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# Introduction

This document summarizes remaining issues proposed in company contributions of AI 9.2.4 for the following objective in Rel-19 WI of NR MIMO Phase 5:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Specify enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenarios, assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios, without changing existing cell definition or defining a new cell (e.g. UL-only cell), assuming the Rel-17/18 unified TCI framework and fully reusing the legacy QCL/UL spatial relation rules, targeting FR1 and FR2
	1. Two closed-loop PC adjustment states for SRS, both separate from PUSCH; and pathloss offset configurations for pathloss calculation to UL TRP(s), when the pathloss RS is from DL sTRP.
 |

# Issues for Discussions

## Pathloss Offset

**Proposal 1.3B:**

Study whether to support Type 3 PHR reporting in a serving cell/BWP where the UE is configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.

* Continue to study whether to support including PL offset in the calculation of Type 3 PHR.

Mod: Quite a few companies (ZTE/MTK/China Telecom/Ericsson/CATT, Google) proposes/ok to study the scenario of transmitting Type 3 PHR in asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenario. However, Huawei/HiSilicon seems to have concern on it. My understanding is that it seems to be a valid issue, worthwhile for study.

* Support: ZTE, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, DCM, Tejas
* Concern: Samsung, ETRI

**Proposal 1.5:**

Study whether/how to facilitate gNB’s determination of the value of PL offset from specification point of view for FR2.

Mod: This has been discussed for quite a few meetings. I think we need to make a conclusion on that. The views diverged a lot. If we still cannot converge to study, we should conclude no discussion on that.

* Support: Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson, OPPO, Spreadtrum, ASUSTeK, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, vivo, QC, CATT, NEC, ETRI, Fujitsu, TCL, Sharp, Sony, Tejas, Transsion
* Concern: MTK, China Telecom, Huawei/HiSilicon, IDC, Lenovo, Google, LG, CMCC,

Table 1-2: Company input for Issues 1.x

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments** |
| Mod00 | Please share your views/inputs on the issues 1.x |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1.3B:** As we elaborated in round-1, Type 3 PHR should be supported for SRS transmitted towards DL TRP (e.g., AS SRS for DL CSI acquisition) that associated with the second separated CLPC adjustment state, which is the main and practical use case for introducing two separated CLPC adjustment states for SRS in Rel-19 asymmetric DL/UL mTRP. Consequently, PL offset of Type 3 PHR calculation seems not needed as per the above use case.**Proposal 1.5:** We think the spec impact of this issue is zero, we are also wondering what is the extra spec impact, if deemed existed. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.3B**: Given current condition for Type 3 PHR, we are not supportive.**Proposal 1.5**:We are fine with this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 1.3B**: Fine to have the study.**Proposal 1.5**: Fine to have the study. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 1.3B:** Ok to have the study.**Proposal 1.5**: We still think it is up to implementation and failed to see the potential spec impact. |
| Docomo | **Proposal 1.3B:** Support. If Type 3 PHR is supported, gNB can use it for calculation of PL-offset in FR2. Hence, we think this is beneficial.**Proposal 1.5:** Support. But, if Proposal 1.3B is agreed, we don’t see anything other to specify. |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1.5**:We prefer to conclude it, as suggested by FL. |
| Tejas | **Proposal 1.3B:** Fine to study further. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 1.3B** Not support.**Proposal 1.5** Support. |
| CATT | **Proposal 1.3B:** Fine to study..**Proposal 1.5:** Support. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 1.3B:** Okay to study**Proposal 1.5:** okay to study |
| Nokia | **Proposal 1.3B:** we believe that Type 3 PHR needs to be supported. We are ok with studying**Proposal 1.5** We support the study |
| Sony | **Proposal 1.3B:** We are fine to study.**Proposal 1.5:** Support |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1.3B:** support to study. It seems valid use case to support Type 3 PHR when PUSCH configured in the same CC and two closed-loop power control configured for SRS. **Proposal 1.5:** fine to study.In our understanding, @FR2, UE has to send two SRS resources with two different UL TCI states toward DL/UL TRP and UL TRP. However, the transmission power of those two SRS resources could be different and not known by NW. To calculate the PL offset, we tend to think Type 3 PHR (one for DL/UL TRP and the other one for UL TRP) could be helpful.  |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 1.3B:** support to study. We think that it would be beneficial to support the type-3 PHR, and it would be calculated without considering the PL\_offset.**Proposal 1.5:** support to study. |
| QC | **Proposal 1.3B:** We think Type-3 PHR is needed in some scenario, e.g., when two UL carriers are configured, one of the UL carrier is configured with SRS-only, the other UL carrier is configured with asymmetric DL/UL which is already possible without any enhancement. While we don’t see the need to consider PL offset for Type-3 PHR calculation since it is not clarified in which use case the UE needs to be configured with SRS but without PUSCH to the UL TRP.**Proposal 1.5:** Support. We are just wondering why this is only for FR2. For FR1, UE can transmit single SRS and both DL TRP and UL TRP can measure the SRS-RSRP and then derive the PL offset based on the SRS-RSRP difference. However, considering the UL coverage of the DL TRP and UL TRP are different which is the original intention to introduce the asymmetric DL/UL, it is possible that the SRS cannot be received by the DL TRP due the low SRS-RSRP to the DL TRP. In this case, it is unclear how can the network determine the PL offset. Therefore, we think both FR1 and FR2 need to be studied. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 1.3B**We do not think Type 3 PHR towards UL-only TRP is necessary, but we are ok to a further study.**Proposal 1.5**We think the PL offset estimation should be up to gNB implementation, but we are ok to a further study.  |
| CMCC | **Proposal 1.3B:** We support Type 3 PHR for SRS transmitted towards DL TRP. However, PL offset of Type 3 PHR calculation is not needed since SSB or CSI-RS from DL TRP is already configured as the pathloss RS.**Proposal 1.5:** Left to gNB implementation. |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 1.3B:**We think at least Type 3 PHR should be supported in asymmetric DL/UL deployment, which is necessary for SRS transmission of DL TRP. But whether PL offset should be considered in the calculation can be further discussed. **Proposal 1.5:**It can be up to gNB implementation, but ok to further study if it is majority view.  |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1.3B:** After further consideration, since it could be beneficial for the purpose of SRS antenna switching, we are okay with study. |

## Two Separate CLPC adjustment states for SRS

**Proposal 2.1**: Support DCI format 1\_1 to indicate TPC command for SRS CLPC adjustment states separate from PUSCH:

* This is subject to UE capability
* Introduce a 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator to indicate one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states, and a 2-bit TPC command indicator to indicate TPC command for one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states where:
	+ The 2-bit TPC command indicator are present for scheduled CC/BWP if UE reports supporting this UE capability, and a corresponding RRC parameter is configured.
	+ The 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator is present for the scheduled CC/BWP if the 2-bit TPC command indicator is present and two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states are configured

Mod: the views collected from round-1 discussion is as follows. The views diverged a lot and I guess the supporting companies need to explain more on the motivation and why it is needed.

* Support: Samsung, ZTE, MTK, CMCC, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, Google, ETRI, Fujitsu, Sharp, Sony, Apple, Tejas,
* Concerns: OPPO, HW, Spreatrum, Lenovo, LG, Xiaomi, vivo, QC, CATT, Panasonic, TCL, Transsion

**Proposal 2.2**: About the extended value range 1~X of starting bit of blocks in DCI format 2\_3 in Rel-19 assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios, down-select one from the following Alts in RAN1#118bis:

* Alt1: X = 45 for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum or FR2-2 and X = 43 otherwise –
	+ This feature is a separate UE capability and is appliable to any rel-19 UE who supports this UE capability, regardless this UE supports two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states or not.
* Alt2: X = 44 for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum for FR2-2 and X = 42 otherwise–
	+ This feature is only applicable to UE who is configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.

Mod: My suggestion is to list both Alt1 and Alt2, and we do down-selection in RAN1#118bis. The views on Alt1 and Alt2 diverged a lot now. And the views input during round-1 discussion are:

* Alt1: Samsung, MTK, HW, Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, QC, Intel, TCL, Sony, Apple, Transsion, ETRI,
* Alt2: ZTE, CMCC, OPPO, Lenovo, Google, Fujitsu, Panasonic,

**Proposal 2.3:** RAN1 to study whether/how to use DCI format 2\_3 to trigger the transmission of SRS resource configured with multiple entries in *availableSlotOffsetList*

* For example, define one default slot offset for this case without adding new field for this; add one SRS offset indicator field in DCI format 2\_3.

Mod: Majority companies support 2.3 based on the inputs in round-1:

* Support: Samsung, ZTE, MTK, CMCC, Ericsson, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, Google, LG, Xiaomi, ETRI, Fujitsu, Intel, Sharp, Sony, Tejas, Transsion
* Concern: HW, vivo, QC, CATT, TCL,

**Proposal 2.4:**

* Study how to apply PL offset for SRS resource set when the SRS resource set is not configured with TCI state
* Study how to apply one of the two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states on the SRS resource set when the SRS resource set is not configured with TCI state
	+ E.g., defining i0 as the default CLPC for SRS resource set in this case. E.g,, configure one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states to the SRS resource set.

Mod: Majority companies support 2.4 based on the inputs in round-1:

* Support: Samsung, ZTE, MTK, CMCC, Ericsson, HW, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, Google, LG, Xiaomi, CATT, NEC, ETRI, Fujitsu, Intel, TCL, Sharp, Sony, Apple, Tejas, Transsion
* Concern: OPPO, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, QC,

**Proposal 2.5:**

The IE *SRS-CarrierSwitching* can be configured when separate SRS CLPC(s) is configured regardless PUSCH is configured or not.

Mod: The motivation for proposal 2.5 is that in current 38.331, the description on the IE *SRS-CarrierSwitching* restricts that this IE can be configured only when PUSCH is not configured and separate SRS CLPC is configured. That is not true at least for the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios. CATT suggested to correct it.



Table 2-2: Company input for Issues 2.x

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company**  | **Comments** |
| Mod00 | Please share your views/inputs on the issues 2.x |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2.1:** Support the updated version for progress.**Proposal 2.2:** Fine to further down-select between Alt1 and Alt 2. Besides, given that two RRC parameters are dedicated to the starting bit position of block in DCI format 2\_3 (i.e., *startingBitOfFormat2-3* for NUL carrier, *startingBitOfFormat2-3SUL* for SUL carrier), we think the case of SUL is out of scope and should be precluded due to:* As stated in WID, Rel-19 asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP assumes intra-band and non-co-located mTRP scenarios, in which SUL is precluded.
* Given that Rel-19 asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP can facilitate coverage enhancement of UL transmission, the necessity of supporting SUL is marginal and redundant.

In light of this, we suggest to capture the assumption in WID as follows.**Proposal 2.2**: About the extended value range 1~X of starting bit of blocks in DCI format 2\_3 in Rel-19 that assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios, down-select one from the following Alts in RAN1#118bis:* Alt1: X = maximum payload size of DCI format 1\_0 – 1
	+ This feature is a separate UE capability and is appliable to any rel-19 UE who supports this UE capability, regardless this UE supports two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states or not.
* Alt2: X = maximum payload size of DCI format 1\_0 – 2
	+ This feature is only applicable to UE who is configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.

Mod: implemented**Proposal 2.3:** Support.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Basically, we think this discussion is good for clarification. Nevertheless, there is no such misunderstanding in RAN1 specs as per the discussion in previous meetings. Instead, we think it is proper and also sufficient to send an LS to RAN2 to fix this discrepancy. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.1**: Actually our comment was that we need to introduce different condition for two new fields. * For 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator, we think that it is based on the case when RRC parameter supporting two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states is configured.
* For 2-bit SRS TPC command indicator, we think that it is based on separate parameters (e.g., UE capability and/or RRC parameter) from the parameters for 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator above.

So, 2-bit SRS TPC command indicator can be used for the case when a UE has a single SRS CLPC separate from PUSCH, especially for SRS antenna switching.Hence, we would like to suggest one more time as we mentioned in the previous round.**(Updated) Proposal 2.1**: Support DCI format 1\_1 to indicate TPC command for SRS CLPC adjustment state(s)separate from PUSCH:* Introduce a 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator to indicate one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states, and a 2-bit TPC command indicator to indicate TPC command for one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states, where
	+ 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator is present for scheduled CC/BWP where two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states are configured.
	+ 2-bit TPC command indicator is present for scheduled CC/BWP if the UE reports a separate UE capability (independent from UE capability of supporting rel-19 two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states) and the corresponding RRC parameter (which is different with an RRC parameter for two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states) is configured.

Mod: I understand your intention here is to use this new feature of DCI format 1\_1 for all the rel-19 Ues who is configured with either single separate SRS CLPC or two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states. Similarly to 2.2, I guess here we also need to discuss the applicable case of this new feature (if agreed)Mod2: @Samsung, your suggestion is implemented in the proposal 2.2. Re the 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator, I think it is present if two separate SRS CLPCs are configured and also the new 2-bit TPC command field is present ( the reason is the SRS CLPC shall be present only when the UE has two separate SRS CLPCs and also the system enable this new UE feature)**Proposal 2.2.** Support Alt1. It can be beneficial for all Ues supporting this feature regardless of supporting two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states. Hence, it is good to introduce this feature by subject to a separate UE capability.**Proposal 2.3.** We are fine to study.**Proposal 2.4.** We are fine to study.**Proposal 2.5.** We are fine with ZTE’s suggestion. |
| Spreadtrum | **Proposal 2.1**: Not support. It would change the original intention since Rel-15 where only DCI 2\_3 can indicate TPC command for SRS. We have not seen strong motivation to do the enhancement specially for asymmetric DL/UL scenario in Rel-19. We have agreed to the enhancement on DCI 2\_3 and introduce PL offset, which are enough for asymmetric DL/UL scenario.**Proposal 2.2**: Support, and prefer Alt1.**Proposal 2.3**: Not support. The conclusion in Rel-17 is still valid. Even for Rel-18 UL M-TRP, there is also no enhancement on DCI 2\_3 for this issue. We have not seen the necessity to do the special enhancement for asymmetric DL/UL scenario.**Proposal 2.4**: Ok to study.**Proposal 2.5**: Ok |
| Mod | Re 2.5, my understanding is:1. If we want RAN2 to correct that for all the releases, then this shall be discussed in section 7 and then a LS is sent to RAN2
2. If we make the decision in our session, we can only ask RAN2 to fix that in spec of release 19 and an agreement based on proposal 2.5 would be sufficient.
 |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 2.1**: Not support. Support only DCI 2\_3 to indicate TPC command for SRS as explained in the first-round discussion.**Proposal 2.2**: Support. We prefer Alt2 since it is caused by the increased bits of a block for a UE configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.**Proposal 2.3**: Support.**Proposal 2.4**: Not support. We understand that an SRS resource should either be configured with a TCI state or be indicated to follow the indicated unified TCI state according to the current specification.**Proposal 2.5**: Support in principle. |
| Docomo | **Proposal 2.1:** Support the updated version**Proposal 2.2:** OK except for “assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios”. We don’t think the limitation is necessary. At least, A-HetNet scenario can includes sTRP scenario.**Proposal 2.3:** Support. We see a value of the proposal. Re Spreadtrum’s comment, Rel.17 conclusion does not preclude possibility for Rel.19.**Proposal 2.4:** OK.**Proposal 2.5:** Support. |
| Tejas | **Proposal 2.2:** Support. Our preference is Alt 1 that provisions the extension to be applicable to any rel-19 UE, including UL mTRP UE.**Proposal 2.5**: Support in principle. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 2.1** Support.**Proposal 2.2** Support. We prefer Alt1.**Proposal 2.3** Support. **Proposal 2.4** Support. **Proposal 2.5** Support.  |
| Mod | Revise the wording in 2.2 by including the particular values for X:* Per the current spec, the size of DCI 1\_0 could be up to 46 bits for the operations in FR1 in shared spectrum or FR2-2 and 44 otherwise.
* Alt1 is the size of DCI 1\_0 – 1 while Alt2 is the size of DCI 1\_0 -2.

Also revise the wording in 2.1 to implement Samsung’s comments. |
| CATT | **Proposal 2.1:** Not support. Same comment as in round1.**Proposal 2.2:** Fine to further down-select between Alt1 and Alt 2 and prefer to Alt2.**Proposal 2.3:** Not support. Same comment as in round1.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Support and we would like to clarify that we do not have to change anything in RAN1 spec, the same as ZTE mentioned. We also agree to send an LS asking RAN2 to fix this issue. |
| Nokia | **Proposal 2.1** we support**Proposal 2.2** We support Alt1. We are ok with the moderator’s latest text proposal**Proposal 2.3** we support**Proposal 2.4** we support**Proposal 2.5** we are fine with ZTE’s suggestion as well |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2.5** it seems proper to send RAN2 an LS to address this issue as suggested by ZTE. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 2.2:** support Alt.1.**Proposal 2.3:** ok.**Proposal 2.4:** ok.**Proposal 2.5:** support. |
| QC | **Proposal 2.2:** Not support. As we commented in round 1, we don’t see strong motivation to introduce additional solution given DCI 2\_3 is already supported. In addition, DCI 1\_1 is used for PDSCH scheduling which is used more frequent than SRS power control, introducing 3 bits could lead to high burden for DCI 1\_1 and degrade the performance of DCI 1\_1.**Proposal 2.3:** Support Alt.1.**Proposal 2.4:** As we elaborated inround 1, we don’t think the current spec allows to not configure any TCI state for an SRS resource set (details can be found in our round 1 comment). In our view, the issue is not about how to determine the PL offset, CLPC adjustment state because these parameters are tied to the TCI state and based on the current spec, the NW needs to configure at least one TCI state for SRS resource with lowest ID in the SRS resource set. Then given the fact that at least one TCI state need to be configured for SRSs in the SRS resource set, the issue becomes how can the network configure the Type-D QCL info for initial beam acquisition (detailed analysis can be found in round 1 discussion). Therefore, we propose to study:Proposal 2.4: Study whether to allow the QCL source RS in the joint/UL TCI state to be optional. **Proposal 2.5:** We are fine with this in principle, while we prefer ZTE’s suggestion to send LS to RAN2 to fix this misalignment between RAN1 spec and RAN2 spec since this issue is not specific for asymmetric DL/UL, even for legacy, such misalignment exists between the current RAN1 spec and RAN2 spec. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2.1**We support the proposal and the updated proposal by Samsung. DCI 1\_1 is well established and used in real networks, compared to the UE common DCI 2\_3 which is less used in real networks. As explained earlier, CLPC for separate SRS using only the dedicated DCI, e.g. DCI 1\_1, will significantly reduce the increased PDCCH blocking probability and scheduling latency due to NW needs to schedule both DCI 1\_1 and DCI 2\_3. We’ve showed in our contribution simulation result on PDCCH blocking probability impact comparing using DCI 1\_1 or DCI 2\_3 for CLPC. We also showed PDCCH performance impact with respect to DCI sizes to address concerns on increasing the size of DCI 1\_1 raise by some of the companies from last meeting. It is also a big advantage that only using DCI 1\_1 will reduce the network and UE implementation complexity, and improve the over all system performance. **Proposal 2.2**For this proposal only one value is needed for each alternative, because the size of DCI 2-3 is determined by the size of DCI 1-0, not by the X configuration in RRC. And in RRC configuration in ASN, it is very common to only configure the max length, same rule shall be followed here. We can agree on this proposal and adding a note in the agreement, without impact the specification, as our compromise.**Proposal 2.2**: About the extended value range 1~X of starting bit of blocks in DCI format 2\_3 in Rel-19 assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios, down-select one from the following Alts in RAN1#118bis:* Alt1: X = 45 ~~for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum or FR2-2 and X = 43 otherwise~~ –
	+ This feature is a separate UE capability and is appliable to any rel-19 UE who supports this UE capability, regardless this UE supports two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states or not.
* Alt2: X = 44 ~~for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum for FR2-2 and X = 42~~ otherwise–
	+ This feature is only applicable to UE who is configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.

**Proposal 2.3**We are fine to study. **Proposal 2.4**Support |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2.1:** Support. **Proposal 2.2:** Support Alt2. Alt1 is out of the scope of Rel-19 MIMO.**Proposal 2.3:** Support.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Separate SRS CLPC should be decoupled with SRS carrier switching to let asymmetric DL and UL transmission can be configured in non-CA case. |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 2.1:** Support. Introduce DCI 1\_1 to indicate the TPC command for SRS CLPC can be an essential complementary for UEs who doesn’t want to support DCI 2\_3 but want to support the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment, which will expand the deployment in pratical network.**Proposal 2.2:** Support to down-select, and prefer Alt 2. **Proposal 2.3:** Support.**Proposal 2.4:** Support.**Proposal 2.5:** Support and agree with ZTE. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2.1:** Thanks FL for good wording suggestion. We are fine with the latest updated Proposal 2.1 in principle. Some minor wording update is additionally suggested with the following reasons.It seems that the 1st bullet “This is subject to UE capability” can be removed since it is already reflected in 1st sub-bullet in the 2nd bullet.Also, based on the updated proposal, it is possible to have two cases as follows:* 2-bit SRS TPC command field
* 2-bit SRS TPC command field + 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator

1st case above is corresponding to a single SRS CLPC separate from PUSCH and 2nd case is corresponding to two SRS CLPC separate from PUSCH. To include 1st case, we would like to put bracket as follows:**Proposal 2.1**: Support DCI format 1\_1 to indicate TPC command for SRS CLPC adjustment state(s) separate from PUSCH:* ~~This is subject to UE capability~~
* Introduce a 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator to indicate one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states, and a 2-bit TPC command indicator to indicate TPC command for one of the separate SRS CLPC adjustment states where:
	+ The 2-bit TPC command indicator are present for scheduled CC/BWP if UE reports supporting a UE capability, and a corresponding RRC parameter is configured.
	+ The 1-bit SRS CLPC indicator is present for the scheduled CC/BWP if the 2-bit TPC command indicator is present and two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states are configured

**Proposal 2.2:** We are fine with Ericsson’s update having a single maximum payload size as 45 and 44 for Alt1 and Alt2, respectively.On top of that, since all companies have same understanding that asymmetric MTRP is applied to NUL case, but views are not merged yet on SUL case (we are not supportive on SUL though), we would like to suggest one more bullet to limit the value range extension only for RRC parameter for NUL (i.e., *startingBitOfFormat2-3*).Based on this bullet, we think that “assuming intra-band intra-DU non-co-located mTRP scenarios” can be deleted.**Proposal 2.2**: About the extended value range 1~X of starting bit of blocks in DCI format 2\_3 in Rel-19, down-select one from the following Alts in RAN1#118bis:* Alt1: X = 45 ~~for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum or FR2-2 and X = 43 otherwise~~ –
	+ This feature is a separate UE capability and is appliable to any rel-19 UE who supports this UE capability, regardless this UE supports two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states or not.
* Alt2: X = 44 ~~for operations in FR1 in shared spectrum for FR2-2 and X = 42~~ otherwise–
	+ This feature is only applicable to UE who is configured with two separate SRS CLPC adjustment states.
* Above extended value range is applied to *startingBitOfFormat2-3*.

**Proposal 2.3**: To clarify more, we think that when there are multiple entries in *availableSlotOffsetList,* the conclusion Fujitsu brought up prohibits the below two cases:1. Using DCI format 2\_3 with SRS TPC command
2. Using DCI format 2\_3 with SRS TPC command + SRS triggering

We think that prohibiting at least 1) is not reasonable, so we are fine with relaxing the restriction on 1).Regarding 2), we are open to discuss, but not sure whether example solutions in Proposal 2.3 is in-scope or not. |

## SLS evaluation Results for the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios

Companies provided evaluation results to study the time difference between UL TRP and macro TRP in the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenarios. The results are captured here for your reference.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#**  | **Evaluation results** |
| 3.1 | ZTE/Sanechips and China Telecom provided SLS results of uplink propagation delay difference between macro and micro TRPs:And they provided the following observation:***Observation 2:*** *In asymmetric UL sTRP/ DL mTRP scenarios applied with one single TAG, uplink propagation delay difference between macro and micro nodes of ~70% UE cannot meet the timing error limit Te in both FR1 and FR2. As a result, it will negatively lead to that the performance of the vast majority of uplink transmissions cannot be guaranteed or the network has to deploy more dense micro nodes.* |
| 3.2 | Samsung provided the following SLS evaluation results:Figure 3. Empirical CDF of uplink propagation delay differences for all scheduled UEsSamsung explained that for x=4 micro cells distributed in each of the macro cells, more than 50% of the scheduled UEs would have their uplink propagation delay differences between their scheduling micro cells and the corresponding macro cells greater than the timing error limit Te of 114.0 ns (at FR2). This number becomes to more than 60% for x=2.Figure 4. Normalized UPT performances for x=2 and x=4 with 2 TA valuesSamsung explained that for both x=2 (i.e., 2 micro cells distributed per macro cell) and x=4 (i.e., 4 micro cells distributed per macro cell), with appropriate UL timing adjustments/alignments towards the scheduling cells, the average UPT performance can be significantly improved. |
| 3.3 | NTT DOCOMO also provided system level evaluation results on the timing difference between macro TRP and UL TRP:Figure 3 CDF of time differences for all UEs between DL macro-UE and UL TRP-UE.Observation 1:* When only one TA is used in asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenario, for FR1@30KHz with ISD=500m, more than 76% UEs could not meet the requirement on Timing Error Limit; for FR2@120KHz with ISD=200m, more than 54% UEs could not meet the requirement on Time Error Limit.
 |

Mod: All these evaluation results generally suggests that the uplink time difference between Macro TRP and UL TRP for many UEs could be pretty large in the asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP deployment scenarios.

# Proposals for Online Discussion

# Contributions in RAN1#118

1. R1-2405873 Enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Huawei, HiSilicon
2. R1-2405878 On Rel-19 Asymmetric mTRP Operation InterDigital, Inc.
3. R1-2405890 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios MediaTek Inc.
4. R1-2405906 Enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Spreadtrum Communications
5. R1-2405937 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Tejas Networks Limited
6. R1-2405983 Discussion on enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios CMCC
7. R1-2406026 Enhancements for asymmetric DL/UL scenarios Intel Corporation
8. R1-2406031 Discussion on enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios ZTE Corporation, Sanechips, China Telecom
9. R1-2406086 Discussion on enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios China Telecom, ZTE
10. R1-2406180 Discussion on asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios vivo
11. R1-2406263 Enhancements on asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios OPPO
12. R1-2406265 Discussion on asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios TCL
13. R1-2406282 Discussion on enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Xiaomi
14. R1-2406313 Discussion on UL-only mTRP operation Fujitsu
15. R1-2406366 On asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios CATT
16. R1-2406455 "Enhancement for Asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP Scenarios " Panasonic
17. R1-2406469 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Sony
18. R1-2406524 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Lenovo
19. R1-2406544 Discussion on enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP and UL mTRP scenarios NEC
20. R1-2406647 Views on Rel-19 asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Samsung
21. R1-2406701 Discussion on enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Transsion Holdings
22. R1-2406724 Discussion on UL enhancement through asymmetric DL and UL ETRI
23. R1-2406748 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Nokia
24. R1-2406803 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP UL mTRP scenarios Ericsson
25. R1-2406834 Enhancements for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP Apple
26. R1-2406928 Discussion on enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios NTT DOCOMO, INC.
27. R1-2407005 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP/UL mTRP scenarios Sharp
28. R1-2407027 Enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP and UL mTRP deployment scenarios Qualcomm Incorporated
29. R1-2407112 Discussion on enhancement for asymmetric DL sTRP and UL mTRP scenarios Google
30. R1-2407123 Discussion on asymmetric DL sTRP and UL mTRP ASUSTeK