a UE capability (incapability) will be needed for Rel-16 UE otherwise it will cause NBC issue. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have similar view on proposal 8 as CATT that it will cost big network performance loss.@ZTE, in your figure, there are four switchings, CC1 to CC2 for SRS, then CC2 to CC3 for SRS, then CC3 to CC2 then to CC1 for PUSCH. This case illustrated in the figure is precluded by proposal 8. We feel it is popular scheduling scheme in a network. Do you prefer to preclude it?. |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 8.For Option 9 our comments are still no resolved as seems new RCC IE on switching between CC3 and CC1 would be needed. In response to Huawei, seems you missed our comments again.The new required UE capability is switching capability (including switching gap) between CC3 and CC1 which is in our 2nd round comments. As the switching capability is per band pair and not transitive, UE needs to report switching capability (including switching gap) between CC3 and CC1 before BS could directly trigger the direct switching from CC3 to CC1. Even if UE is capable of switching between CC3 and CC1, and report the switching capability, the switching gap might be other values than sum of SRS retuning time and switching gap between CC2 and CC1.In response of Huawei’s comment “With this size of gap, it is up to UE implementation to have two steps of switchings”. If it’s still two step switching, we are confused as it conflicts the “direct switching” in the 1st round comment – “the UE can directly switch to the carrier of the succeeding uplink transmission to avoid unnecessary frequent Tx switching”.  |

# Agreements at RAN1#105-e

**Agreements:**

* For a UE configured with higher layer parameter *supplementaryUplink* and with 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers, the mechanism of uplink switching specified in S6.1.6.3 of TS 38.214 is reused.

**Agreements:**

* For a UE configured with UL CA Option 1 and with 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers, the mechanism of uplink switching specified in S6.1.6.2 of TS 38.214 is reused with the following add-on.
* When the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier and if the preceding uplink transmission is a 2-port transmission on another uplink carrier, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the two carriers.

**Agreements:**

* For inter-band UL CA, if 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers is configured:
* For option 2 of mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain
	+ The switching period is only applicable in the following cases:
		- If the current state of Tx chains is 1Tx on carrier 1 and 1Tx on carrier 2, the next UL transmission has a 2-port transmission on either carrier 1 or carrier 2.
		- If the current state of Tx chains is 0Tx on carrier 1 and 2Tx on carrier 2, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on carrier 1.
		- If the current state of Tx chains is 2Tx on carrier 1 and 0Tx on carrier 2, the next UL transmission has a 1-port or 2-port transmission on carrier 2.
	+ For other cases, the state of Tx chains of last UL transmission is assumed.
* Note: For SUL, UL CA option 1 and UL CA option 2, in RAN1 understanding, no spec change to power configuration and power control.

**Agreement:**

* For a UE configured with 2Tx-2Tx UL Tx switching between two uplink carriers and configured with UL CA Option 2, if the state of Tx chains after UL Tx switching is not unique, a rule to determine the state of Tx chains after Tx switching is to be specified.
	+ FFS: The state of Tx chains with the most of Tx chains on the most important uplink carrier is assumed, e.g. the carrier with *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriodLocation* configured as false.

# Agreements at RAN1#104b-e

**Agreements:**

* **For Rel-17 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for SUL and UL CA Option 1 is defined as follows.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (carrier 1 + carrier 2) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (carrier 1 + carrier 2) |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+2P, 0P+1P  |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T | 2P+0P, 1P+0P |

**Agreements:**

* **For Rel-17 2Tx-2Tx switching between two uplink carriers, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for UL CA Option 2 is defined as follows.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (carrier 1 + carrier 2) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (carrier 1 + carrier 2) |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T | 1P+0P, 1P+1P, 0P+1P |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+2P, 0P+1P  |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T | 2P+0P, 1P+0P |

**Conclusion:**

* For uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B,
	+ If the state of Tx chains is 1Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band B, 1Tx is available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.
	+ If the state of Tx chains is 0Tx on Band A and 2Tx on Band B, 2Tx are available simultaneously on both uplink carriers on band B for a UE.

**Agreement:**

* Send LS to RAN4 asking following question:
	+ Question: For UL Tx switching in a band pair of a band combination, whether or not the switching time reported by a UE for 2Tx-2Tx switching can be different from that reported by the UE for 1Tx-2Tx switching.

**Agreement:**

For Rel-17 1Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for SUL and UL CA Option 1 is defined as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (band A + band B) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (band A (carrier 1) + band B (carrier 2 + carrier 3)) |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T | 1P+(0P+0P) |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+(2P+0P), 0P+(0P+2P), 0P+(2P+2P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+2P), 0P+(2P+1P)  |

**Agreement:**

For Rel-17 2Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for SUL and UL CA Option 1 is defined as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (band A + band B) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (band A (carrier 1) + band B (carrier 2 + carrier 3)) |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+(2P+0P), 0P+(0P+2P), 0P+(2P+2P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+2P), 0P+(2P+1P) |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T | 2P+(0P+0P), 1P+(0P+0P) |

**Agreement:**

For Rel-17 1Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for UL CA Option 2 is defined as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (band A + band B) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (band A (carrier 1) + band B (carrier 2 + carrier 3)) |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T | 1P+(0P+0P), 1P+(1P+0P), 1P+(0P+1P), 1P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P)  |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+(2P+0P), 0P+(0P+2P), 0P+(2P+2P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+2P), 0P+(2P+1P)  |

**Agreement:**

For Rel-17 2Tx-2Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, the mapping between UL transmission ports and Tx chain for UL CA Option 2 is defined as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Number of **Tx chains** in WID (band A + band B) | Number of **antenna ports** for UL transmission (band A (carrier 1) + band B (carrier 2 + carrier 3)) |
| Case 1 | 1T+1T | 1P+(0P+0P), 1P+(1P+0P), 1P+(0P+1P), 1P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P)  |
| Case 2 | 0T+2T | 0P+(2P+0P), 0P+(0P+2P), 0P+(2P+2P), 0P+(1P+0P), 0P+(0P+1P), 0P+(1P+1P), 0P+(1P+2P), 0P+(2P+1P) |
| Case 3 | 2T+0T | 2P+(0P+0P), 1P+(0P+0P) |

**Conclusion:**

* For uplink Tx switching between 1 carrier on Band A and 2 contiguous carriers on Band B, whether Tx switching between 2Tx on Band A and 1Tx on Band A+1Tx on Band B for UL CA option 1 and SUL is included in WID could be clarified by RAN plenary or RAN4.
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