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# Introduction

In RAN#86 meeting the work item on enhanced MIMO support was agreed for Rel-17 [1]. The objectives of WID include enhancements to multi-TRP transmission scheme in HST-SFN scenario.

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Enhancement on the support for multi-TRP deployment, targeting both FR1 and FR2:  …  d. Enhancement to support HST-SFN deployment scenario:  i. Identify and specify solution(s) on QCL assumption for DMRS, e.g. multiple QCL assumptions for the same DMRS port(s), targeting DL-only transmission  ii. Evaluate and, if the benefit over Rel.16 HST enhancement baseline is demonstrated, specify QCL/QCL-like relation (including applicable type(s) and the associated requirement) between DL and UL signal by reusing the unified TCI framework |

The document contains summary of the company’s proposal and Moderator’s proposals.

# Possible enhancements for HST-SFN deployment

The section summarizes company proposals regarding enhancements that can be supported for HST-SFN deployment. The proposals are based on the contributions [2]-[21] submitted to RAN1#104-e meeting.

## Support of UE-based solution

## Issue #1-1 (Support of scheme 1)

Regarding support of scheme 1 in Rel-17 for HST-SFN deployment scenario. In RAN1#103-e meeting it was agreed to support two TCI states for the same DM-RS antenna ports. However, formal agreement on support of scheme 1 in Rel-17 is still missing. It is, therefore, proposed to have a conclusion on this issue.

**Issue#1-1:** Whether to support scheme 1

* Scheme 1 is supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by:** Futurewei, InterDigital, Huawei / HiSilicon, ZTE, LGE, Spreadtrum, Lenovo / Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSN, CMCC, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Docomo, …
* Scheme 1 is not supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by:** vivo?

Based on the company’s view, there is majority that prefers specification of scheme 1 and the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 1-1:**

* *Scheme 1 is supported in Rel-17*
  + *FFS other details*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the FL’s proposal |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| vivo | OK with the proposal.  As SFN PDCCH has been supported in AI 8.1.2.1, it generally needs two TCI states both associated with QCL-Type A. Considering the coordination of SFN PDCCH and SFN PDSCH, we are ok to support scheme 1, though the performance and UE complexity of scheme 1 are suboptimal compared with NW-based solution. |
| Docomo | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | Support FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | Propose to have offline agreement on Proposal 1-1 |
| CATT | Support |
| Lenovo/MotM | We are OK to support, however a proper definition of Scheme 1 (regarding TRS transmission) should be included in the agreement to avoid ambiguity in later meetings and/or when writing the spec |
| OPPO | Support |

## Issue #1-2 (QCL types/assumptions when TRS is source)

Regarding support of QCL types/assumptions when TRS is used as source RS in TCI state for scheme 1. Several companies expressed their preference regarding preferred QCL variant for scheme 1 identified in RAN1#103-e meeting. Summary of the company’s views is provided below:

**Issue#1-2:** For scheme 1, when the same DMRS port(s) are associated with two TCI states containing TRS as source reference signal, the following QCL is supported for Rel-17

* Variant E from RAN1#103-e meeting agreement
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, InterDigital, OPPO, ZTE, LGE, Spreadtrum, Lenovo / Motorola Mobility, Nokia / NSN, CMCC, Apple, Intel, Qualcomm, …

**Proposal 1-2:**

* *For scheme 1 and SFN transmission of PDCCH support Variant E for QCL assumption in TCI state when TRS is used as source RS*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support Variant E only for Scheme 1 variant with TRP-specific TRS transmission, i.e., non-SFN TRS transmission where TRP1 transmits TRS0 and TRP2 transmits TRS1 |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| Sony | For scheme 1 only (not combined with Doppler pre-compensation), we are supportive to Variant E. |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| Docomo | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal |
| Futurewei | Support. Suggest to add “at least Variant E” or “FFS other variants under different scenarios”. |
| QC | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | Propose to have offline agreement on Proposal 1-2 with slight revision in wording |
| CATT | Support |
| Lenovo/MotM | We are OK to support Variant E. However the TRS transmission scheme should be clarified (either in Proposal 1-1 or Proposal 1-2), e.g., copied from RAN1#102e chairman notes, as follows  **Proposal 1-2:**  *For scheme 1 and SFN transmission of PDCCH support Variant E for QCL assumption in TCI state when TRS is used as source RS*   * *Note: For scheme 1, TRS is transmitted in TRP-specific / non-SFN manner* |
| OPPO | Support |

## Issue #1-3 (Indication of scheme 1)

Regarding configuration of scheme 1. Several companies provided their preference regarding switching of scheme 1 with legacy schemes. Summary of the company’s preference is provided below:

**Issue#1-3:** How to support configuration / switching of Rel-17 scheme 1 with legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 schemes?

* **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based)
  + FFS which legacy schemes should support dynamic switching with scheme 1
  + **Supported by**: ZTE, Samsung, QC, …
* **Alt-2**: Semi-static (RRC-based)
  + **Supported by**: InterDigital, OPPO, NEC, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, CMCC, …

Companies are encouraged to provide their preference / views regarding the above alternatives.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Propose to add Alt-3,   * **Alt-3**: Using implicit mechanisms   + **Supported by**: InterDigital |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | More discussion is needed. The benefits on the both side should be clarified. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-2. RRC signaling should be used for switching between scheme 2a/2b/3 and Rel-17 HST-SFN, which are configured via single CDM group and two TCI states. For switching between Rel-17 HST-SFN and single TRP/scheme 1a, dynamic switching can be considered via configuration of TCI state(s) and CDM group(s) |
| ZTE | Have the same view with OPPO. One RRC signaling is needed to enable Rel-17 SFN scheme 1. Then, we can directly discuss issue #1-4. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Alt-2. We also believe this should be merged with Proposal 1-4 |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt-2. Share the same view with OPPO. |
| LG | We prefer Alt-1. This is because there can be various service types also in HST deployment as the same reason as supporting dynamic switching between eMBB and URLLC schemes in Rel-16 multi-TRP transmission. |
| NEC | Support Alt-2. |
| Sony | Support Alt-2. In our view, the DL transmission schemes should be semi-statically configured and changed. |
| Vivo | Support Alt-1: Dynamic.  But we suggest discussing this issue after determining the QCL assumption of NW-based solution, since the QCL assumption of NW-based solution is directly associated with how to design the indication of scheme 1 and NW-based solution with a unified design. |
| Docomo | Question to Alt. 1: If scheme1 is applied to PDCCH, what is the UE assumption to receive DCI? If the UE assumption to receive the DCI is based on the most recent DCI indication, how to handle the case if UE missed the DCI indication? |
| Apple | We support RRC based, Alt-2 |
| Nokia/NSB | It is related to how new QCL type is signaled.  If new QCL-type is configured as new TCI state, existing Rel-16 procedures can be applied to trigger Scheme 1. If new QCL-type is indicated by two TCI states via DCI/MAC-CE, new RRC parameter is necessary.  For UE’s preparation of receiving PDSCH/PDCCH with scheme 1, at least RRC configuration should provide the use of scheme 1.  But, switching itself can be supported by DCI/MAC-CE. In other words, support for each alternative can be discussed separately.  Thus, first the following shall be discussed before proposal 1-3/4.  **Proposal 1-x**. support one of alternatives to signal variant E QCL type   * Alt 1: new QCL-type is introduced in QCL-Info. * Alt 2: two TCI states are indicated in TCI codepoint via DCI/MAC-CE   FFS: how to distinguish from Rel-16 schemes |
| Futurewei | Alt-1, Alt-2, and Alt-3 proposed by InterDigital may all work. Their pros and cons will be more clear after the supported schemes are agreed. In our contribution, Table 1 summarizes a number of schemes and shows how they can be indicated / distinguished, but a good design depends on how many / which schemes are to be supported. So we suggest to revisit this proposal later. |
| QC | Both alternatives should be considered.   * Alt 2 (RRC): To differentiate between SFN scheme 1 and Rel-16 multi-TCI states TDM and FDM schemes. * Alt 1 (Dynamic): To enable dynamic adaptation between SFN scheme 1, Rel-16 SDM schemes and single TRP including Rel-15 pure SFN scheme. |
| Ericsson | The issue is unclear to us.    For Scheme 1, two TCI states need to be indicated in a DCI, which is different from single TRP transmission.   If only up to 4 layers are to be supported by Scheme 1, a single DMRS CDM group would be indicated, which is different from Rel-16 NC-JT. Thus, dynamic switching between Scheme 1 and single TRP or NC-JT is possible already.  However, DCI with two TCI states and a sing DMRS CDM group is also used for Rel-16 m-TRP FDM/TDM repetition schemes, thus dynamic switching between Rel-16 m-TRP FDM/TDM repetition schemes is no possible unless addition bit field is added.  There is no need to support both Scheme 1 and Rel-16 M-TRP schemes on our view.  Therefore, similar to Rel-16 FDM/TDM schemes, RRC configuration can be used to distinguish between Scheme 1 and the Rel-16 m-TRP schemes.    What we need to decide is whether Scheme 1 needs to be dynamically switched with one or more of the Rel-16 FDM/TDN mTRP schemes. Thus, we suggest to have a modified issue #1-3 and alternatives:    **Issue#1-3:**  Whether dynamic switching or RRC configuration between Rel-17Scheme 1 and Rel-16 m-TRP FDM/TDM schemes?   * **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) * **Alt-2**: Semi-static (RRC-based)     We suggest the following proposal:  **Proposal 1-3:  For switching between Scheme 1 and Rel-16 m-TRP FDM/TDM schemes, one of the alternatives is selected:**   * **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) * **Alt-2**: Semi-static (RRC-based) |
| Samsung | Support Alt1. |
| Moderator | Modified wording of Issue #1-3 and updated Proposal 1-3 based on the comments above. The detailed signalling / indication solution will be addressed in the next step. |

**Issue#1-3:** Whether to support switching of Rel-17 scheme 1 (for PDSCH only) with Rel-15/Rel-16 legacy schemes and the exact legacy scheme for switching?

* **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported
  + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1
    - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP
      * Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC
      * OPPO, ZTE, Lenovo/MotMobility, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm?, NEC, vivo, Ericsson, Intel, …
    - **Alt 1-4**: 1a/2a/2b/3/4/single-TRP
      * Futurewei, LG,…
    - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including restriction to have all DM-RS port in one CDM group, implicit indication, etc.
    - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16
* **Alt-2**: Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy schemes is not supported
  + FFS: Other details
  + **Supported by**: Sony, NEC, Apple?, …

**Updated Proposal 1-3:**

* **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported
  + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1
    - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP
      * Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC
    - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including restriction to have all DM-RS port in one CDM group, implicit indication, etc.
    - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| CATT | It should be clarified that the updated Proposal 1-3 applies to PDSCH only. The configuration and switching among enhanced PDCCH schemes should be discussed under A.I. 8.1.2.1. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal in principle.  Further, it is natural to have all DMRS ports in one CDM group for scheme 1. Thus, we think we can further agree the FFS part as follows  **Proposal 1-3:**   * **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH   + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1     - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP       * Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC     - all DM-RS ports in one CDM group.     - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16 |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1-3:**   * Only single DMRS CDM group is supported for HST-SFN transmission in Rel-17. * Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH   + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1     - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP       * Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC     - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including implicit indication, etc.     - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16 |
| vivo | Agree with ZTE and OPPO, support all DM-RS ports in one CDM group.  If the restriction that all DM-RS ports are in one CDM group is supported, we think the RRC indication for scheme 1 can be omitted. Since other legacy R16 MTRP schemes with one CDM group, i.e. scheme 2a/2b/3 already have RRC indication, it’s clear to differentiate scheme 1 from them. In other words, the one without RRC indication but with one CDM group and 2 TCI states is scheme 1.    Therefore, we prefer to modify the proposal as follows.  **Proposal 1-3:**   * Only single DMRS CDM group is supported for HST-SFN transmission in Rel-17. * Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH   + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1     - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP       * ~~Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC~~     - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including implicit indication, etc.   Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support in principle |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG | We prefer Alt1-4. But if majority wants Alt1-1, we are ok with Alt 1-1 for the progress.  Regarding RRC based switching with other legacy scheme(s), it can be further discussed after the decision about issue #2-1. This is because RRC parameter for switching between UE-based scheme and TRP-based scheme can be considered if TRP-based scheme is supported. |

**Updated Proposal 1-3:**

* Only single CDM group for DMRS is supported for scheme 1
* **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH
  + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1
    - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP
      * Note: Switching with other legacy scheme(s) is supported by RRC
    - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including implicit indication, switching with TRP-based precompensation scheme (if supported), etc.
    - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16

**Updated Proposal 1-3 after 1st GTW session:**

**Possible Working Assumption**

* At least dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH
  + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1
    - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP
    - FFS: Detailed signaling solution includingrestriction to have all DM-RS port in one CDM group, implicit indication, switching with TRP-based precompensation scheme (if supported), etc.
    - Note: Consideration on DCI overhead should be considered in the final design this feature
    - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16
  + This functionality is configured using RRC signaling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | Please provide your views at least for the following aspects raised during GTW:  1. Whether to also support option of semi-static (RRC-based) switching of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes, i.e. Alt 2. In this case, UE configured with scheme 1 could not be concurrently configured with other legacy schemes including single TRP.  2. Whether it should be clarified that for Alt 1-1 the switching with other legacy schemes, i.e., 2a/2b/3/4 are RRC-based.  3. Whether one CDM group restriction for DM-RS is agreeable for Alt 1-1 or requires further study. |
| QC | 1. Support semi-static configuration (RRC-based) for scheme 1. 2. Not needed if scheme 1 is RRC configured. 3. Futher study on restriction to have all DM-RS port in one CDM group   Regarding dynamic switching, we revise our position and don’t think that dynamic switching is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. We need to support Alt.1-1, i.e., DCI based switching, on the proposal. Whether additionally support RRC based switching can be discussed later.  2. Not needed, whether other legacy schemes can be dynamic switching with Shceme-1 may be discussed further.  3. Further study is needed, performance for CDM based DMRS ports in HST need to be further evaluated, while the orthogonality is not sure to be guaranteed.  4. The last sentence is ambiguilty, RRC=on then DCI based, RRC=off does it means RRC based switching or the switching of schemes is not available? Before clear definition, we’d better with FFS on the sentence. |
| ZTE | Support the update proposal without the last bullet ‘this functionality is configured using RRC signaling’ since it causes misunderstanding.   1. Not support additional RRC based switching 2. Better to clarify. But we are OK not to clarify 3. Must be within one CDM group |
| Lenovo/MotM | 1. Share similar views as QC regarding semi-static configuration of Scheme 1 with legacy schemes. Switching between Scheme 1 and pre-compensation scheme (if supported) is FFS  2. Not needed  3. Further study |
| Apple | 1. Support RRC semi-static (RRC-based) switching of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes 2. We do not suppro Alt1-1, but we can clarify at least switching to the other scheme is RRC based 3. Not agreeable   There is no need to dynamic (DCI based) switch between scheme 1a and HST-SFN. |
| Sony | Thanks to the questions from FL, our answers would be  1. Support semi-static (RRC-based) switching of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes  2. Additionally, if semi-static (RRC-based) switching between scheme 1 (Rel.17) and other legacy schemes (2a/2b/3/4 in Rel.16) are possible, we think there might be details to be clarified or at least discussed.  3. Assuming Alt 1-1 is supported, one CDM group restriction for DM-RS can be used to identify between scheme 1a (Rel.16) and scheme 1 (Rel.17), that seems a good solution. But what about dynamic switching between single TRP (Rel.15) and scheme 1 (Rel.17)? So perhaps further discussion or clarification is needed. |
| LG | 1. We think semi-static (RRC-based) switching of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes is too restrictive and will decrease scheduling flexibility. So, we do not support additional RRC based switching.  2. If dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 2a/2b/3/4 is not supported, RRC signaling for enabling of dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 1a/single-TRP, similar to enabling of dynamic switching between 2a/2b/3/4 and 1a/single-TRP in Rel-16, should be considered. If my understanding is correct, the main motivation for not supporting such RRC signaling is to use error case in Rel-16 , i.e., 2TCI states + 1CDM group without RRC cofiguration for 2a/2b/3/4, for indicating Rel-17 SFN. However, based on guidance from RAN2 (R1-2001513), it is better to avoid defining functionality that has no RRC configuration but is dependent on capability bits. So, we prefer to provide explicit signalling to enable dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 1a/single-TRP.  3. We are ok to study further. |
| Docomo | 1. Our interested scenario is switching between S-TRP (or transparent SFN) and Scheme 1, and once Scheme 1 is configured, we don’t see the benefit to swtich to S-TRP. Hence, RRC based switching is enough, and semi-static configuration should be added. 2. Good to clarify, but not necessary. 3. Prefer further study. |
| vivo | 1. Support the DCI-based switching, without a new RRC parameter for scheme 1.  2. No need to clarify. We are fine to support switching between scheme 2a/2b/3/4 (two TCI states+one CDM group+RRC parameter)and scheme 1(two TCI states+one CDM group[if restricted]) based on RRC, but it dosen’t mean the indication of scheme 1 needs a RRC parameter, such as ‘*sfnScheme*’. Without the RRC indication, semi-static switching between scheme 2a/2b/3/4 and scheme 1 can still work as follows:   * **Switching from scheme 1 to scheme 2a/2b/3/4:** Setup the ‘FDM-TDM-r16’ or ‘SlotBased-r16’ configuration in RepetitionSchemeConfig-r16 IE * **Switching from scheme 2a/2b/3/4 to scheme 1:** Release the ‘FDM-TDM-r16’ or ‘SlotBased-r16’ configuration in RepetitionSchemeConfig-r16 IE   3. Support one CDM group restriction for DM-RS. It would be hard to transmit more than two layers in a LOS channel. Besides, one CDM group is a general consensus for reliability in Rel-16. |
| OPPO | 1. *We think dynamic switching between scheme 1 and single TRP should naturally be supported*. If only one TCI state is indicated by DCI, it should be single TRP transmission even if scheme 1a is configured by RRC. gNB is not needed to always configure two TCI states in this case. For example, when UE is moved closely to one TRP, without any other TRP nearby, it is not reasonable to mandate gNB to configure TCI states.   *For dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 1a, considering companies are negative to restrict one CDM group, we think RRC configuration is fine.*   1. It would be fine to clarify this. 2. If dynamic switching between scheme 1 and scheme 1a is not supported, this restriction is not needed at all. |
| Samsung | 1. Support DCI based dynamic switching only.  2. The clarification would be helpful.  3. We prefer the way by using only one CDM group seems good to distinguish scheme 1 and 1a dynamically, but we are open to discuss more. |
| Nokia/NSB | 1. Support **the option of semi-static (RRC-based) switching** of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes.   Please note that this switching operation got a bit complicated in Rel-16 schemes and also in the spec texts, and adding further dynamic switching options should be carefully done if there is any need for that. Rel-16 discussion happened considering a table like this,   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | TCI states | CDM groups | URLLCRepNum | URLLCSchemeEnabler | UE Behavior | | 0 (in spec draft) | 1 | >=1 | Not applicable | Not applicable | Rel 15 | | A (one scheme) | 1 | 1 | Condition 1 | Configured or not configured | "Scheme 4" with repetition from the same TRP  Limitations agreed for Scheme 4 apply | | A’ (one scheme) | 1 | >=1 | Condition 2 | Not configured | Rel 15 | | B (in spec draft) | 2 | 1 | Condition 1 | Not configured | Scheme 4 | | C (in spec draft) | 2 | 2 | Condition 2 | Not configured | 1a/NCJT | | E (in spec draft) | 2 | 2 | Condition 4 | Not configured | 1a/NCJT | | F (in spec draft) | 2 | 1 | Condition 4 | Configured | Scheme 2a/2b/3 | | D’’ (one scheme) | 2 | 2 | Condition 4 | Configured | 1a/NCJT | | G’ (one scheme) | 1 | >=1 | Condition 2 | Configured | Rel 15 | | G (one scheme) | 1 | >=1 | Condition 4 | Configured | Rel 15 |   Note:   * Condition 1: indicates ~~at least~~ one entry in *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList* containing *URLLCRepNum* (>1) in *TDRA by DCI* * Condition 2: indicates one entry in *pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationList* having no *URLLCRepNum by DCI*, but at least one entry having URLLCRepNum * Condition 4: None of entry in TDRA contains *URLLCRepNum*  1. The switching with other legacy schemes, i.e., scheme 2a/2b/3/4 should be RRC-based. If the benefits are identified, switching between scheme 1a and a single TRP shall be further studied. Switching the PDSCH scheme can also be combined with the PDCCH scheme, because when scheme 1 is applied to PDCCH it is hard to assume why it is not applied to PDSCH. On the other hand, DCI may be sent as S-TRP DCI, and switching solutions can not relate to PDCCH. In another variant, PDCCH may follow SFN, but PDSCH could follow any other PDSCH scheme. We feel that RAN1 first needs to check each channel’s possibilities and relations.   3. CDM groups can be restricted, which may impact the possibilities of switching methods (refer to the table above). |
| Ericsson | 1. We support the SFN scheme 1 being RRC configured, dynamic swiching between SFNed scheme and single-TRP schme can be FFS. |
| InterDigital | We have one comment about the Working Assumption. To clarify the configuration aspects, I would like to propose the following,  **Possible Working Assumption**   * Besides RRC configuration, at least dynamic (DCI-based) switching of scheme 1 with legacy scheme is supported for PDSCH   + The following legacy scheme(s) support dynamic switching with Rel-17 scheme 1     - **Alt 1-1**: 1a/single-TRP     - FFS: Detailed signaling solution including restriction to have all DM-RS port in one CDM group, implicit indication, switching with TRP-based precompensation scheme (if supported), etc.     - Note: Consideration on DCI overhead should be considered in the final design this feature     - Note: Switching among legacy schemes is the same as in Rel-16   + This functionality is configured using RRC signaling   Without the addition above, the second sub-bullet (This functionality …) would not make much practical sense. |
| QC2 | We like to better understand from companies supporting dynamic switching what are the factors that necessitates very fast switching between scheme1 and SDM scheme for UE in HST?  Also, considering the example by OPPO motivating switching to single TRP when UE closer to TRP: we think only two switches (single TRP 🡪 Scheme 1 🡪 Single TRP) within roulgy 5000 ms (assuming 500 km/hr) may happen. Then, why dynamic swithicng within every 1-2m is needed ? |
| Moderator | Summary of the company’s preferences:  1. Dynamic (DCI based) switching for scheme 1 with legacy scheme(s) is supported   * Huawei / HiSilicon, ZTE, LGE, Vivo, OPPO, Samsung   2. Dynamic (DCI based) switching for scheme 1 with legacy scheme is not supported   * Qualcomm, Lenovo / MotMobility, Apple, Sony, DOCOMO, Nokia / NSB, Ericsson   Moderator observations:  1. There is slight majority of companies that prefer supporting RRC based switching of scheme 1 with all legacy schemes.  2. There is no company supporting DCI based switching of scheme 1 with schemes 2a/2b/3/4  Based on the observations, the following proposal should be acceptable to all companies.  Updated proposal 1-3:   * Switching of scheme 1 with 2a/2b/3/4 is based on RRC * Further study switching of scheme 1 with 1a / single TRP   + Alt 1. DCI based   + Alt 2. RRC based   + Alt 3. DCI based or RRC based * FFS all other details   Please focus discussion on necessity of supporting dynamic switching for the following combinations.   * scheme 1 and single TRP (e.g., QC2 question) * scheme 1 and scheme 1a |
| OPPO | We are fine to the updated proposal in principle.  We prefer to disucss switching between 1a and between single TRP separately. It seems that the concerns to dynamic switching mainly refer to scheme 1a. We agree that dynamic switching between 1 and 1a is unnecessary in most scenarios. But for single TRP, support of dynamic switching is not only for flexibility, but for fallback. Without this, when scheme 1 is configured by RRC, gNB should always configure two TCI states to UE, and UE should always detect PDSCH/PDCCH with two TCI states, even if another TRP is blocked or the beam for the TRP is out of update. It is too restrictive for scheme 1 since all the transmission schemes with two TCI states in Rel-16 can fall back to single TCI state. |
| CATT | 1. We are open to consider dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 1a/sTRP.  2. It’s ok to have such a clarification.  3. Considering the fact that more than 2 layers are not likely to be supported in L-o-S case, one CDM group restriction for DM-RS is reasonable. And if such restriction is supported, dynamic switching between scheme 1 and 1a/sTRP can be achieved. |

Based on the inputs above and email discussion in [104-e-NR-feMIMO-06] the following proposal can be made:

Updated working assumption 1-3:

For HST-SFN scenario:

* Support semi-static (RRC based) switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with 2a, 2b, 3, 4
* Support dynamic (DCI based) switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with single TRP scheme (Change to FFS: Apple, Qualcomm, Motorola Mobility/Lenovo, …)
* Switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with 1a is supported by Option 1b + Option 2 (Change to FFS: Sony, OPPO, Vivo (+ Option 1a should be also considered), …)
  + ~~Option 1a: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a~~
  + Option 1b: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a based on UE capability
  + Option 2: semi-static (RRC based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a
* FFS all other details including RRC signaling, possible RAN4 impact (if any), etc.

After GTW session the following possible directions for compromise were made to support dynamic (DCI based) switching of scheme 1 with single TRP

**Switching of scheme 1 with single TRP**

* Define UE capability for dynamic switching of scheme 1 and 1 TRP
* Relax PDSCH processing requirements (e.g. timelines) when dynamic switching between single TRP and scheme 1 is configured for the UE.
  + This can be also part of new UE capabilities.

The following feedback was recevied.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No need to add a new capability, since Scheme-1 will be a UE capability for reporting already. In our understanding, STRP is the fall back transmission solution for Scheme-1, if Scheme-1 is supported and configured by gNB, then dynamic switching between Scheme-1 and STRP should be enabled, otherwise the RRC signaling burst from NW cannot be addressed. |
| Ericsson | If there’s need to relax the procession time because of UE HW limitation when switching the algorithms, these requirement shall come from RAN4. We don’t think a UE capability to support dynamic switching shall be added in addition to the support of SFN scheme 1. |
| CATT | New capability is not needed.  As mentioned by many companies, switching between a transmission scheme and the fall back transmission scheme should always be supported. Even since early stage of LTE, such fall back transmission scheme has already been included in each transmission mode, and dynamic switching between schemes within one transmission mode is supported for all the transmission mode. For URLLC schemes based on mTRP specified in R16, dynamic switching is also supported. So, there seems to have no reason not supporting this in R17. |
| ZTE | New capability is not needed. Same veiw with Huawei , Ericsson , and CATT> |
| vivo | No need to add new capability for dynamic switching of scheme 1 and STRP.  Some reasons have been mentioned by Huawei, Ericsson and CATT, we have the same view with them. Besides, when the scheduling falls back from DCI 1\_1 to DCI 1\_0, dynamic switching from scheme 1 to STRP is needed. |
| InterDigital | We think that UE capability may not be needed for FR1. However, for a multi-panel UE in FR2, whether a UE can dynamically switch panels may be dictated by its switching capability. |
| Apple | Capability is needed  We can accept one of the two alternatives  1. FFS: dynamic switching between sTRP (DPS) and scheme 1  2. Support dynamic switching between sTRP (DPS) and scheme 1 in the specification, but corresponding capability is introduced. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t see need for new UE capability nor relaxation of timeline.  Single TRP operation is natural option if only one beam is available. We cannot always support two TRP transmission. Also, SFN transmission is not useful when the train is near at a TRP. In this case, SFN transmission generates waste of radio resource. So, single TRP transmission should be always supported.  gNB’s scheduling of single or SFN scheme can be known by UE with MAC-CE codepoint.  Regarding to the option to relax processing timeline, if this is required, we have to consider new processing timeline (e.g. N1/N2/N3) for scheme 1 regardless of dynamic switching.  UE can be ready for SFN reception always but if single TCI is indicated, simplified operation can be used, and if two TCI states are indicated, SFN reception should be applied. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support introducing an optional UE capability for dynamic switching. Defining optional UE sub-features within a feature is very common, we do not see a big issue about that |
| Samsung | We think that a new capability is not needed and have similar view with other opponents: Huawei , Ericsson, CATT, ZTE, vivo, and Nokia. |
| OPPO | We think a UE capability would be beneficial considering the HW implementation to support this feature. |
| LG | We do not see need for introducing a UE capability for dynamic switching of scheme 1 and 1 TRP in addition to a UE capability for indicating supporting of scheme 1. In Rel-16, there is no additional UE capability for indicating dynamic switching of mTRP scheme and single TRP. So, it is not clear why such UE capability is particularly needed for scheme 1. |
| Docomo | No need to add the new UE capability. Some companies claim two hardware are required for a UE to support dynamic switching between S-TRP and Scheme 1. However, the dynamic switching between S-TRP and Scheme 1 is inevitable. For example, for UE configured with Scheme 1, if UE receives DCI format 1\_0 to schedule PDSCH, the PDSCH should be S-TRP as specified in Rel.15 (because DCI format 1\_0 has no TCI state field). So, anyway UE needs to prepare dynamic switching between S-TRP and Scheme 1, at least by different DCI formats. If UE cannot receive PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0, it means NW cannot RRC re-configure because Msg. 2 is scheduled by DCI format 1\_0. So, all UEs who support Scheme 1 should support dynamic switching between S-TRP and Scheme 1. |
| Qualcomm | UE capability is needed.  It is not okay to increase UE complexity just to give Network full flexibility. If companies don’t agree on UE capability, then we should have that bullet as FFS. |
| Futurewei | UE capability is not needed. The S-TRP operation is the default / fallback operating way. To dynamically switching between an enhancement and its fallback should be supported. |

Rergarding support of switching for scheme 1 and 1a the following proposal was made:

**Switching of scheme 1 and 1a**

Switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with 1a is supported by Option 1b + Option 2

* ~~Option 1a: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a~~
* Option 1b: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a based on UE capability for support of dynamic switching
* Option 2: semi-static (RRC based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a

FFS all other details including RRC signaling, possible RAN4 impact (if any), etc.

The following feedback was received.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK for the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support this proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| vivo | From the perspective of UE vendor, we are fine with option 1b +2, since it can give UE more flexibility. But we still can’t see a unacceptable difficulty of dynamic switching between scheme 1a and 1 in Rel-17, since dynamic switching of scheme 1a with 2a/2b/3/4 has been supported in Rel-16. Anyway, if some companies still have concerns on the UE complexity, we are ok with the current proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | Given the feedback on the dynamic switching between sTRP and scheme 1, we are not okay with this proposal.  We are not okay for option 1b even with UE capability. We do not think dynamic switching between scheme 1a and scheme 1 is needed even in the specification. We do not believe there is any reason for infra-vendor to even support it if no UE vendor ever wants to support it. There is no need for a paper specification since NW cannot work without a UE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Changing the above bullet to FFS is preferred. If the UEs support Scheme 1a + Scheme 1, both option 1b and option 2 are fine with us, but we do not see any clear need to switch to SDM scheme 1a dynamically with Scheme 1. The only motivation for not objecting to option 1b is that this operation is a possibility by simple extension to the spec. |
| Lenovo/MotM | OK with the proposal. Support Option 2 |
| Samsung | We are Okay with this proposal. |
| OPPO | We still prefer FFS for the proposal, or add "or Option 2" to the end. The benefits of this dynamic switching in HST-SFN scenarios and correponding specification impact to DCI design is unclear to us. |
| LG | We have similar view with vivo. In Rel-16, there is no additional UE capability for indicating dynamic switching of 1a and 2a/2b/3/4. So, it is not clear why such UE capability is particularly needed for scheme 1. I think gNB may be able to dynamically indicate one of scheme 1 and 1a according to gNB’s preference if a UE has capabilities for scheme 1 and 1a. Anyway, we are OK with the proposal if there is a majority view. |
| Docomo | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Not support.  Support Option 2 only. No clear motivation for having UE feature on dynamic switching between scheme 1 and scheme 1a. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal |

Based on the recevied inputs, it is proposed to discuss the following proposal to address Issue #3-1:

Updated proposal #1-3:

For HST-SFN scenario:

* Support semi-static (RRC based) switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with 2a, 2b, 3, 4
* Working assumption: Support dynamic (DCI based) switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with single TRP scheme
  + Define UE capability to support dynamic switching of scheme 1 and single TRP [mandatory with capability signalling for UE supporting scheme 1]
* Working assumption: Switching of scheme 1 (PDSCH) with 1a is supported by Option 1b + Option 2
  + ~~Option 1a: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a~~
  + Option 1b: dynamic (DCI based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a based on UE capability
  + Option 2: semi-static (RRC based) switching is supported for scheme 1 (PDSCH ) with 1a
* FFS all other details including RRC signaling, possible RAN4 impact (if any), etc.

## Issue #1-4 (Legacy schemes for switching with scheme 1)

If dynamic switching of scheme 1 is supported, the following options of the legacy schemes from Rel-15/16 were proposed based on the submitted contribution.

**Issue#1-4:** Dynamic switching of Rel-17 scheme 1 is supported with the following legacy schemes

* **Alt-1**: Switching with 1a/single-TRP
* **Alt-2**: Switching with schemes 1a/4/single-TRP
* **Alt-3**: Switching with schemes 1a/2a/2b/3/single-TRP
* **Alt-4**: Switching with 1a/2a/2b/3/4/single-TRP/Rel-15 SFN scheme
* FFS: Whether all DMRS ports are within one CDM group
* FFS: Detailed signaling solution
* [Extend the alternatives to TRP-based pre-compensation, if supported]

Companies are encouraged to provide their preference / views regarding the above alternatives.

**Proposal 1-4:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Based on the discussion in Section 2.1.3. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-1, similar to scheme 2a/2b/3. |
| ZTE | We support Alt-1.  Further, in the typical HST scenarios, all DMRS ports should be within one CDM group. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Alt-1 |
| Spreadtrum | Based on the discussion in section 2.1.3. We support Alt-1. |
| LG | One of scheme 2a/2b/3/4 can be configured by RRC. Based on this, it seems that Alt-2/3 can be modified as follows and we support this.  Switching with schemes 1a/one of 2a,2b,3,4/single-TRP |
| NEC | Support Alt-1. |
| Vivo | Agree with ZTE, support Alt-1 and all DMRS ports within one CDM group. |
| Apple | Not sure why we need to discuss this. HST mode can be configured explicitly with RRC and in which case, DCI indicates a TCI codepoint with two TCI states |
| Nokia/NSB | Need clarification as stated in Proposal 1-3. |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-4. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1-3 and 1-4 should be discussed together. |
| Ericsson | Alt.1 and Alt.2 are not needed in our view because they can already be supported. Alt.4 is also not needed as  Rel-15 SFN is UE transparent in our understanding and is the same as single TRP.    Alt.3 should be modified as follows and is the only alternative to be determined:     * **Alt-3**: Switching with 2a/2b/3/     Given our comments for issue 1-3, we don’t think any proposal is needed here. |
| Samsung | Seems that Issue 1-4 should be discussed after concluding the Issue 1-3. |
| Moderator | The discussion on Issue #1-4 is merged with discussion on Issue #1-3 |

## Issue #1-5 (Number of TCI states in FR2)

Regarding the number of TCI states that should be supported for scheme 1 in FR2. Several companies provided their views on this issue. Summary of the company’s preference is provided below:

**Issue#1-5:** The number of TCI states supported for scheme 1 in FR2

* At most two TCI states can be configured/indicated for the UE
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, Huawei / HiSilicon, CATT, vivo, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSN, Samsung, QC
* Two or more TCI states can be configured/indicated for the UE
  + **Supported by**: Intel
* Further study more than two TCI states
  + **Supported by**: Sony

Based on the company’s preference above, there is majority that prefers support of at most two TCI states for scheme 1 in FR2. Therefore, the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 1-5:**

* *Two TCI states are supported for scheme 1 in FR2*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| Sony | If the majority view is to support at most 2 TCI states for scheme 1 in FR2, we are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal |
| Docomo | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Ericsson | For Scheme 1, at least two TCI states are needed.  Therefore, we suggest a modified version of the proposal:  **Proposal 1-5:**   * *~~At most~~ two TCI states are supported for scheme 1 in FR2* * *FFS: if more than 2 TCI states are supported* |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | Propose to have offline agreement on Proposal 1-5 with small revision |
| CATT | Support. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| OPPO | Support |

## Issue #1-6 (Additional source RS for scheme 1)

A few companies have mentioned that in Rel-15 for PDSCH a TCI state may be configured not only with TRS as source RS, but also with other reference signals (e.g., CSI-RS for CSI acquisition) as illustrated below. Therefore, it should be discussed whether to restrict supported source RS configurations in TCI state for HST-SFN scenario.

|  |
| --- |
| - ‘QCL-TypeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘QCL-TypeD’ with the same CSI-RS resource*,* or  - ‘QCL-TypeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and, when applicable, ‘QCL-TypeD’ with a CSI-RS resource in an *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *repetition*,or  - QCL-TypeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and without higher layer parameter *repetition* and, when applicable, ‘QCL-TypeD’ with the same CSI-RS resource. |

**Issue#1-6:** Whether to support additional source RS for scheme 1 in addition to TRS, e.g. allowing the same QCL and RS combination as currently supported for PDSCH in Rel-15?

* **Alt-1**: All QCL source RS resource types as defined in TCI state of Rel-16 multi-TRP are supported for scheme 1
  + **Supported by**: CATT, …
* **Alt-2**: Only TRS is supported as QCL source for QCL-TypeA in TCI
  + **Supported by**: …
* It was already agreed that each TCI state may be additionally associated with {Spatial Rx parameter} (i.e., QCL-TypeD)

Companies are invited to share their preference on support of the additional source RS in TCI state for scheme 1.

**Proposal 1-6:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Support Alt-2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.1 can be discussed |
| OPPO | Support Alt-1 as Rel-15. |
| ZTE | We fail to see the necessity to discuss this issue. Proposal 1-5 is enough.  Based on the current Rel-15/16 for a target PDSCH/PDCCH after RRC connection, only QCL-TypeA and TypeD are allowed. Nothing is changed in Rel-17. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Alt-2 |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.1 |
| Sony | We are open to Alt-1. If DL RS other than TRS cannot provide similar QCL-TypeD performance, NW can only configure TRS in TCI states. But at the moment, we think these alternatives may need to be discussed more. |
| Vivo | Support Alt-1 |
| Docomo | Agree with ZTE. We don’t need to discuss this. |
| Apple | Do not see a strong need to discuss this |
| Nokia/NSB | No need to discuss. We don’t see any need for changing specification. Scheme 1 is using distributed TRSs as QCL source, so this is enough. |
| Futurewei | Seems not absolutely needed, but we can support Alt-1. |
| QC | Open to discuss. |
| Ericsson | We don’t see the need to restrict to only TRS, although TRS may provide better frequency tracking |
| Samsung | Not support |
| Moderator | To ZTE, Apple, Nokia/NSB:  This issue is better to be discussed with more explicit conclusion / agreement, since the current agreements in HST-SFN agenda item restrict source RS type used in QCL-Type A to TRS only, i.e., the third configuration for PDSCH / PDCCH supported by Rel-16 NR specification is not allowed. Note for non-SFN multi-TRP scheme there is no restriction to use only TRS for QCL-TypeA. |
| CATT | Support Alt-1.  There is no reason to restrict the use of QCL source RS defined in R15/16 other than TRS. |
| ZTE | @Moderator, for target PDCCH/PDSCH after RRC connection, only QCL-Type A can be configured where TRS must be the QCL source. The current spec does not support any other cases. If my understanding is incorrect, please provide an example. Thanks! |
| OPPO | We don’t think discussion is needed. Current specification can be reused by Rel-17. |
| Nokia/NSB | Pending to QCL indication. If majority is supporting signaling of new QCL type via two independent TCI states, we are fine to support both TRS and CSI-RS for acquisition as in Rel-15. |
| Moderator | To ZTE  The case that can be missing we only allow TRS:   |  | | --- | | - QCL-TypeA’ with a CSI-RS resource in a *NZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet* configured without higher layer parameter *trs-Info* and without higher layer parameter *repetition* and, when applicable, ‘QCL-TypeD’ with the same CSI-RS resource. | |
| ZTE | @ Moderator, Now I understand the case. Sorry I missed the case. To make agreement clear, we are OK to support any existing RS as QCL type A. |
|  |  |

## Issue #1-7 (Additional target RS for scheme 1)

A few companies have mentioned that support of multiple QCL reference RS or two TCI states may be also required for reference signals in HST-SFN scenario. It is therefore proposed to discuss necessity of the multiple TCI state agreement to CSI-RS.

**Issue#1-7:** Whether to support multiple QCL reference RS and TCI states for reference signals?

* **Alt 1**: Support two TCI states indication for CSI-RS for CSI acquisition
  + **Supported by**: …
* **Alt 2**: Two TCI states are only supported for PDCCH / PDSCH
  + **Supported by**: …

Companies are invited to share their preference on support of multiple QCL reference RS or TCI states for the reference signals.

**Proposal 1-7:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Support Alt 2. We don’t think there would be much use for Alt 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt.2. |
| OPPO | Support Alt.2. |
| ZTE | Support Alt.2. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We believe discussion on the alternatives would be pre-mature without agreeing on CSI-RS for CSI transmission scheme for HST-SFN |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.2 |
| LG | Support Alt.2. |
| NEC | Support Alt.2. |
| Sony | Support Alt.2, since CSI-RS is not included in scheme 1 or scheme 2. |
| vivo | Support Alt.2. As distributed TRS is configured in HST-SFN, it’s natural that CSI-RS is also distributed, thus we don’t see the necessity to support two TCI states for SFN CSI-RS. |
| Docomo | Agree with Lenovo/MotM. |
| Apple | As part of the complete system design, CSI enhancement might be needed  But like mTRP, we can first finish the PDCCH/PDSCH design, and then consider CSI enhancement |
| Nokia/NSB | This can be discussed in AI 8.1.4. |
| Futurewei | It seems with Alt 2, the CSI derived from the CSI-RS can better reflect the SFN data CSI. Maybe more study is needed to decide if this is the case or not. |
| QC | Similar views as Nokia, Alt-1 is under discussion of M-TRP CSI enhancement agenda (8.1.4). HST-SFN should focus on Alt 2 for PDSCH/PDCCH. |
| Ericsson | Support Alt.2. |
| Samsung | Support Alt.2. |
| Moderator | Discuss later or as part of 8.1.4 agenda item. |
| CATT | Support Alt.2. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Agree with moderator’s comment |

## Issue #1-8 (Support of scheme 2)

Regarding support of scheme 2. Several companies expressed their preference regarding support of scheme 2 in Rel-17. Some companies have also provided LLS evaluation results comparing performance of scheme 2 with scheme 1 and the baseline scheme. Summary of the company’s views is provided below:

**Issue#1-8:** Whether to support scheme 2 in Rel-17?

* Scheme 2 is supported
  + **Supported by**: InterDigital, Intel, LGE, Lenovo / Motorola Mobility, …
* Scheme 2 is not supported / low priority
  + **Supported by**: OPPO, Samsung, Nokia/NSN, Qualcomm, …

Since there is no clear majority to support scheme 2 in Rel-17, it is recommended to have the following conclusion.

**Proposal 1-8:**

* *Possible conclusion:*
  + *Scheme 2 is not supported in Rel-17*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Don’t support the proposal at this stage. We beleive both schemes 1and 2 should be considered as they support different SNR scenarios. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the FL’s proposal. Scheme-2 is less performance than Scheme-1 (evaluated in our Tdocs in RAN1#103-e meeting) and also have issue on DMRS overhead. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Multiple companies have provided different alternatives for Scheme 2. At least it should be discussed |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Sony | Support FL’s proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| Docomo | Support FL proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal. No need to have multiple schemes for HST-SFN. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| QC | Support FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | The situation is similar to the last meeting. To reduce the number of open issues suggest to make conclusion in this meeting (e.g. GTW session). |
| CATT | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Support. |

## Other issues

This section contains other issues that companies want to highlight for discussion regarding support of UE-based schemes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | We believe that use of zones and positioning information for QCL/TCI state update should be considered to prevent excessive signaling overhead. |
| Moderator | The proposal on use of zones and positioning information for QCL/TCI state update is captured in Section 2.4 |
| CATT | A new definition on QCL relationship is needed. According to current definition of QCL relationship in the spec, if the two antenna ports are QCL-ed, the channel over which a symbol on one antenna port is conveyed should be inferred from the channel over which a symbol on the other antenna port is conveyed.  For scheme 1 in HST-SFN deployment, the large-scale properties of the channel that convey DMRS port(s) should be inferred from the combination of channels of the RS ports that indicated by multiple TCI states. And the large-scale properties of the channel of each RS port that indicated by the multiple TCI states cannot be inferred from the channel of the DMRS port.  Hence, a definition on QCL association relationship of an antenna port and an antenna port group is needed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Support of TRP-based solution

## Issue #2-1 (Support of TRP-based pre-compensation)

Regarding support of TRP-based pre-compensation scheme in Rel-17. In RAN1#103-e meeting it was agreed to support two TCI states for the DM-RS antenna ports. However, formal conclusion on support / no support of specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme in Rel-17 is still missing. It is, therefore, proposed to have a decision on this issue.

**Issue#2-1:** Whether to support specification based TRP pre-compensations?

* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation is supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, **Huawei / HiSilicon** (with evaluations), **Vivo** (with evaluations), **ZTE** (with evaluations), **CATT** (with evaluations), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, **CMCC** (with evaluations), **Samsung** (with evaluations), OPPO (with evaluation), Apple, NEC, Spreadtrum, Docomo, Sony
* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation is not supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by**: LGE, **Nokia / NSN** (with evaluation), **Ericsson** (with evaluations), InterDigital
* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation should be further studied
  + Supported by: Qualcomm

Based on the company’s preference above, there is majority that prefers specification of TRP-based frequency offset compensation in Rel-17 for HST-SFN scenario, which is similar to the RAN1#103-e meeting. Therefore, the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 2-1:**

* *TRP-based pre-compensation is supported in Rel-17*
  + *FFS other details*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the FL’s proposal. Interference (ICI) will be reduced with frequency compensation, the evaluation results show the obvious gain in our Tdocs. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal. We also provided many simulation results to justify the benefit of pre-compensation scheme. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| Sony | Support FL proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal, since TRP-based pre-compensation outperforms scheme 1 as shown in our simulation results. |
| Docomo | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support FL’s proposal.  Scheme 1 is enough. There are many aspects for performance degradation from real implementation such as frequency estimation error, delayed application of Doppler pre-compensation etc. Much overhead is expected for supporting accuracy. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| InterDigital | We have very similar concerns as expressed by Nokia. |
| QC | More discussion needed on the accuracy of pre-compensation schemes. In our tdoc, we highlighted few issues for both UL-based Doppler estimation and CSI-based reporting that affect the quality of pre-compensation. When reflected into simulation, results show performance degradation. |
| Ericsson | We don’t see the significant benefit of supporting pre-compensation method. The overhead on UL and signaling complexity is also unclear. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | Majority of companies prefer supporting specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme, but noticeable number of companies still have concerns.  Propose to discuss this issue in GTW, since a number of #2-x issues are dependent on the conclusion for issue #2-1. Meanwhile the companies with concerns (Nokia/NSB, InterDigital, Ericsson, Qualcomm) please indicate whether you would object to the proposal 2-1. |
| CATT | Support |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| OPPO | UE based solution and TRP based solution can achieve similar functionality. We are fine with either one but it may be a little redundant to support both solutions. |
| Ericsson | We have done numerous simulations and comparing the different schemes. Based on our best knowledge, we don’t see the worthy of effort on supporting the pre-compensation, we can not recommend RAN1 to go ahead with pre-compensation. We believe this should be further studied, we should not rush into agreement on this meeting. |
| Moderator | If RAN1 decides to continue the study on TRP base pre-compensation scheme, I suggest companies expressing concerns to provide specific issues that should be verified in simulations, e.g. overhead, accuracy, etc. Companies supporting TRP-based pre-compensation are welcome to address the above concerns. |
| QC | We have concerns on the accuracy of TRP pre-compensation that requires futher clarification and performance re-evaluation with realistic assumptions. We can’t agree to the proposal till benefits over scheme 1 are clear.   * Issue#1A: Freq. estimation error based on UL signal/channel for high speed scenarios. As highlighted by Nokia, the frequency soffset observed by either TPRs should be within certain estimation range. * Issue#1B: Accuracy of Doppler shift reporting (CSI based) due to quantization and UE freq. estimation errors. * Issue#2: Latency/Delay between frequency estimation to application of pre-compensation which represents another freq. error. * Issue#3: CFO per TRPs. * Issue#4: SRS overhead. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Support frequency precompensation.  From the simulation results provided by CMCC, ZTE, OPPO, Vivo, CATT, Huawei/HiSilicon, Samsung, the perfoamcne gain of frequency pre-compensation is shown. Even from Nokia’s Tdoc, Figure-4 shows the gain of frequency pre-compensation.  To QC, for Issue#1A, the residue estimation frequency error is much less than Doppler frequency shift. QC’s evaluation in Figure 3-4 shows obvious gain with frequency offset reduction. It means the frequency precompensations is beneficial, which is also proved by many companies.  For Issue#1B: no such issue, frequency pre-compensation do not need CSI feedback.  For Issue#2: It’s depend on gNB implementation, but we do not think Doppler frequency will be fast change in “ms” level. With 350km/h, in the 2.5ms or 5ms, only moved less than 0.24m or 0.5m, how can big change on Doppler frequency.  For Issue#3: In the HST scenarios, the TRPs are conneted in a BBU, there is no CFO problems. This issue was discussed in the evaluation assumption stage.  For Issue#4: No such issue, UL frequency estimation can be based on SRS and PUSCH, no need dedicated SRS.  To Ericsson, for the simulation, the MCS is always assumed with 17 for any SNR assumption, it seems not realistic. Then, from the simulations, we also curious that DSP is always the flat performance when moving from TRP to another TRP for most cases in Figure 6, which means the received power in UE side is so high to the max receive power, it is not a realistic deployment. Actually, even in Ericsson’s simulation, Figure-3, 4 and 5 still show the performance of pre-compensation is better than legacy SFN. |
| ZTE | We support pre-compensation solution, and share the same view with HW.  Based on our previous simulation results, the performance is better than scheme 1 and DPS. Even the performance is similar as scheme 1, why can we support both. Then, for UE not supporting scheme 1, network can choose to do frequency compensation.  To QC’ question, we think SRS overhead is not an issue since the same SRS has multiple functionality. Further, it is unnecessary to explicitly feedback Doppler shift. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Offset frequency pre-compensation scheme. The following should be discussed  1. Different variants of the offset frequency pre-compensation scheme exist, e.g., whether one TRS transmitted from one TRP or 2 TRSs transmitted from 2 TRPs. It should be clarified which variant (or both) would be supported  2. Whether implicit/explicit indication of the TRP applying frequency pre-compensation is needed  3. Whether/How switching between Scheme 1 and pre-compensation scheme is done  4. Other issues listed by the FL should also be discussed  5. We agree with QC that the impact of CFO and Doppler calculation latency should be studied |
| vivo | We support frequency offset pre-compensation, and share the same view with with HW and ZTE.   * To Nokia and Ericsson: In Nokia(Figure 5) and Ericsson’s(Figure 3~6) simulation results, we find that fixed MCS levels and relatively high SNRs are used, which leads to a saturated throughput of scheme 1 and pre-compensaiton. In that case, the performance comparision of these two schemes are relatively inconclusive. We suggest it’s better to select a moderate SNR and enable the AMC function in simulation, considering the realistic deployment of HST-SFN. Then we believe pre-compensation based on SRS would outperform scheme 1 as shown in our contribution. * To QC:   + Issue#1A: In our simulation, we have used SRS to estimate the UL Doppler shift with estimation error, and the result shows pre-compensation outperforms scheme 1.   + Issue#1B: No need CSI feedback, due to more feedback overhead and spec effect than implicit method.   + Issue#2: Latency/Delay between frequency estimation and application of pre-compensation would be negligible, since the train just moves a short distance in “ms” level.   + Issue#3: CFO error can be handled by the adjustment between TRPs connected to the same BBU.   + Issue#4: SRS for other purpose can be used for UL frequency shift estimation simultaneously. Moreover, further enhancement on SRS can be also considered as mentioned in your contribution if need. |
| Nokia | For the same functionality, RAN1 does not have to define two schemes.  From our evaluation result, scheme 1 and pre-compensation scheme are showing comparable performance, but the pre-compensation scheme has much specification impact. It requires higher overhead and complexity, and also the real performance considering frequency estimation error is questionable.  More investigation is required before we are supporting the scheme.  So, we can propose,  For TRP based frequency pre-compensation scheme, study the following aspect.   * + Overhead of SRS or PUCCH/PUSCH   + Performance impact from delayed application of frequency offset   + Frequency estimation accuracy vs. SRS overhead. |
| Ericsson | First we would like to answer questions/comments from HW, ZTE and VIVO regarding our simulations.  “To Ericsson, for the simulation, the MCS is always assumed with 17 for any SNR assumption, it seems not realistic. Then, from the simulations, we also curious that DSP is always the flat performance when moving from TRP to another TRP for most cases in Figure 6, which means the received power in UE side is so high to the max receive power, it is not a realistic deployment. Actually, even in Ericsson’s simulation, Figure-3, 4 and 5 still show the performance of pre-compensation is better than legacy SFN.”  MCS is one of the agreed fixed MCS in EVM, higher MCS and link adaptation is optional. The flat DPS results is because of the fixed MCS agreed in EVM. With link adaption and a varying SNR along the track, the throughput of DPS will show difference. The high SNRs are due to the choice of 2-tx antenna agreed in EVM aht has a gain of 20.5 dBi. In our understanding this setup reflect the current HST deployment. The performance of pre-compensation is better than legacy SFN, but over a very small range of UE positions as shown in the result.    Second, we would like ask questions about the simulations in some of the contributions, the purpose for the exercise is to calibrate the simulation results and reach better understanding for the issue we may need to solve in the real deployment.  To HW:   1. How was PMI calculated for the SFN transmission. Were precoders calculated for each TRP and fed-back? 2. What is the definition of SNR? Is the SNR shown is the SNR at D1=0m as we agreed in EVM?   To ZTE:   1. What is the antenna pattern used and the orientation/downtilt of the antennas? 2. In your simulation there’s an SNR sweep and show that with DPS there’s a loss of around 2-3 dB at the midpoint. Does sweeping of SNR make sense for a fixed deployment?   Third, we would like to address our concern on pre-compensation scheme:   1. The pre-compensation gain is observed mainly in the middle point of 2 TRPs and with low SNR. However the middle point is not the bottleneck in real deployments where a higher SNR can be achieved at the mid-point. 2. SRS/PUSCH overhead, the number of UEs that can be configured with SRS/PUSCH to provide adequate doppler shift information. What is impact on capacity and UL performance?   Regarding CFO error. Even a same BBU is used for two TRPs, because the two TRPs are in different locations, separate radio units are needed with their local oscillators. |
| QC2 | Regarding estimation frequency error:   * How much is the freq. error relative to the Doppler shift? This requires a study. A hand-waving argument saying relatively small is not acceptable. Given the imbalance between gNB Tx Power and UE TxPwr as well as SRS pattern (which is not designed for Doppler estimation) vs TRS pattern, we believe that the SRS-based freq estimaion errors is much larger than TRS-based frequency error. Please note that TRS is designed for tracking purposes, not the SRS. Also, the estimation error is different between the two TRPs as the TRP that is further away from the UE will have worse estimate due to larger path loss.   Regarding latency between estimation and application:   * That requires careful study as well. First there is some processing latency between the time gNB receive SRS to the time PDSCH is pre-compensated. The NW will use the same pre-compensation till new measurement is received and processed. This means the quality of PDSCH pre-compensation depreciates with time till new measurements is received. That is why SRS periodicity plays an important role in tracking of the Doppler shift. Based on fields measurements of Qualcomm devices in FR1 commercial networks, we noticed that SRS periodicity is in the range of 20 ms to 100+ms. Figure below explains our understanding as described above.      * Also, consdiering the HST setup as agreed in RAN1-102e, the figure below shows how Doppler shift changes with time (in ms) with respect to one of the TRP. As it can been seen, taking two points that are roughly 50 ms apart, Doppler shift seen by the UE can change by more than 70Hz.     Regarding CFO error and assumption of syncrhonization between TRPs:   * According to 3gpp specs (38.104 Clause 9.6.1 ), the modulated carrier frequency of each NR carrier configured by the BS shall be accurate to within the accuracy range given by ±0.1 ppm and ±0.05 ppm for medium range and wide range BS accordingly. Even if both TRPs are connected via backhaul, there are statistical and temporal variation of the CFOs per each TRP. * As a reminder of the discussion in Rel.16 MTRP on the assumption of time synchronization of the DL transmission between the two TRPs. It was a long discussion and big debate on the time synchronization assumptions whether DL tranmision from both TRPs are aligned within CP or not. Given this, we can’t say that there freq. synchronization is perfect. This is not a realistic assumption and is not true.   note in 38.306:  NOTE 1: A UE may assume that its maximum receive timing difference between the DL transmissions from two TRPs is within a Cyclic Prefix.  SRS overhead:   * To improve gNB tracking/estimation of the of Doppler shift from UL signal, SRS peridocity should be comparable to TRS periodicity. This cosumes a lot of UL resources which are very limited. Further clarification and study on acceptable SRS periodicity and SRS overhed is needed. * Also, as pre-compensation is UE specific, there are no enough SRS resources for all UEs within the train. And group-based sounding may be adopted. This will have another impact on the accuracy of pre-compensation.   Performance evaluation:   * Taking all these factors into consideration, our simulation shows that the gain of TPR-compensation vanishes as compared to scheme-1. |
| Moderator | Many thanks for providing very detailed discussion on performance of TRP based pre-compensation scheme and possible issue. Please continue discussion to address the concerns and defined the scope of the required study.  Possible conclusion:  To facilitate decision on support of specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme in Rel-17, additionally study the following aspects for RAN1#104-bis-e meeting:   * + Frequency offset estimation accuracy   + Overhead of SRS or PUCCH/PUSCH   + Performance impact from delayed application of frequency offset |
| CMCC | I want to clarify a few points:   1. Firstly, NW pre-compensation and scheme 1 have different requirement of complexity of NW and UE. At the current stage, from operator point of view, only supporting scheme 1 is very risky. We cannot make sure that scheme 1 will definitely be supported by UE vendors in the real network. On the other hand, NW pre-compensation only requires some complexity of gNB, which we are more confident on. We cannot put all the eggs in one basket. 2. Secondly, many companies show that NW precompensation has obvious performance gain over scheme 1, I cannot the understand the logic of some companies that you support scheme 1 but object NW pre- compensation. 3. Thirdly, Regarding the issues listed by QC (Issue#1A/1B/2/3/4), we share the same views with HW. I do not see the problems. Regarding the latency between estimation and application raised by QC, at least in our network, we believe the freq. synchronization is not a problem. Additionally, the typical SRS periodicity in our HST deployment is 10~20ms, even less. DMRS can also be used for estimation. The 50ms assumed in your analysis is not realistic. Regarding the SRS overhead, we donot see problem, anyway the uplink symbols in the special subframe are all used for SRS transmission. |
| CATT | According to our simulation, even with frequency estimation error and CFO, compared with Rel-15 SFN transmission, obvious performance gain can still be observed for the schemes with pre-compenastion.  Therefore, from performance perspective, pre-compensation should be supported. |
| ZTE | @ E///, in our simulation, the UE is in the middle position between two TRPs. Antenna downtilt and azimuth directions point to the midpoint between the two TRPs. The gNB antenna configuration can be found in Appendix in our contribution. Our simulation shows obvious performance gain with SFN than DPS. I don’t understand what do you mean ‘Does sweeping of SNR make sense for a fixed deployment?’.  Further, as many companies commented to E///, MCS adaption should be used to more align with real scheduling. Also, based on the agreement for simulation assumption, DPS is not the baseline. However, per E/// requested, we provide DPS results. However, more simulation are further asked to defer the discussion. It is unfair.  In short, we don’t think DPS(not agreed as baseline) should be the excuse to derfer the progress. Many companies show the performance gain of pre-compnestation compared with SFN scheme 1 which has been agreed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Support frequency precompensation.  **Reply to Ericsson:**  1) PMI is calculated based on type I codebook for robustness with per-TRP feedback.  2) YES, SNR is calculated based on the agreed method, which is SNR defined as reference point closest to TRP.  Using a fixed MCS in the simulation is fine, but it is clear in the scenarios we can not fixed SNR for transmission. In the agreement, we never said the MCS should be fixed as 17. What we concern is that why only simulate high SNR cases with MCS=17, especially in the region of cell/TRP edges.  Then, for our simulation, we see obivious performance gain in both low and high SNR cases, not only in low SNR case. It is my first time to hear company argue that high SNR is in the mid-point of the TRPs in the practical scenarios.  For the question on the SRS and PUSCH overhead, we have replied before, it is not an issue at all, the frequency estimation can be based on PUSCH or SRS. Not only based on dedicated SRS. With PUSCH or reusing SRS, there is no impact on UL performance.  **Reply to QC:**  For frequency estimation, as I replied before, both SRS and PUSCH can be used for freuqncy estimation. We never see there is any problem for the frequency estimation in practical scenarios, which we already used. By the way, vivo have provided the evaluation results with estimation error already shows frequency pre-compensation is beneficial.  Then, for the latency on Doppler estimation, at first the calculation from QC is misleading. Shown as following, only close to TRP, the Doppler will change a little fast. But, in 5ms or 2.5ms, the UE only moved less than 0.5meter. There is only 2~4 Hz on the difference for Doppler: (left is Doppler, right is difference of Doppler with 5ms periodicity).  C:\Users\z00221589\AppData\Roaming\eSpace_Desktop\UserData\z00583471\imagefiles\8CF46869-D608-425B-ACA3-94A928554B79.png  We can see that without precompensation, the Doppler may be more than 1000Hz, but the Doppler difference for 5ms periodicity is less than **4Hz**.  Even, with large periodicity, 50ms (in the HST case, we do not need to configure so long periodicity), UE only moved less than 5meter, the Doppler difference is shown as follows, i.e., less than 37Hz. Compared to 1000Hz, the Doppler difference is so small.    For SRS overhead issue, please see the reply to Ericsson. For CFO, honestly, we have discuss it in the EVM assumptions, it is not agreed to be a parameters companies should used, since many companies think it is not a issue for CFO when TRPs conneted to a same BBU. Some companies may have different implementation, but it does not make sense to force companies to evaluate CFO. |
| Ericsson | Thanks Huawei and ZTE provided your answering to our questions. We have further questions and comments related to your answer and comments.  To Huawei:   * Since per TRP type I CSI feedback was used,  per TRP CSI-RS must be transmitted.  Question:   + Is CSI-RS pre-compensated or not?   + How is the SFN CQI derived  from the per TRP CSI report? * How is the link adaptation achieved at high speed?  Do you see a CSI-RS and CSI overhead issue? * With antenna pattern and pointing specified in the EVM,  why do you think the mid-point between two TRPs is equivalent to cell edge?  Can you provide the SNR distribution between two TRPs in your simulation setup?   To ZTE:   * First of all, we don’t agree that DPS should not be the baseline. Our understanding is that DPS is one of the schemes specified or to be specified for Rel-16 HST enhancement in RAN4.  The WID below says “if the benefit over Rel.16 HST enhancement baseline is demonstrated”.   + Enhancement to support HST-SFN deployment scenario:     - Identify and specify solution(s) on QCL assumption for DMRS, e.g. multiple QCL assumptions for the same DMRS port(s), targeting DL-only transmission     - Evaluate and, if the benefit over Rel.16 HST enhancement baseline is demonstrated, specify QCL/QCL-like relation (including applicable type(s) and the associated requirement) between DL and UL signal by reusing the unified TCI framework * On “MCS adaption should be used to more align with real scheduling”,  we have the following questions:   + How is link adaptation achieved at high speed in your view?   + How is CSI feedback achieved for SFNed PDSCH  transitions?   + Should CSI-RS be pre-compensated or not? * On sweeping SNR at a single location.  Our point is that from system perspective,  we need to understand what is the system’s bottle neck. By focusing  on a single point, you don’t have a full picture of where the bottle neck is and the SNR sweep is a bit of artificial as some of the SNR points may not reflect the actual SNR.  For example, with directional beam and pointing direction specified in the EVM,  we don’t see that the mid-point is the bottle neck, rather the region close to the TRPs  has lower SNRs.  Of course, different antenna tilt could be used in actual deployments, but the point is that  the perception that the mid-point is always equivalent to “ cell edge”  is kind of  mis-leading,  it might be true if omni-antenna is deployed, but it is not always true if directional antenna is used. |
| QC3 | Thanks Huawei for your feedback!   * The estimation based on other UL channel (e.g PUSCH) is opportunistic. Not sure how reliable it can be and how it can help with improving the estimation. Further study is needed. * On vivo’s simulation, it seems that simulation is done per each track point, it doesn’t take into account the mobility of UE. In other words, it seems that simulation is done by estimating the ‘same’ freq. error over and over at same track point and use it for pre-compensation. That is not the realistic scenario and doesn’t reflect HST enviorment. A proper simulation should be based on time tracking with the UE moving across the track. Please vivo clarify whether my understanding. * What is the proper SRS peridocity in HST? This has trade-off on UL resources vs accurate estimation. Also, it seems that the figures has a missing factor of ‘2’. The figures below for differential Doppler for 50 ms periodcity where errors can be up to 75 Hz.      * Also, it is not clear why we should’t consider the region close to TRP? Do you want to limit pre-compensation to mid track locatons? If so, according to some companies simulation results with extended channel, this regins is not the most critical one as it has enough high SNR. * On CFO error and frequency synchrnozation, our understanding this is not realistic assumption. Also, as RAN1 is not the proper expertise for that issue. We should consult with RAN4. |
| vivo | To QC:  Sorry for getting back to you late, I missed your question before. I understand your concern on frequency error without time tracking, but as your simulation results given in Figure3-3 in your tdoc R1-2101450, it seems the degradation of throughput is acceptable when the Fre\_error is 150Hz. Besides, I believe we have the same view that it’s not easy to simulate a statistics throughput with the time-tracking requirement, right? That would need much efforts to build a dynamic-moving simulation model, especially the dynamic channel model with correlation. Therefore, frequency error moded as a random uniform error with betwneen (-Freq\_err Freq\_err) per each TRP mentioned in your tdoc might be a relatively feasible way. We are fine to provide our simulation results based on this assumption in the next meeting, and we are also appreciate if companies could give simulation results based on realistic dynamic-moving model for the comparision of TRP compensation with scheme 1 additionally. |

**Issue#2-1:** Whether to support specification based TRP pre-compensations?

* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation is supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, **Huawei / HiSilicon** (with evaluations), **Vivo** (with evaluations), **ZTE** (with evaluations), **CATT** (with evaluations), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, **CMCC** (with evaluations), **Samsung** (with evaluations), OPPO (with evaluation), Apple, NEC, Spreadtrum, Docomo, Sony
* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation is not supported in Rel-17
  + **Supported by**: LGE, **Nokia / NSN** (with evaluations), **Ericsson** (with evaluations), InterDigital
* TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation should be further studied
  + Supported by: Qualcomm

Based on the discussion above and request from two operators, it is proposed to agree on support of TRP based pre-compensation as working assumption, but to continue evaluation focusing on the impairments issue identified by two companies.

**Updated Proposal 2-1:**

Working assumption:

* Specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme is supported in Rel-17
  + FFS other details
* Continue evaluations of TRP pre-compensation scheme focusing evaluation on the following impairments:
  + Frequency offset estimation accuracy
  + Overhead of SRS or PUCCH/PUSCH
  + Performance impact from delayed application of frequency offset

Strong concerns: InterDigital, …

After GTW session, it was proposed to postpone the decision on support of TRP based precompensation scheme in Rel-17 until RAN1#104-bis-e meeting with aim to better align simulation results and possibly address the concerns raised by some companies.

Possible conclusion:

* The decision on support of specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme for HST-SFN scenario to be made in RAN1#104-e-bis meeting. To facilitate RAN1 decision, companies are encouraged to provide evaluation results according to the agreed evaluation assumptions. The evaluations not compliant with agreed assumptions will not be considered by RAN1 in the decision process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not object on the proposal. However, frequency pre-compensation is beneficial for HST scenarios for sure. A lot of companies already showed the performance benefits based on the agreed EVM assumption. There is clear requirement from operator, and with majority supporting and performance shown, we prefer to support pre-compensation as working assumption in this meeting, if companies find critical issues for the working assumption, we can some further discussion. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of this conclusion. We are looking forward to make the RAN1 decision on RAN1#104-e-bis based on common knowledge of the evaluation results that reflect the real deployment scenarios as we agreed in RAN1#102 meeting. |
| CATT | Companies that are interested in HST scenario already showed sufficient evaluation results based on the agreed EVM. I doubt similar argument will  continue over and over again, even if we can further extend the discussion to the next meeting. |
| ZTE | We can accept the proposal. However, we have to complain that we had provided simulation results based on the agreed EVM assumption, and show gain. We don't think the situation can be changed in the next meeting. To opponents, if you think the gain is not enough to deploy this feature, that is fine. But you cannot block the interesting gNB vendors and operators. |
| vivo | We have already provided some simulation results showing that TRP pre-compensation has considerable gain than scheme 1. Moreover, scheme 1 requires more UE complexity, that is one of my concerns in the first two e-meetings before we compromised to support scheme 1. TRP pre-compensation is a more friendly solution for UE.  In addition, if we still can’t agree the TRP pre-compensation in the last few days of  this meeting, I suggest companies to enable the AMC in the simulation for the next meeting, because fixed MSC may restrict TRP pre-compensation’s reachable maximum throughput. Anyway, we have seen the gain when we enable the AMC. One more thing we want to mention is the antenna radiation pattern for TRP should refer to Table 5 which was agreed in #102 e-meeting, that would cause a great effect of receive SNR at the UE side. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposed conclusion. We thank and appreciate the evaluation work conducted by our colleagues, and understand that pre-compensation could potentially be a viable option. That said, given that in HST, Doppler is not constant and it is in fact a time-varying side effect of the channel, we still think that we need a bit more time to better understand the impact of imposed overhead by implicit/explicit Doppler indication, accuracy of Doppler measurement, delay cycle between Doppler measurement to the instant of pre-compensation, etc. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the conclusion. It is recommended to consider impact from real deployment aspect as listed in InterDigital comments. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support the updated proposal. We agree with VIVO, network-based pre-compensation can serve as an alternative/auxiliary technique to Scheme 1, that can help reduce the burden of complex channel estimation and tracking at the UE |
| Samsung | Given the situation, we support the proposal. However, as one of many companies who already has shown the simulation results, we think that the performance gain of TRP-based pre-compensation seems already justified. Also, TRP-based pre-compensation scheme can be an alternative solution for UEs who do not support scheme 1. |
| OPPO | Support the conclusion. And we think the results from companies so far are compliant with agreed evaluation assumptions. |
| LG | We are supportive of FL’s conclusion. |
| Docomo | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support  We echo comments made by Nokia and InterDigital and encourage companies to consider real deployment aspects (estimation accuracy, latency consideration, SRS periodicity/overhead, etc. ). |
| Futurewei | Support the conclusion |
| Company | Comment |

Based on the recevied feedback the following offline conclusion was agreed:

Offline conclusion:

* The decision on support of specification based TRP pre-compensation scheme for HST-SFN scenario to be made in RAN1#104-e-bis meeting. To facilitate RAN1 decision, companies are encouraged to provide evaluation results according to the agreed evaluation assumptions. The evaluations not compliant with agreed assumptions will not be considered by RAN1 in the decision process.

## Issue #2-2 (QCL types/assumptions when TRS is source)

Regarding new QCL types/assumption for TRS, when TRS resource(s) is used as source RS in the TCI state. The following preferences on the QCL Variants (agreed in RAN1#103-e meeting) were provided by companies in their tdocs for TRP-based compensation schemes.

**Issue#2-2:** For TRP-based pre-compensation, when the same DMRS port(s) are associated with two TCI states containing TRS as source reference signal, at least one variant from RAN1#103-e meeting agreement is supported for Rel-17 HST-SFN scenario

* **Variant A**
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, OPPO, Huawei / HiSilicon, ZTE, CATT, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, …
* **Variant B**
  + **Supported by**: CATT, QC, Intel, …
* **Variant C**
  + **Supported by**: vivo, CMCC, …
* **Variant E**
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, …

Companies are invited to share their preference on QCL types/assumptions when TRS is used as source in TCI state for TRP-based pre-compensation scheme.

**Proposal 2-2:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Variant A. For Variant-B, the average delay and delay information from one link is missing. |
| OPPO | Support Variant A only. |
| ZTE | The same view as HW and OPPO |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Variant A |
| Spreadtrum | Support Variant A. |
| LG | Support Variant A |
| NEC | Support Variant A. |
| Sony | Support Variant A. And we are also fine with Variant E when a UE could be indicated to ignore some QCL properties in one out of 2 TCI states. |
| Vivo | Support Variant C, as analyzed in our tdoc, the average delay is mainly measured by SSB and TRS and then used for downlink timing. Thus from the perspective of adjusting downlink timing, UE referring to the average delay measured on only one of two TRSs is enough. |
| Nokia/NSB | If TRP-based pre-compensation scheme is supported, we prefer using pre-compensated TRS without new QCL type. |
| Futurewei | Support Variant A. It seems based on the implementation for the 2nd TRS, Variant E may also work. |
| InterDigital | First we need to agree on precompensation. |
| QC | Support variant B.   * It is the neatest solution with lowest UE complexity where Doppler shift/spread can be obtained from TRS of one TCI state and the delay spread/average delay is obtained from the SFN TRS (which has same time properties as the SFN DMRS/PDSCH). * Each TRSs of variant A don’t see the ‘combined’ SFNed channel of the DMRS/PDSCH. And the UE needs to process each TRS separately then combine both channels which may result into synchronization and matching issues as compared to the OTA combined channel of DMRS/PDSCH. |
| Ericsson | If pre-compensation is supported, issue #2-2, #2-3, #2-4 and #2-5 shall be discussed together, as they are related to each other. |
| Intel | Support Variant B.  RE to Huawei/HiSilicon. The TRS providing {average delay, delay spread} is transmitted in SFN manner (assumed to be presented for BC purpose), i.e. doesn’t correspond to one link |
| Samsung | Support Variant A, and E is also fine. |
| Moderator | The issue is dependent on conclusion for Issue #2-1. Meanwhile, Variant A has majority support and can be recommended as a proposal. |
| CATT | Support Variant A or Variant B. For Variant-B, the RS for delay profile estimation is transmitted in SFN manner from multiple TRPs. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support in principle. TRS transmission scheme associated with pre-compensation scheme should be emphasized prior to making QCL agreements, especially that different versions of pre-compensation schemes have been proposed |
| vivo | As it’s enough to adjust downlink timing by the average delay estimated by the anchor TRS in the first TCI state associated with QCL-TypeA, we are confused that what the usage of the average delay in the second TCI state is? It’s redundant to provide another average delay value in Variant A. |

## Issue #2-3 (Signalling of QCL types/assumption)

Regarding signalling of QCL type/assumptions for TRP-based pre-compensation scheme. Two approaches were mentioned by companies:

**Issue#2-3:** For TRP-based pre-compensation QCL assumptions is provided to the UE by using

* **Alt-1**: New QCL type
  + **Supported by**: Intel, Huawei / HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotMobility, Spreadtrum, Vivo, Futurewei, Qualcomm, CATT
* **Alt-2**: The existing QCL type(s) with certain QCL parameters dropped from the indicted QCL type
  + FFS rule to determine TCI state with dropped QCL parameters
  + **Supported by**: OPP, ZTE, Sony, LGE, NEC, Docomo, Apple, …

Companies are invited to share their preference on signalling option of QCL types/assumptions for TRP-based pre-compensation scheme.

**Proposal 2-3:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | We believe that in Alt-2, those parameters should not be dropped. The so-called “the certain QCL parameter” should be left to the UE implementation whether to be used or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt.1. In our understanding, if we support Variant-A, then it is straightforward to use new QCL type with {average delay, delay spread}. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-2 for less specification impact. |
| ZTE | Support Alt-2 for less specification impact.  We cannot accept Alt.1 since the TCI state with the new QCL type cannot be shared for Rel-17 pre-compensation SFNed PDSCH/PDCCH and other signals including non-Rel-17 MTRP PDSCH/PDCCH, single-TRP PDSCH/PDCCH and CSI-RS. The drawback of Alt.1 is as follows   * + The number of supported beams will be reduced or the required number of support TCI states should be increased.     - Based on the current specification, TCI states can be configured by RRC signaling usually to PDSCH, PDCCH, CSI-RS and also possible to UL signals as being discussed in agenda 8.1.1 for unified TCI framework. However, if the new QCL type E is introduced, one new TCI state can only be configured for SFN mannered PDSCH (possible also for SFN mannered PDCCH), but impossible to be configured for all other signals including CSI-RS, non-SFN mannered PDSCH, e.g. single-TRP based PDSCH, etc. even the same TRS resource is included in the new TCI state and legacy TCI state.       * For example, maximum 128 beams are needed for a UE where the first 64 TCI sates corresponding to 64 beams are for TRP 0, and the other 64 TCI states also corresponding to 64 beams are for TRP1. If all of the second 64 TCI states for TRP 1 are new QCL type which can only be used for SFN mannered PDCCH/PDSCH, another 64 traditional TCI states should be configured for non-SFN mannered PDCCH/PDSCH, CSI-RS for TRP1. So the number of configured TCI states for TRP 1 should be 64+64=128 for 64 beams. The total number of configured TCI states for both TRP0 and TRP1 should be 64+128 = 192 to support 128 beams. It is noted that only 128 TCI states are supported in the current specification.   + The flexibility of activated beams by MACCE will be sacrificed.     - Currently, maximum 8 TCI states can be activated by MACCE for both single-TRP and MTRP. However, if the new TCI state with new QCLtype is introduced, the activate 8 TCI states should be clearly split into two parts, and cannot be shared for single-TRP and MTRP anymore. Thus, 8 activate TCI states can only support maximum 4 beams to support Rel-17 SFN and Rel-15/16 schemes.   In our view, the TCI structure and signalling information can be the same as Rel-15/16. Once gNB schedules Rel-17 pre-compensation SFN transmission, UE can just leverage delay related parameters from the first or second indicated TCI state. The spec impact is very minor, e.g. UE assume only {average delay, delay spread} is used from the second indicated TCI state.  However, if we support new QCL type, RRC impact on TCI structure is needed, the number of configured/activated TCI states should be further discussed. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Alt-1. Agree with Huawei, this is clearly related to the outcome of Proposal 2-2. In case Variant A is supported, a new QCL type is needed |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.1. Share the same view with Huawei. |
| LG | Support Alt-2. |
| NEC | Support Alt-2. |
| Sony | Same view with OPPO that using existing QCL type would introduce less standard impact, but provide the same function. Support Alt-2. |
| Vivo | Support Alt.1. We prefer to specify a new QCL-type, i.e. {delay spreed}. |
| Docomo | Support Alt-2 for less specification impact. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-2 without introducing new QCL Type |
| Nokia/NSB | If TRP-based pre-compensation scheme is supported, we prefer using pre-compensated TRS without new QCL type. |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-1. |
| QC | Prefer Alt-1. |
| Ericsson | If pre-compensation is supported, issue #2-2, #2-3, #2-4 and #2-5 shall be discussed together, as they are related to each other. |
| Samsung | Support Alt-2. |
| Moderator | The issue is dependent on conclusion for Issue #2-1. Alt-1 is supported by slightly larger number of companies. |
| CATT | Alt-1 is slightly preferred. |

## Issue #2-4 (Indication of of the carrier frequency for UL)

Regarding indication of the carrier frequency for UL transmission. Several companies expressed their views regarding this issue, which are summarized below:

**Issue#2-4:** Indication of carrier frequency for TRP-based pre-compensation

* **Option 1** (implicit) from RAN1#102-e agreement
  + **Supported by**: Futurewei, OPPO, CATT, vivo, CMCC, Lenovo / Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Intel, NTT DOCOMO, …
* **Option 2** (explicit) from RAN1#102-e agreement
  + **Supported by**: Sony, Intel, Nokia / NSN (if supported), Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, …

Companies are invited to share their preference regarding indication option of the carrier frequency for UL.

**Proposal 2-4:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option-1 is fine |
| OPPO | Support Option 1. |
| ZTE | Support option 1 |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Option 1 |
| Spreadtrum | Support Option 1 |
| LG | Support option 1 |
| NEC | Support option 1. |
| Sony | Support Option 2. |
| Vivo | Support Option 1. |
| Apple | Depends on the targeted TRS pre-compensation case, especially TRS has to be shared with different UEs. Option 1 seems to be good enough |
| Nokia/NSB | Support option 2 (if TRP-based pre-compensation scheme is supported). Option 1 requires much specification impact such as “new SRS configuration (set)”, SRS triggering, SRS power control toward two TRPs, also higher SRS overhead is required. |
| Futurewei | Support Option 1. |
| InterDigital | Do not support. We need further studies,   * For Option 1, due to sparsity of SRS transmission, we need to evaluate accuracy and feasibility of SRS-based Doppler estimation * For Option 2, we need to study impact on CSI overhead |
| QC | We are fine with both options. Option1 is preferred along with SRS enhancement to improve Doppler estimation as highlighted in our tdoc. |
| Ericsson | If pre-compensation is supported, issue #2-2, #2-3, #2-4 and #2-5 shall be discussed together, as they are related to each other. |
| Samsung | Support Option 1. |
| Moderator | The issue is dependent on conclusion for Issue #2-1. Meanwhile, Option 1 has majority support and can be recommended as a proposal. |
| CATT | Support Option 1. |

## Issue #2-5 (QCL-like association between DL and UL RS)

Regarding support of QCL-like association between DL and UL RS, e.g. for carrier frequency indication in UL. Several companies expressed their views whether it requires specification support or can be up to UE implementation. Companies views on this issue are summarized below:

**Issue#2-5:** Whether to support QCL-like association between DL and UL RS?

* **Option 1**: QCL-like association of the resource(s) received in the 1st step with UL signal transmitted in the 2nd step is supported by specification. FFS between the following alternatives:
  + **Alt-1**: Explicit indication of the DL RS for QCL-like association
  + **Alt-2**: Implicit indication of DL RS for QCL-like association
  + **Supported by**: ZTE, Lenovo/MotMobility, Futurewei, Sony, CMCC, Ericsson (if supported), Qualcomm, …
* **Option 2**: QCL-like association of the resource(s) received in the 1st step with UL signal transmitted in the 2nd step is supported by implementation without specification impact
  + **Supported by**: OPPO, LGE, NEC, Nokia/NSB, CATT, vivo, Samsung, Intel, …

Companies are invited to share their preference on QCL-like association between DL and UL RS.

**Proposal 2-5:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Support Option 2. No specification impact is needed. |
| ZTE | Option 1 is slightly preferred. |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support Option 1 Alt-1. Existing fields in SRS configuration can be used |
| LG | Support option 2 |
| NEC | Support Option 2. |
| Sony | Support Option 1 to reduce additional DL signaling in control channel. In addition, we can leave Alt.1 and Alt.2 under Option 1 FFS. |
| Vivo | Support Option 2. Within the ability of frequency offset estimation in the NW side, no matter what the uplink carrier frequency is, the frequency pre-compensation value in the NW side can still be derived by the implementation. |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar to Option 2. No enhancement is needed for UL transmission. |
| Futurewei | Support Option 1 Alt 1. |
| QC | Support option 1. |
| Ericsson | If pre-compensation is supported, issue #2-2, #2-3, #2-4 and #2-5 shall be discussed together, as they are related to each other. |
| Samsung | Support Option 2 |
| Moderator | The issue is dependent on conclusion for Issue #2-1. Both options has similar support. Need further discussion. |
| CATT | Support Option 2. |

## Issue #2-6 (Indication of TRP pre-compensation scheme)

Some companies have provided their views regarding configuration of TRP pre-compensation scheme and support of dynamic switching with legacy schemes. Companies views on this issue are summarized below:

**Issue#2-6:** How to support switching/configuration of TRP pre-compensation with legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 schemes?

* **Alt-1**: Dynamic (DCI-based)
  + FFS which legacy schemes should support dynamic switching
  + **Supported by**: ZTE, Qualcomm, …
* **Alt-2**: Semi-static (RRC-based)
  + **Supported by**: InterDigital, OPPO, …

Companies are invited to share their preference on indication of TRP pre-compensation scheme.

**Proposal 2-6:**

* *TBD*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer Alt.1 |
| OPPO | Support Alt-2. The same mechanism as Issue#1-3 and Issue#1-4. |
| ZTE | The same solution as Scheme 1.  In addition, we think only one of Scheme 1 and TRP pre-compensation SFN can be configured by RRC signaling at a given time. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support Alt-2. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt-2. |
| LG | We have the same view with ZTE. One of scheme 1 and TRP pre-compensation SFN can be configured by RRC, and the same solution as scheme 1 can be supported for switching with Rel-15/16 schemes. |
| NEC | Support Alt-2. |
| Sony | Support Alt-2. |
| Vivo | Support Alt.1 |
| Docomo | Question to Alt. 1 (same question as #1-3): If TRP pre-compensation scheme is applied to PDCCH, what is the UE assumption to receive DCI? If the UE assumption to receive the DCI is based on the most recent DCI indication, how to handle the case if UE missed the DCI indication? |
| Apple | Prefer Alt 2 RRC based |
| Nokia/NSB | Pre-compensated TRS can be used to indicate if TRP-based pre-compensation scheme is supported. |
| Futurewei | Suggest to revisit after the supported schemes are decided. |
| QC | Support Al. 1 |
| Samsung | Support Alt1. |
| Moderator | Discuss later. Similar solution to scheme 1 can be considered as starting point. |

## Other issues

This section contains other issues that companies want to highlight for discussion regarding support of TRP-based pre-compensation scheme.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Support of SFN transmission of PDCCH

## Issue #3-1 (MAC CE indication for CORESET)

Several companies have provided discussion on higher-layer signalling enhancements to support MAC CE activation of two TCI states for PDCCH. Based on the discussion, the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 3-1:**

* *Working assumption*
  + *Support MAC CE activation of two TCI states for PDCCH*
    - *FFS other details*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support FL’s proposal |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| Sony | Support FL proposal. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Docomo | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Need further discussion for Issue 1-3/4 before discussing this proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP AI 8.1.2.1 |
| Samsung | Support |
| Moderator | There is no concern on the proposal itself. To address procedural issue raised by Ericsson suggest to make it as working assumption. |
| APT | We support this proposal and fine to have WA first. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Lenovo/MotM | As per the chairman’s guidance, SFN PDCCH is now discussed in AI 8.1.2.4, so it should be an agreement. OK to confirm with chairman though |
| OPPO | Support |

## Issue #3-2 (Default TCI for PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS)

In the context of supporting two TCI states for PDCCH, several companies have mentioned the issue of the default beam(s) for PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS. Based on the companies contributions the following proposal is made.

**Proposal 3-2:**

* *Study UE default beam behavior for the case when two TCI states are configured for a CORESET* 
  + *Consider the following scenarios of PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS transmissions*
    - *Scenario-1: For DCI format not having the TCI field*
    - *Scenario-2: For PDSCH scheduling offset less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL and the following two cases are considered.*
      * *Case1: SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from STRP*
      * *Case2:* *SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from M-TRP in Rel-16 (e.g. scheme 3/4), but UE is not capable of simultaneous reception of two beams*
    - *Scenario-3: For AP CSI-RS scheduling offset less than the threshold beamSwitchTiming / beamSwitchTiming-r16*
  + *Consider at least the following solutions:*
    - *Alt-1: gNB ensures the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot only configured with one TCI state by implementation*
    - *Alt-2: Modify the definition of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot, e.g. the lowest CORESET ID among the CORESETs associated with one TCI state in the latest slot*
    - *Alt-3: QCL assumption associated with one of TCI states, e.g. always selects the first or the second TCI state*
    - *Alt-4: QCL assumption associated with both of two TCI states*
    - *Alt-5: Select TCI state of PDSCH with a lower ID*
    - *Other alternatives are not precluded*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. We need to discuss and decide first which case need default TCI before list solutions for study. At least we are not convinced Scenario-1 and 3 are necessary. Scenario-2 may be discussed. |
| OPPO | The default TCI state for PDSCH should depend on the transmission scheme of PDSCH.   * If HST-SFN transmission is configured for PDSCH, two TCI states will be activated by MAC CE. Similar to S-DCI based M-TRP transmission, the lowest codepoint corresponding to two TCI states activated by MAC CE should be applied to the PDSCH if PDSCH scheduling offset less than the threshold *timeDurationForQCL*. * If other transmission scheme is configured for PDSCH, and the TCI state of the CORESET with lowest ID is expected to be applied to PDSCH by current specification, predefined one TCI state from the two TCI states can be applied to PDSCH if two TCI states are configured for the CORESET. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal for study |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support the proposal |
| LG | OK to study |
| NEC | Support to study. |
| Sony | We are open to study, but the default beam of PDSCH and Ap-CSI-RS seems not the 1st priority. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal  Regarding the comment from OPPO, we agree that Scenario-2 is related to the transmission cases discussed in our contribution. There are four possible options as follows:   * Case1: SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from STRP in Rel-15 * Case2: SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from MTRP in Rel-16 (including scheme 1a,2a,2b,3,4), and UE is capable of simultaneous reception of two beams * Case3: SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from M-TRP in Rel-16 (including scheme 3,4), but UE is not capable of simultaneous reception of two beams * Case4: SFN based PDCCH scheduling SFN based PDSCH from M-TRP, and UE is capable of simultaneous reception of two beams   We think case2 and case4 can reuse the legacy behaviour, e.g. corresponding to the lowest codepoint among the TCI codepoints containing two different TCI states. Only case1 and case3 should be considered here. Thus, we prefer to revise the proposal as follows:  **Proposal 3-2:**   * *Study UE default beam behavior for the case when two TCI states are configured for a CORESET*    + *Consider the following scenarios of PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS transmissions*     - *Scenario-1: For DCI format not having the TCI field*     - *Scenario-2: For PDSCH scheduling offset less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL, and the following two cases are considered.*       * *Case1: SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from STRP*       * *Case2:* *SFN based PDCCH scheduling PDSCH from M-TRP in Rel-16 (e.g. scheme ¾), but UE is not capable of simultaneous reception of two beams*     - *Scenario-3: For AP CSI-RS scheduling offset less than the threshold beamSwitchTiming / beamSwitchTiming-r16*   [The second sub-bullet in original proposal is not copied here to reduce redundancy] |
| Docomo | Support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support. Discuss after completion of high priority issues. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP AI 8.1.2.1 |
| Samsung | Support to study |
| Moderator | Recommend for agreement to capture list of aspect for discussion in the next RAN1 meeting |
| APT | This issue is important from our perspective. We support to discuss it. We also support moderator’s recommendation, but we don’t think we need to list cases now for Scenario 2 under the first sub-bullet. |
| CATT | Not support. This should be discussed together with AI 8.1.2.1 and we should focus our discussion on issues with high priority in this meeting. |
| OPPO | We are fine to discuss it in 8.1.2.1 or here. |
| LG | What is the reason to consider only case 1/2 for scenario-2? We think all cases such as case 1/2/3/4 provided by vivo can be considered, and UE behavior would be determined based on decision of supporting case. So, we think all possible cases should be considered for further discussion. |

**Updated Proposal 3-2:**

* *Study UE default beam behavior for the case when two TCI states are configured for a CORESET* 
  + *Consider the following scenarios of PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS transmissions*
    - *Scenario-1: For DCI format not having the TCI field*
    - *Scenario-2: For PDSCH scheduling offset less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL*
    - *Scenario-3: For AP CSI-RS scheduling offset less than the threshold beamSwitchTiming / beamSwitchTiming-r16*
  + *Consider at least the following solutions:*
    - *Alt-1: gNB ensures the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot only configured with one TCI state by implementation*
    - *Alt-2: Modify the definition of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot, e.g. the lowest CORESET ID among the CORESETs associated with one TCI state in the latest slot*
    - *Alt-3: QCL assumption associated with one of TCI states, e.g. always selects the first or the second TCI state*
    - *Alt-4: QCL assumption associated with both of two TCI states*
    - *Alt-5: Select TCI state of PDSCH with a lower ID*
    - *Other alternatives are not precluded*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Support study for scenarios #1 and #2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. At least we are not convinced for Scenario-1 and 3 are necessary. Scenario-2 may be discussed. Then, the listed solution need to be based on agreed scenarios. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Docomo | Support |
| vivo | Support. Prefer to consider all Scenario-1/2/3. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Share view with Huawei. We don’t see the alternative solutions to be listed this time.  Also, we need more clarification of distinguishing Scheme 1 from other M-TRP PDCCH schemes. Based on the solution, we can go into the details on default QCL assumption. |
| Moderator | I have modified the wording for study on the scenarios. Please indicate whether you have any concern on the proposal:  **Updated Proposal 3-2:**   * *Study UE default beam behavior for the case when two TCI states are configured for a CORESET*    + *Idetify scenarios to be considered for PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS transmissions*     - *Scenario-1: For DCI format not having the TCI field*     - *Scenario-2: For PDSCH scheduling offset less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL*     - *Scenario-3: For AP CSI-RS scheduling offset less than the threshold beamSwitchTiming / beamSwitchTiming-r16*   + *Consider at least the following solutions:*     - *Alt-1: gNB ensures the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot only configured with one TCI state by implementation*     - *Alt-2: Modify the definition of the lowest CORESET ID in the latest slot, e.g. the lowest CORESET ID among the CORESETs associated with one TCI state in the latest slot*     - *Alt-3: QCL assumption associated with one of TCI states, e.g. always selects the first or the second TCI state*     - *Alt-4: QCL assumption associated with both of two TCI states*     - *Alt-5: Select TCI state of PDSCH with a lower ID*     - *Other alternatives are not precluded* |
| CATT | Proposal 3-2 is not supported.  We don’t think these issues should be discussed with high priority in this meeting.  However, if majority companies agree to just list items for further study, we have the following comments:  For scenario-1 and 2, if two default beams are supported by UE (e.g., Alt-4), scheme 1 can still be enabled. However, if only a single default beam is supported by UE, the rest of alternatives listed above can be considered.  Therefore, our first comment is that UE default beam behavior is related to UE capability, and this issue should be take into account as well.  Besides, default beam behavior is also related the issue of switching between scheme 1 and singl-TRP/1a schemes. For example, for a UE not supporting two default beams, only one beam is used in scenario 1 or 2. If RRC-based semi-static switching is adopted and scheme 1 is configured to UE, in such case, how does UE understand the Tx scheme of PDSCH? Does this mean that dynamic switching between scheme 1 and singl-TRP/1a schemes is always possible even if RRC-based semi-static switching is adopted? |

## Issue #3-3 (Default spatial relation for PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH)

A few companies have mentioned the issue of the default Tx beam(s) for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH transmission in the context of supporting two TCI states for PDCCH. Based on the company’s contributions the following proposal is made.

**Proposal 3-3:**

* *Study use of TCI state with a lower ID as default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 if the CORESET with the lowest ControlResourceSetId is activated with two TCI states*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to study |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal for study |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to study. In current stage, we suggest to list all of options to downselect, e.g., the first TCI state, or the second TCI state. |
| NEC | Support to study. |
| Sony | We are open to study, but the UL default beam seems not the 1st priority as well at the moment. |
| Vivo | Support to study the default spatial relation for PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH.  And using TCI state with a lower ID is one potential method, other methods such as selecting the first or the second TCI state should also be considered. |
| Docomo | Support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support. Discuss after completion of high priority issues. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP AI 8.1.2.1 |
| Samsung | Support to study |
| Intel | Recommend for agreement to capture list of aspect for discussion in the next RAN1 meeting |
| APT | We support to discuss it. |
| CATT | Not support. We should focus our discussion on issues with high priority in this meeting. |
| QC | Support to study. |
| vivo | Support to study.  But using TCI state with a lower ID is just one potential method, other methods should also be considered.  We prefer to modify the proposal as follows:  **Proposal 3-3:**   * *Study the determination of TCI state as default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 if the CORESET with the lowest ControlResourceSetId is activated with two TCI states.*   + *Consider at least the following solutions:*     - *Select the TCI state with a lower ID*     - *Select the first or the second TCI state* |
| Moderator | Please indicate if you have any concern on the Updated Proposal 3-3 based on Vivo’s wording:  **Proposal 3-3:**   * *Study the determination of TCI state as default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 if the CORESET with the lowest ControlResourceSetId is activated with two TCI states.*   + *Consider at least the following solutions:*     - *Select the TCI state with a lower ID*     - *Select the first or the second TCI state* |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal in principle. However, default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 may not always be derived from CORESET in Rel-15/16. Hence, we suggest a note below:  **Proposal 3-3:**   * *Study the determination of TCI state as default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 if the CORESET with the lowest ControlResourceSetId is activated with two TCI states.*   + *Consider at least the following solutions:*     - *Select the TCI state with a lower ID*     - *Select the first or the second TCI state*   + *Note: Only the cases that the default spatial relation and PL-RS for dedicated-PUCCH/SRS/PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 is derived from CORESET with the lowest ControlResourceSetId in Rel-15/16 are considered.* |
| CATT | Proposal 3-3 is not supported.  We don’t think this issue should be discussed with high priority in this meeting. |

## Issue #3-4 (Issues related to BFR support)

Several companies have mentioned BFR issues that should be addressed for the UE configured with PDCCH monitoring associated with two TCI states. Based on the company’s contributions the following proposal is made.

**Proposal 3-4:**

* *Study support of the BFD for Rel-17 BFR and Rel-15/16 BFR when two TCI states are configured for a CORESET. Consider at least the following aspects:*
  + *Reference signal for BFD* 
    - *E.g. whether to consider only CORESETs with single active TCI state or both CORESETs with single and two TCI states, how to define rules for BFD RS selection, whether to support CSI-RS resource pairs or SSB pairs as BFD RS*
  + *Assumptions for hypothetical BLER calculation for PDCCH*
    - *E.g. whether RS in the two TCI states are directly used as the BFD RS or UE calculates one hypothetical BLER under SFN assumption based on two independent BFR RS*
  + *Configuration of NBI RS*
  + *UE behavior on monitoring the PDCCH candidate after BFD*
  + *Other aspects are not precluded*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Prefer to discuss the topic when we have more stability in M-TRP BM discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. Similar view with InterDigital. |
| OPPO | This topic can be discussed later. |
| ZTE | OK to study |
| Lenovo/MotM | Agree with InterDigital |
| Spreadtum | Fine to discuss it later. |
| LG | OK to study |
| NEC | Support to study. |
| Sony | Open to study. |
| Vivo | OK to study |
| Docomo | Support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support. Similar view with InterDigital. Need first focus on the high priority issues. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP BM AI 8.1.2.3 |
| Samsung | Okay to discuss. |
| Moderator | Recommend for agreement to capture list of aspect for discussion in the next RAN1 meeting |
| APT | OK to discuss it. But as IDC mentioned, it may be related to 8.1.2.3. |
| CATT | Not support. This should be discussed together with AI 8.1.2.3 and we should focus our discussion on issues with high priority in this meeting. |
| QC | There is dependency on M-TRP BM. It should be discussed in a later meeting. |

## Issue #3-5 (Identification of SFN-ed PDCCH scheme)

One company has mentioned the issue of identification of the Rel-17 SFN-ed when simultaneously used with Rel-17 non-SFN transmission scheme for PDCCH in HST-SFN scenario. Based on this discussion, the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 3-5:**

* *Study necessity of simultaneous support and identification of the SFN and non-SFN enhanced PDCCH transmission schemes discussed in agenda item 8.1.2.1*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Need further discussion. |
| OPPO | It is not needed to support M-TRP based PDCCH repetition (non-SFN) for PDCCH which is SFNed from different TRP. Simultaneous configuration of the SFN and non-SFN enhanced PDCCH transmission schemes is not supported. |
| ZTE | Could proponent clarify what the use case is , and how to support simultaneous SFN and non-SFN PDCCH. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Should be deferred until more details of SFN and non-SFN enhanced PDCCH transmission schemes are agreed |
| Spreadtrum | Fine to discuss it. |
| NEC | Further discussion later. |
| Sony | In our view, the SFN transmission scheme has better to be as much transparent as possible to UE. Can any concrete benefit be clarified by identifying SFN Tx and non-SFN Tx scheme? This may need more discussion. |
| Vivo | We are a little confused about the meaning of the proposal.  Does it mean that SFN PDCCH can be combined with non-SFN PDCCH together, e.g., SFN-ed PDCCH with TDM repetition, or SFN PDCCH and non-SFN PDCCH can be indicated separately for HST-SFN?  If it’s the former meaning, we support the proposal, because in the HST scenario, the PDCCH transmission between gNB and UE would suffer severe path loss due to metal coaches of the train. Therefore, in order to improve the reliability of PDCCH, SFN-ed PDCCH with TDM repetition can be considered. |
| Nokia/NSB | Related to the QCL indication method. First decide the other issues. |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP AI 8.1.2.1 |
| Samsung | We are fine to discuss this. We believe that SFN and non-SFN based enhanced PDCCH scheme can be differentiated by selecting which CORESET is used to transmit PDCCH from gNB. If CORESET with two TCI states is chosen, then SFN based scheme can be used. If two linked different CORESETs associated with two SS sets are used to transmit DCI, then non-SFN based scheme can be used. |
| Moderator | TBD |
| APT | We are open to discuss this issue, but it is necessary to clarify first which non-SFN transmission is considered here. Does it mean TDM, FDM or even PDCCH transmission with one TCI state? |
| CATT | Similar view as Lenovo, this should be deferred until more details of SFN and non-SFN enhanced PDCCH transmission schemes are agreed |
| QC | Out of scope for 8.1.2.4 agenda. It should be discussed under M-TPR PDDCH repetition (8.1.2.1) |

## Issue #3-6 SS-specific configuration of one/two TCI states

A few companies have mentioned the issue of search space specific configuration of one or two TCI states for SFN transmission of PDCCH. Based on this discussion, the following proposal is made:

**Proposal 3-6:**

* *Study support of configuration for one or two TCI States for different search spaces of PDCCH*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support, concern on the complexity. |
| OPPO | Not support. |
| ZTE | Not support. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support, this should be studied |
| Spreadtrum | Not support |
| LG | Support the proposal. SS-specific configuration can be useful. For example, both SFNed PDCCH and non-SFNed PDCCH can be supported based on single CORESET with two TCI states. |
| NEC | Not support. |
| Sony | Not support. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal.  One use case is to support dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP for PDCCH transmission. When one CORESET is configured with two TCI states, search spaces associated with the CORESET can be configured with one TCI state for STRP or both TCI states for MTRP. |
| Apple | Do not see a need, one or two TCI state is based on CORESET |
| Nokia/NSB | Not Support. |
| Futurewei | This seems to lead to many combinations and we are not sure if they are necessary. |
| Ericsson | This should be discussed together with Multi-TRP AI 8.1.2.1 |
| Samsung | Not support. CORESET with one or two TCI states would be enough. |
| Moderator | TBD |
| APT | We are not sure the meaning of this proposal, since it is CORESET to be associated with TCI states rather than SS. May need to clarify intention first. |
| CATT | Not support. CORESET-level configuration of TCI state(s) is sufficient. |
| QC | Not support. A CORESET with two TCI staes is sufficient. The proposal increases the complexity. |

## Other issues

This section contains other issues the companies want to highlight for discussion regarding support of SFN PDCCH transmission.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Issue #4-1 (Other non-categorized proposals)

The proposals supported by one company are provided below for consideration in the next RAN1 meetings.

* *A new definition on QCL association relationship of one antenna port and one antenna port group*
* *Support of small delay CDD with a properly adjusted delay offset between TRPs*
* *Support configuration of combination of SFN and TDM based PDCCH simultaneously*
* *Study additional QCL configuration constraints for TCI, e.g. TCI state shall be associated with the same QCL Type, i.e., QCL-TypeA and/or QCL-TypeD*
* *Introduce new QCL type-E with loose Doppler shift relationship between the target and source RS.*
* *Study zone-based configuration for TCI/QCL information to mitigate potential high signaling overhead.*
* *Support new QCL information indicating opposite polarity of Doppler shift between different transmissions.*
* *Support variable-rate TRS transmission for HST deployment scenario.*
* *TCI states configured in non-serving cell(s) with PCI either explicitly configured or implicitly associated*
* *Support of unified TCI state in DCI to trigger SP/AP-TRS followed by SP/AP-SRS*
* *DMRS adaptation for HST SFN scenario*
* *UE assisted DMRS adaptation for DL, in which UE provides an indication of the most convenient DMRS configuration*
* *Study PTRS design in case of SFN transmission scheme*
* *Dynamic DMRS configuration signaling to enable DMRS adaptation*
* *New SRS pattern for UL Doppler estimation purpose*
* *SRS allocation for Doppler measurements multiplexing with any UL or DL channel for the addressed UE*
* *Support transmitting DMRS REs for one antenna port in FDM fashion from both TRPs*
* *Study UE behavior when CORESET with multiple QCL type-D RSs is overlapped with another CORESET(s).*
* *Study TA issue in HST scenario*
* *Study small delay CDD with a properly adjusted delay offset between TRPs*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| vivo | SFN channel in the UE side would suffer the following problems:   * SFN signals from two TRPs might cancel out with each other at the middle point of two TRPs. * Lager delay between the SFN signals from two TRPs would cause deep and more frequent fading of the SFN channel, leading to performance degradation of SFN transmission.   Therefore, small delay CDD with a properly adjusted delay offset between TRPs can be studied to further enhance the performance of HST-SFN. |
| Ericsson | Comparing to some of the HST enhancement being discussed, the TA issue is more urgent for HST deployment that should be studied and resolved. |
| QC | * To improve UL Doppler estimation, proposes to introduce new SRS pattern comprised of a two non-consecutive SRS symbol repetition with a configurable time gap between the symbols. * Study mechanisms for dynamic DMRS configuration signaling to enable DMRS adaptation in HST environment. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Other issues

This section contains other issues the companies want to highlight.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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# Appendix (Summary of the agreements)

The agreements made in RAN1#102e and RAN1#103e meetings are provided below.

**RAN1#102e meeting agreements**

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For the discussion purpose consider the following categorization of the enhanced DL transmission schemes   * **Scheme 1**:   + TRS is transmitted in TRP-specific / non-SFN manner   + DM-RS and PDCCH/PDSCH from TRPs are transmitted in SFN manner * **Scheme 2**:   + TRS and DM-RS are transmitted in TRP-specific / non-SFN manner   + PDSCH from TRPs is transmitted in SFN manner   **Agreement**  Study the following aspects of the enhanced transmission schemes:   * **For scheme 1**:   + Target DL physical channels, i.e., PDSCH only or PDSCH + PDCCH   + Whether more than 2 QCL/TCI states are required and corresponding signaling details   + Whether and how to indicate scheme 1 for differentiation with Rel-16 non-SFNed transmission schemes with multiple QCL/TCI states   + QCL relationship between TRS and DMRS ports   + Note: Other schemes/aspects are not precluded * **For scheme 2**:   + Association of each MIMO layer of PDSCH to DM-RS antenna ports   + Whether more than 2 QCL/TCI states are required and corresponding signaling details   + Whether and how to indicate scheme 2 for differentiation with Rel-16 non-SFNed transmission schemes with multiple QCL/TCI states   Note: Other schemes/aspects are not precluded |

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Study TRP-based frequency offset pre-compensation including the following aspects:   * Aspects related to indication of the carrier frequency determined based on the received TRS resource(s) in the 1st step   + **Option 1**: Implicit indication of the Doppler shift(s) using uplink signal(s) transmitted on the carrier frequency acquired in the 1st step     - Indication for QCL-like association of the resource(s) received in the 1st step with UL signal transmitted in the 2nd step     - Type of the uplink reference signals / physical channel used in the 2nd step, necessity of new configuration and corresponding signaling details   + **Option 2**: Explicit reporting of the Doppler shift(s) acquired in the 1st step using CSI framework     - FFS: Indication for QCL-like association of the resource(s) received in the 1st step with UL signal transmitted in the 2nd step     - CSI reporting aspects, configuration, quantization, signalling details, etc. * New QCL types/assumption for TRS with other RS (e.g., SS/PBCH), when TRS resource(s) is used as target RS in TCI state * New QCL types/assumptions for TRS with other RS (e.g., DM-RS), when TRS resource(s) is used as source RS in the TCI state * Target physical channels (e.g., PDSCH only or PDSCH/PDCCH) and reference signals that should be supported for pre-compensation * Signalling/procedural details on whether/how the pre-compensation is applied to target channels * Whether multiple sets of TRS and pre-compensation on TRS is needed in 3rd step.   Note: Other aspects/schemes are not precluded |

**RAN1#103e meeting**

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Support at least the following configuration for HST scenario in Rel-17   * The same DMRS port(s) can associate with multiple TCI states   + FFS other details   Note: DMRS and PDCCH/PDSCH from different TRPs are transmitted in SFN manner  **Agreement**  At most two TCI states are supported for HST scenario in Rel-17   * FFS: Whether to support more than two TCI states for FR2 * FFS configuration/signalling details of the TCI states   Note: DMRS and PDCCH/PDSCH from different TRPs are transmitted in SFN manner  **Agreement**  When the same DMRS port(s) are associated with two TCI states containing TRS as source reference signal, at least one variant is supported for Rel-17 HST-SFN scenario based on further evaluations   * **Variant A**: One of the TCI state can be associated with {*average delay*, *delay spread*} and another TCI states can be associated with {*average delay, delay spread, Doppler shift, Doppler spread*} (i.e., QCL-TypeA) * **Variant B**: One of the TCI state can be associated with {*average delay, delay spread*} and another TCI state with {*Doppler shift, Doppler spread*} (i.e., QCL-TypeB) * **Variant C**: One of the TCI state can be associated with {*delay spread*}  and another TCI states can be associated with {*average delay, delay spread, Doppler shift, Doppler spread*} (i.e., QCL-TypeA) * **Variant E**: Both TCI states can be associated with {*average delay, delay spread, Doppler shift, Doppler spread*} (i.e., QCL-TypeA) * FFS: Indication method to apply QCL, e.g., via new QCL-type, or reuse existing QCL-type while UE to ignore certain QCL properties * Note: Each TCI state in the above variants may be additionally associated with {Spatial Rx parameter} (i.e., QCL-TypeD) * Note: Companies are encouraged to provide evaluation results for the above variants based on agreed EVM from RAN1#102e meeting * Note: Above variants are applicable to scheme 1 and/or TRP based pre-compensation as a reference for evaluation. * This agreement is for the purpose of evaluation and does not imply the support or lack of support of scheme 1 and/or TRP based pre-compensation |

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For PDCCH reliability enhancements, support SFN scheme + Alt 1-1.   * FFS: TCI state activation for CORESET, impact on default beam, BFD resource for BFR   Where the Alt 1-1 is agreed as:  Alt 1-1: One PDCCH candidate (in a given SS set) is associated with both TCI states of the CORESET. |