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# Introduction

*Briefly introduce background, the scope of this email discussion (e.g. list of treated agenda items) and provide some guidelines for email discussion if necessary.*

*List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round*

* 1st round: TBA
* 2nd round: TBA

It is appreciated that the delegates for this topic put their contact information in the table below.

**Contact information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Moderator (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell) | Dimitri Gold | [dimitri.gold@nokia-bell-labs.com](mailto:dimitri.gold@nokia-bell-labs.com) |
| CATT | Yanze Fu | fuyanze@catt.cn |
| Samsung | Wang, He (Jackson) | h0809.wang@samsung.com |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)

## Background and scope

This document will be used to guide and summarize the email discussion for the topic of Rel-17 NR HST FR2 enhancements RRM core requirements maintenance, with the email thread identifier “[104‑e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1”.

In this email thread, the following agenda items are discussed:

* 9.7.2 RRM core requirement maintenance
  + 9.7.2.1 RRC Idle/Inactive and connected state mobility requirements
  + 9.7.2.2 Timing and signaling characteristics requirements
  + 9.7.2.3 Measurement procedure requirements

The following WFs were approved previously:

* R4-2103679, WF on Rel-17 NR HST FR2 enhancements, RRM requirements, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#98-e.
* R4-2105794, WF on FR2 HST RRM requirements, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#98-bis-e.
* R4-2115334, WF on FR2 HST RRM requirements (part 1), Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#100-e.
* R4-2115335, WF on FR2 HST RRM requirements (part 2), Samsung, RAN4#100-e.
* R4-2120292, WF on FR2 HST RRM requirements (part 1), Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#101-e.
* R4-2120416, WF on FR2 HST RRM requirements (part 2), Samsung, RAN4#101-e.
* R4-2202594, WF on FR2 HST RRM (part 1), Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#101-bis-e.
* R4-2202767, WF on FR2 HST RRM (part 2), Samsung, RAN4#101-bis-e.
* R4-2206848, WF on FR2 HST RRM (part 1), Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#102-e.
* R4-2210608, WF on HST FR2 RRM Core Requirement Maintenance, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, RAN4#103-e.

As a moderator for FR2 HST enhancements RRM discussion, we would like to suggest the following candidate target of 1st and 2nd round email discussion:

* 1st round:
  + In Topic#1, some of the issues still require further discussion. It is necessary to align understanding of the companies of all possible UL timing adjustment mechanisms, if/when relaxation in UL transmit timing accuracy requirements is allowed.  
    The agreements shall be reflected in the CR.
  + In Topic#2, no new Issues were introduced. The companies need to align on the issues that were discussed for the several meetings already.  
    The agreements shall be reflected in the CRs.
* 2nd round:
  + Achieve agreements on all remaining open issues and finalize the corresponding maintenance CRs.

## Email discussion guidelines

The moderator would like to ask companies to adhere to the following guidelines, when taking part in [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1.

Please also check the “RAN4#104-e meeting arrangements and guidelines”, available on the reflector, for fundamental guidelines and deadlines.

The preferred method of commenting is to add/update your company’s view directly in this email summary document (use change marks whenever appropriate) and upload it to [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 draft folder corresponding to the stage of the meeting, e.g., pre-meeting, first round, second round.

* Draft folder:  
  [[104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1?login=1)  
  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1>
* It is expected that delegates will download the latest version (including other companies’ versions) of the summary document, insert comments and upload it again.
* To ensure the comments are captured timely and correctly, delegates are encouraged to:
  + Rename the file by adding your company name and changing the file version.  
    Example:  
    “Summary\_104-e\_206\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1\_r1\_**v05\_CATT\_Nokia**.docx” -> “Summary\_104-e\_206\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1\_r1\_**v06\_Nokia\_QC**.docx”
  + There is no need to send e-mails in the reflector when comments in the summary are added.
  + Please, check for updated base document versions, right before uploading your updates.
* Please, do not hesitate to mark your company as supporting a certain option directly in this document.  
  Please refrain from rewriting existing options and proposed WFs; ask the moderator (in your company’s comment) to modify/add.
* It is encouraged to give a short reasoning for each view expressed (1-2 sentences are recommended).  
  Please avoid statements like “Option X”, without further explication or reasoning.

# Topic #1: UL timing

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2211595](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211595.zip) | Qualcomm, Inc. | **FR2 HST RRM core**  **Observation 1-1**: The transmission restriction or any other requirement imposed before RACH can’t eliminate the interference across UEs on UL since the UL transmission after RACH has a misaligned frame boundary with the UL transmission from UEs in the old TCI state. Moreover, DL signals from different RRHs also arrived with misaligned frame boundaries due to propagation delay difference.  **Observation 1-2**: Since UL gradual timing adjustment is still applicable to UE, before RACH procedure and 200ms after TCI state switch, UE still follow the previous TCI state timing up to Tq autonomous adjustment, which is much smaller than CP and frame boundary misalignment has negligible impact to the UEs on the previous TCI state, at least much smaller than UE Tx after RACH.  **Observation 2**: We can eliminate cross UE interference on UL only when all UEs are transmitting on the same timing regardless of TCI state, otherwise UL transmission from UEs with different TCI states from different RRHs have misaligned frame boundaries.  **Proposal 1**: Network applies different offsets to DL frame boundaries of different RRHs to pre-compensate the propagation delay difference across different RRHs to eliminate UL and DL interference across UEs when UEs in the same region are on different TCI states from different RRHs. Network doesn’t schedule UL transmission if network can’t handle different UL reception timing on different RRHs. After all the UEs are on the TCI states from the same RRH in the same region, network schedules RACH session to all UEs to acquire new UL and (uncompensated) DL timing.  **Proposal 2**: If proposal 1 is too complicated for network implementation, given that transmission restriction can not eliminate UL interference across different TCI states, no additional requirement should be defined.  [Moderator]: Observation and proposal below are treated in Topic#2.  **Observation 3**: Interference on SSBs in FR2 HST is rare since (1) trains crossing each other is rare and duration is very short due to high speed (2) no interference across SSBs due to the agreed constraints on consecutive SSBs. With negligible interference, enhanced (faster) L1-RSRP measurement is sufficient for FR2 HST.  **Proposal 3**: Follow FR1 HST, do not introduce L1-SINR measurement delay requirement enhancement. |
| [R4-2211674](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211674.zip) | CATT | **Discussion on remaining issues of timing and signal characteristics requirements for HST FR2**  **Proposal 1**: When highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled, after the TCI state switch, option 4 is acceptable. |
| [R4-2212473](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212473.zip) | Samsung | **Remaining issues on RRM core requirement for FR2 HST**  **Observation 1**: There are different ways in practice to perform RA-based UL timing adjustment, by considering PDCCH-order (for RA triggering) is sent from the source RRH or target RRH.  **Observation 2**: The issue of UE transmission in the new TCI state after TCI state switching but before the new TA is acquired cause more negative influence for the case in which PDCCH-order is sent from new TCI after TCI switching.  **Proposal 1**: No need to transmit or scheduling restriction for UL after the TCI state switch, when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled.  [Moderator]: Two proposal below are treated in Topic#2.  **Proposal 2**: For SMTC limit in HST FR2 enhancement requirements, to adopt the below Option 1, i.e.,  Option 1: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply.  **Proposal 3**: For L1-SINR measurements core requirement, do not define enhancement for L1-SINR. |
| [R4-2213342](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213342.zip) | Ericsson | **RRM remaining issues for HST FR2**  **Proposal 1**: Support Option2, no impact on UE behavior after TCI state switch.  [Moderator]: Proposal below is treated in Topic#2.  **Proposal 2**: Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR unless practical use cases can prove the necessity. |
| [R4-2213387](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213387.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **On HST FR2 UL Transmit Timing Requirements**  **Observation 1**: The UE is able to track fine DL timing after the TCI state switch in HST FR2 scenarios even after the large jump in propagation delay and when target TCI state was not in the active TCI state list.  **Observation 2**: Currently, for some UE categories in HST FR2 deployments, it is allowed to transmit in UL with a larger timing error after the TCI state switch (±7Ts instead of ±3.5Ts= Te). It is defined and unclear on the network side when and how the UE shall adjust its timing back within ±Te.  **Observation 3**: In the case of HO, after the HO interruption time (TS 38.133, Clause 6.1.1.4.2), the UE can transmit in UL with the timing error limit within ±Te.  **Proposal 1**: RAN4 to specify explicitly when the UE shall adjust its UL timing to within ±Te after the TCI state switch, i.e., when it can follow again the reequipments from 7.1.2.1.  **Proposal 2**: If target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list, limit the time needed for the UE to follow again clause 7.1.2.1 requirements and to adjust its UL timing within ±Te. It should happen not later than Trs + 2ms after the TCI state switch.  **Observation 4:** Using either network-based (e.g., RACH-based) or large one-shot UL timing adjustment mechanisms, the UE should be able to achieve transmit timing error within ±Te after the TCI state switch. However, no UL timing error requirements are defined explicitly for TCI state switch in TS 38.133.  **Proposal 4:** RAN4 to introduce UE initial transmission timing error requirement after the TCI state switch.  **Proposal 5:** UE initial transmission timing error shall be less than or equal to ±Te where the timing error limit value Te is specified in Table 7.1.2-1. This requirement applies when it is the first transmission after the TCI state switch. |
| [R4-2213399](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213399.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario** |
| [R4-2213866](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213866.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Discussion on remaining issues of Timing for HST FR2**  **Proposal 1**: In order to align the understanding from different companies, further clarification on the agreement bout the accuracy of UL transmit timing is necessary. Our understanding is as below:   * If largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17 is disabled, accuracy relaxation is not allowed. Otherwise, accuracy relaxation is allowed possibly and needs further decision by the UE. * If largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17 is enabled, since the one-shot TA adjustment is triggered by TCI state switching plus the contrast between DL timing difference and the threshold, so immediately after each TCI state switching, UE needs to check whether accuracy relaxation is allowed. The following cases are possible:   + Case 1: If UE can only track one TCI state     - If the DL timing difference is above the threshold, the accuracy relaxation is allowed.     - Otherwise, the accuracy relaxation is not allowed.   + Case 2: If UE can track multiple TCI states and the target TCI state is not in the list     - If the DL timing difference is above the threshold, the accuracy relaxation is allowed.     - Otherwise, the accuracy relaxation is not allowed.   + Case 3: If UE can track multiple TCI states and the target TCI state is in the list     - The accuracy relaxation is not allowed no matter whether the DL timing difference is above the threshold or not.   **Proposal 2**: We agree with the relaxation of UL transmit timing accuracy from legacy ±Te to ±7Ts in FR2. So the brackets can be removed.  For RACH based solution,  **Proposal 3**: Compared with Option 1 and Option 3, Option 4 is more feasible. However Option 4 is somehow radical since no matter inter-RRH TCI state or intra-RRH TCI state switch occurs, the transmit restriction is always applied.  **Proposal 4**: Aim to optimize the scheduling/transmit restriction, the threshold of DL timing difference is useful. For the exact value of threshold, re-use the value determined for one-shot TA adjustment is fine. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1: Large one-step UL timing adjustment

*Sub-topic description:*

One shot large UL timing adjustment for FR2 Power Class 6 UE requirements are formulated in TS 38.133, Clause 7.1.2.3, and some of the values are still in square brackets:

|  |
| --- |
| **7.1.2.3 One shot large UL timing adjustment for FR2 Power Class 6 UE**  When *highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* is configured and *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is enabled for UE supporting FR2 power class 6 and [*largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17*] capability, the following requirements apply to the UE:  - If the absolute value , the requirement in clause 7.1.2.1 apply to the first UL transmission after a TCI state switch.  - Otherwise, the UE transmit timing immediately after TCI state switch shall be and clause 7.1.2.1 requirements don’t apply.  - The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts], and the reference point is .  Above,  - (in units) is the DL timing defined as the time when UE receives downlink frame with new target TCI state.  - (in units) is the DL timing defined as the time when UE receives downlink frame with old source TCI state. |

#### Issue 1-1-1: Time period of relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy

* Background:

Following the requirements from Clause 7.1.2.3

* When highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 is configured and highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is enabled for UE supporting FR2 power class 6 and [largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17] capability
* And the absolute value
* And the new target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list

The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±[7Ts].

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Observation 1 (Nokia): The UE is able to track fine DL timing after the TCI state switch in HST FR2 scenarios even after the large jump in propagation delay and when target TCI state was not in the active TCI state list.
  + Observation 2 (Nokia): Currently, for some UE categories in HST FR2 deployments, it is allowed to transmit in UL with a larger timing error after the TCI state switch (±7Ts instead of ±3.5Ts= Te). It is defined and unclear on the network side when and how the UE shall adjust its timing back within ±Te.
  + Observation 3 (Nokia): In the case of HO, after the HO interruption time (TS 38.133, Clause 6.1.1.4.2), the UE can transmit in UL with the timing error limit within ±Te.
  + **Proposal 1** (Nokia): RAN4 to specify explicitly when the UE shall adjust its UL timing to within ±Te after the TCI state switch, i.e., when it can follow again the reequipments from 7.1.2.1.
  + **Proposal 2** (Nokia): If target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list, limit the time needed for the UE to follow again clause 7.1.2.1 requirements and to adjust its UL timing within ±Te. It should happen not later than Trs + 2ms after the TCI state switch.
* Candidate options
  + Option 1 [Nokia]: Adopt Proposals 1 and 2.
  + Option 2: Keep current spec as it is: *The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts].*
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to share their understanding whether UL transmit timing accuracy shall return to within ±Te=4.5Ts from ±7Ts after the TCI state switch and when.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Regarding Proposal 1 in Option1, we can not find reason to specify the UL timing after a TCI state switch since it’s identical to legacy TCI state switch.  Between Proposal 2 in Option 1 and Option 2, We prefer Proposal 2 in Option 1 which can close the loop.  Besides of that, Trs in Proposal 2 shall be replaced by Tssb if going with Proposal 2. Trs represents SMTC priority in current specification. And, *7Ts* shall be replaced by 7\*64 Tc. |
| QC | As the analysis shown in the previous meeting contribution, gNB can capture almost all the power with 7Ts UL timing error margin, and therefore leave the further convergence of UL timing to UE implementation doesn’t break the system. Also, as we explained in the previous contribution, DL timing estimation error is not the source contributing to additional timing errors, calibration error is the major source. Therefore, guarantee convergence according to additional DL RS is not feasible from UE perspective. In addition, the first UL timing error has the reference timing of , while 7.1.2.1 requirement has , therefore mixing 7.1.2.1 and 7.1.2.3 lead to infeasible and incorrect requirement.  To sum up, proposal 1 and 2 in option 1 is infeasible from UE implementation perspective, and it is also incorrect specification. Therefore, we should keep spec as it is and select option 2. |
| Nokia | Firstly, we would like to clarify the understanding of current requirements in Clause 7.1.2.3 with other companies: *Are reduced UL transmit timing requirements (i.e., ±7Ts) are applicable all the time after the TCI state switch or only shortly after the switch?*  Currently, the requirement states that: “Otherwise, the UE transmit timing **immediately after TCI** state switch … and **clause 7.1.2.1 requirements don’t apply**”. What “immediately” means?  In our view, the UE shall be able to adjust it’s UL transmit timing within ±Te if not immediately after the TCI state switch then, some time after that. It is not clear, *why UE cannot achieve Te accuracy and convergence after TCI state switch if this can be achieved after HO?*  Thus, we propose to limit the time when reduced UL transmit timing accuracy is allowed after the TCI state switch. NW needs this information to be aware of the scale of UL transmit timing error and to optimally schedule UL transmissions after the TCI switch.  We support Option 1, and Proposal 2 is the concrete formulation that is also reflected in our CR R4-2213399.  **To QC:**  As we argued at the previous meeting, the most part of the energy can be captured only if the error in UL timing is positive, i.e., 7Ts, and the signal is received at gNB later, with a delay. However, if the error is negative, i.e., -7Ts, then the signal is transmitted from the UE too early and arrives too early at the gNB. In this latter case, the energy is concentrated further way from the reception window. |
| QC | The “immediately after TCI state switch” refers to the first UL after TCI state, as the parallel description on small DL timing difference case.  In HO, the timing difference is much smaller than the scenario under discussion, as it typically happens in the middle of two cells.  For Nokia’s comment on 7Ts or -7Ts, given that the correct timing is on the center of CP/2 and CP/2 ~ 9Ts, -7Ts timing error can be accommodated similarly as 7Ts. If we follow Nokia’s argument, we need to restrict the timing error to positive, instead of reduce it to +/-Te, because even -Te the signal arrives too early. |
| Nokia2 | We would like to thank QC for the answers to our questions!  However, we still have some additional questions and comments:   1. If ““immediately after TCI state switch” refers to the first UL after TCI state”, then do you still expect that gradual timing adjustment requirements (7.1.2.1) will become applicable at some point after the TCI state switch, i.e., not for the first UL? 2. It is not clear to us why for HO timing difference is much smaller? HO can also be associated with a jump in propagation of the same scale as the TCI state switch. For example, in the scenario below, RRH1 and RRH2 can belong to the same or different cell. In the first case (same) it will be a TCI state switch, whereas in the second one (different), it will be a HO. In both cases a jump in propagation delay will be similar in magnitude. 3. It is described in the requirements that UL transmit timing is relative the first tap of DL signal received at the UE. Hence, UL transition takes place ahead of the DL reference, and the timing is defined by the value of timing advance (TA). Therefore, TA value defines the begging of UL transmission (i.e., of the whole UL symbol), and not when the middle of CP is transmitted. Correspondingly, up to our understanding, an error in UL transmit timing should be relative to the beginning of the symbol and not to the CP/2. |
| ZTE | We understand and agree with the motivation of Option 1.  For the Proposal 2 in Option 1, another condition that DL timing difference larger than threshold can be added. So the Proposal 2 can be revised as:   * **Proposal 2** (Nokia): If target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4], limit the time needed for the UE to follow again clause 7.1.2.1 requirements and to adjust its UL timing within ±Te. It should happen not later than Trs + 2ms after the TCI state switch. |
| QC | To address Nokia’s question   1. We can compromise to have Tq requirement in 7.1.2.1 applicable to UL slots except the first after TCI state switch, but as we pointed out in the previous comment, Te part of 7.1.2.1 is not applicable due to inapplicability of reference timing from 7.1.2.1 to 7.1.2.3. 2. If you are talking about HO in FR2 HST uni-directional model, the correct comparison is RACH case, and whether the timing requires relaxation, it’s a new issue so we can have further discussion by checking RACH procedure. 3. The gNB or RRHs should have tolerance for negative timing offset since even in legacy requirement, -3.5Ts offset is possible. And the same remedy applies to -7Ts, similar to extend 3.5Ts to 7Ts. The point is the total delay spread is not exceeding CP/2 and gNB can select the best window to accommodate timing errors. |
| OPPO | Prefer option 2 to keep the current agreements. |
| Samsung | We are open to discuss on Option 1 (adopting both P1 and P2).  Although in the original requirement, no restriction is provided on the time point required to UE to follow the clause 7.1.2.1, still P1 has the merit because RAN4 finally define accuracy requirement after the switching for one shot large timing adjustment procedure.  Still need more time to evaluate P2. |
| Huawei | Regarding proposal 1 and proposal 2 in option 1, in our understanding, after one shot UL timing adjustment, UE shall perform gradual UL timing adjustment with Tq step (as legacy requirements). It is noted that after UE complete one shot adjustment, the reference timing is and there is a certain duration in which the timing error can not be within Te. The duration length is not easy to specify.  Regarding option 2, in general we are fine. |

#### Issue 1-1-2: Value of relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy

* Background

Following the requirements from Clause 7.1.2.3

* When highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 is configured and highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is enabled for UE supporting FR2 power class 6 and [largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17] capability
* And the absolute value
* And the new target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list

The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±[7Ts].

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + **Proposal 1** (ZTE): We agree with the relaxation of UL transmit timing accuracy from legacy ±Te to ±7Ts in FR2. So the brackets can be removed.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to indicate whether they support Proposal 1 or not.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We interpret that Proposal 1 is identical to Option 2 in Issue 1-1-1. We can use the agreement on Issue 1-1-1. |
| QC | We support proposal 1. |
| Nokia | We think that that the previous Issue 1-1-1 shall be clarified before the square brackets can be removed. |
| ZTE | Proposal 1 just tries to affirm the exact value of relaxed UL timing error since in last meeting we are not sure about the value of ±7Ts, so the brackets were kept. Not referring to the question discussed in Issue 1-1-1. |
| OPPO | Support proposal 1. |
| Samsung | Agree with proposal 1 i.e., the bracket can be removed. |
| Huawei | We think 7 Ts is reasonable, as 7 Ts is 2\*Te considering the error from Told and Tnew.  But we had a general question (also mentioned in Issue 1-1-2): if target TCI state is not in the active TCI list, shall UE first complete TCI state switching (to acquire the fine timing of new beam)? Then UE perform one shot adjustment. Otherwise how does UE know ? If our understanding is correct, our question is why we need to distinguish the case “new target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list” and “in the active TCI state”. Even new target TCI state is in the active TCI state list, considering the equation , the error is still 7Ts. |

### Sub-topic 1-2: Other remaining UL transmit timing issues

*Sub-topic description:*

This sub-topic is devoted to the discussion of other remaining UL transmit timing issues. The focus is:

1. On general requirement on UL transmit timing accuracy after the TCI state switch.
2. On the requirement when *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is disabled.

#### Issue 1-2-1: Initial UL transmit timing after TCI state switch

* Background

The requirements when large one-step timing adjustment mechanism is enabled are described in Clause 7.1.2.3.

The requirements on the UE initial transmission timing error are described in Clause 7.1.2.

Gradual UL transmit timing adjustment requirements are present in Clause 7.1.2.1.

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Observation 1 (Nokia): Using either network-based (e.g., RACH-based) or large one-shot UL timing adjustment mechanisms, the UE should be able to achieve transmit timing error within ±Te after the TCI state switch. However, no UL timing error requirements are defined explicitly for TCI state switch in TS 38.133.
  + **Proposal 1** (Nokia): RAN4 to introduce UE initial transmission timing error requirement after the TCI state switch.
  + **Proposal 2** (Nokia): UE initial transmission timing error shall be less than or equal to ±Te where the timing error limit value Te is specified in Table 7.1.2-1. This requirement applies when it is the first transmission after the TCI state switch.
  + **Proposal 3** (ZTE): In order to align the understanding from different companies, further clarification on the agreement bout the accuracy of UL transmit timing is necessary. Our understanding is as below:
    - If largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17 is disabled, accuracy relaxation is not allowed. Otherwise, accuracy relaxation is allowed possibly and needs further decision by the UE.
    - If largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17 is enabled, since the one-shot TA adjustment is triggered by TCI state switching plus the contrast between DL timing difference and the threshold, so immediately after each TCI state switching, UE needs to check whether accuracy relaxation is allowed. The following cases are possible:
      * Case 1: If UE can only track one TCI state
        + If the DL timing difference is above the threshold, the accuracy relaxation is allowed.
        + Otherwise, the accuracy relaxation is not allowed.
      * Case 2: If UE can track multiple TCI states and the target TCI state is not in the list
        + If the DL timing difference is above the threshold, the accuracy relaxation is allowed.
        + Otherwise, the accuracy relaxation is not allowed.
      * Case 3: If UE can track multiple TCI states and the target TCI state is in the list
        + The accuracy relaxation is not allowed no matter whether the DL timing difference is above the threshold or not.
* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 [Nokia]: UE initial transmission timing error after the TCI state switch shall be less than or equal to ±Te. Enhance the requirement in 7.1.2.
  + Option 2 [ZTE]: If largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17 is enabled, target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list, and the DL timing difference is above the threshold the accuracy relaxation is allowed.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are invited to share their view on the general understanding of UL TX timing accuracy after the TCI state switch.
  + Companies are encouraged to discuss whether a general requirement (Option 1) can be introduced, and/or an exception (Option 2) shall be kept.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Regarding option 1, we can wait for outcome of Issue 1-1-1.  Regarding Option 2, case 1 and case 2 both can be treated as **‘**target TCI state is not in the list**’,** Case 3 is **‘**target TCI state is in the list ’which is identical to agreed TCI state switch. We think the case ‘target TCI state is not in the list’ is what issue 1-1-1 and 1-1-2 shall deal with? If the above understanding is wrong, please correct us. |
| QC | Option 1 covers the scenarios outside FR2 HST, and this out of scope option should be excluded.  Option 2 is agreeable and already captured in the spec:  *The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts].*  Note that target TCI state can’t be in active TCI state if UE can only track one TCI state. |
| Nokia | Based on the analysis presented in our discussion paper [[R4-2213387](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213387.zip)] and also by ZTE, almost for all types of UL transmit timing adjustment, after the TCI state switch (with or without highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17) the accuracy shall stay within ±Te.    The only exception (steps 12, 15) shall be clarified and is discussed in the Issue 1-1-1.  In any case, we see it beneficial to define the accuracy of the first UE transmission timing accuracy after the TCI state switch.  If the companies has concerns that such a requirements is too generic, we can apply it to Power Class 6 UEs one.  Such a requirement can be added in 7.1.2 as following:  The UE initial transmission timing error shall be less than or equal to ±Te where the timing error limit value Te is specified in Table 7.1.2-1. This requirement applies:  - when it is the first transmission in a DRX cycle for PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS, or it is the PRACH transmission, or it is the msgA transmission, or it is the first transmission sent on the PSCell for activating the deactivated SCG without RACH, or it is the first transmission sent by Power Class 6 UE after a TCI state switch.  Then,   1. The requirements in 7.1.2.3 can be simplified because only the case with the exception from 7.1.2 need to be described, 2. Requirements in 7.1.2 will also cover the case when UL timing requirement when large one-step mechanism is disabled (i.e., RACH-based procedure) discussed in the following Issue 1-2-2.   We support Option 1 but Option 2 can be still discussed further based on the outcomes of Issue 1-1-1. |
| ZTE | Yes, as moderator said, Option 1 is the general requirement same as legacy. Option 2 is the exception case introduced for PC6 one-shot TA solution. So we suggest we only need to add the exception case and give clear condition, not need to repeat general requirement again, since 7.1.2.1 has specified. |
| Samsung | We need to clarify firstly why this is needed to be discussed, considering the very clear requirement is already given:  *The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts].\* |
| Huawei | Could proponent of option 1 clarify this is for the gradual timing adjustment or for one shot adjustment.  In general, option 2 is fine, however we had a question, why we only consider the case “target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list”. Even when target TCI state is in the active TCI state list, considering the error from both Tnew and Told, the UL timing error is 2\*Te. |

#### Issue 1-2-2: UL timing requirement when large one-step mechanism is disabled

* Background

Chairman notes from RAN4#102-e [RP-220925]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * The conditions when one shot large UL timing adjustment requirements apply are FFS * Requirements for the case when [*largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17*] is not enabled need to be defined and are FFS. It is not precluded to reuse legacy requirements. |

At RAN4#103-e, the discussion continued, and the following agreement and WF were achieved [R4-2210608]:

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-1: Requirements for the case when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled**  **Agreement**:  No need to introduce new UL timing requirements for the case when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled.  **Issue 1-3-2: Scheduling/Transmit restriction after TCI state switch**  **Way Forward**:  Further discussion is needed whether and how to define transmit or scheduling restriction for UL after the TCI state switch when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled.   * Option 2: No impact on UE behavior * Option 3: Define scheduling restriction on DL and UL after inter-RRH TCI state switch and before PRACH transmission when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled * Option 4: after the TCI state switch, the UE shall not transmit except for RACH preamble in the new target TCI before one of the following conditions is fulfilled:   - the new timing advance is acquired and applied in the target TCI state according to the requirements in clause 7.3;  - the UL transmission is scheduled by the gNB.  In this case, the requirements in clause 7.1.2.1 apply.   * Other options are not precluded |

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Observation 1-1 (QC): The transmission restriction or any other requirement imposed before RACH can’t eliminate the interference across UEs on UL since the UL transmission after RACH has a misaligned frame boundary with the UL transmission from UEs in the old TCI state. Moreover, DL signals from different RRHs also arrived with misaligned frame boundaries due to propagation delay difference.
  + Observation 1-2 (QC): Since UL gradual timing adjustment is still applicable to UE, before RACH procedure and 200ms after TCI state switch, UE still follow the previous TCI state timing up to Tq autonomous adjustment, which is much smaller than CP and frame boundary misalignment has negligible impact to the UEs on the previous TCI state, at least much smaller than UE Tx after RACH.
  + Observation 2 (QC): We can eliminate cross UE interference on UL only when all UEs are transmitting on the same timing regardless of TCI state, otherwise UL transmission from UEs with different TCI states from different RRHs have misaligned frame boundaries.
  + **Proposal 1** (QC): Network applies different offsets to DL frame boundaries of different RRHs to pre-compensate the propagation delay difference across different RRHs to eliminate UL and DL interference across UEs when UEs in the same region are on different TCI states from different RRHs. Network doesn’t schedule UL transmission if network can’t handle different UL reception timing on different RRHs. After all the UEs are on the TCI states from the same RRH in the same region, network schedules RACH session to all UEs to acquire new UL and (uncompensated) DL timing.
  + **Proposal 2** (QC): If proposal 1 is too complicated for network implementation, given that transmission restriction can not eliminate UL interference across different TCI states, no additional requirement should be defined.
  + **Proposal 3** (CATT): When highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled, after the TCI state switch, option 4 is acceptable.
  + Observation 3 (Samsung): There are different ways in practice to perform RA-based UL timing adjustment, by considering PDCCH-order (for RA triggering) is sent from the source RRH or target RRH.
  + Observation 4 (Samsung): The issue of UE transmission in the new TCI state after TCI state switching but before the new TA is acquired cause more negative influence for the case in which PDCCH-order is sent from new TCI after TCI switching.
  + **Proposal 4** (Samsung): No need to transmit or scheduling restriction for UL after the TCI state switch, when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled.
  + **Proposal 5** (Ericsson): Support Option2, no impact on UE behavior after TCI state switch.
  + **Proposal 6** (ZTE): Compared with Option 1 and Option 3, Option 4 is more feasible. However Option 4 is somehow radical since no matter inter-RRH TCI state or intra-RRH TCI state switch occurs, the transmit restriction is always applied.
* Candidate options:
  + Option 2 [Ericsson, QC, Samsung]: No impact on UE behavior (no additional requirements)
  + Option 3: Define scheduling restriction on DL and UL after inter-RRH TCI state switch and before PRACH transmission when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is disabled
  + Option 4 [CATT, ZTE]: After the TCI state switch, the UE shall not transmit except for RACH preamble in the new target TCI before one of the following conditions is fulfilled:
    - the new timing advance is acquired and applied in the target TCI state according to the requirements in clause 7.3;
    - the UL transmission is scheduled by the gNB.  
      In this case, the requirements in clause 7.1.2.1 apply.
  + Option 5 [QC]: Network applies different offsets to DL frame boundaries of different RRHs to pre-compensate the propagation delay difference to eliminate UL and DL interference.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are invited to discuss the candidate options in the 1st round.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We support Option 2 because the impacted time period is limited and the probability of impacting to other UL transmission is rare in HTS FR2 scenario. |
| QC | We proposed option 5 as a complete resolution to the issue raised by Nokia. We oppose option 4 because Tq requirement still applies to UE, and therefore before RACH, the UE in the new TCI state has timing aligned with UE in the old TCI state, no frame boundary misalignment exists. Therefore, option 4 can’t improve the system performance. In addition, ZTE also recognize the throughput impact in intra-RRH TCI state switch cases, and proposal 1 in issue1-2-3 is the remedy of this issue. However, as we commented in issue 1-2-3, proposal 1 is not feasible and therefore, option 4 can’t resolve interference but can introduce performance degradation. |
| Nokia | We still support Option 4 for the following reasons:   1. Option 4 avoids UL transmissions (i.e., PUCCH, PUSCH or SRS) with wrong UL timing after the TCI state switch. It is safe approach that does not seem to contradict any possible RACH-based implementation. Moreover, transmission with wrong UL timing contradicts the design principles of UL timing adjustment in NR in general. 2. It clearly defines what requirements apply when *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is disabled, i.e., that PRACH procedure is used. 3. It provides the way to avoid PRACH procedure in the case when the TCI state switch without propagation delay jump (intra-RRH), i.e. when the UL transmission can be scheduled directly.   However, to allow more flexibility in the choice of the procedure when *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is disabled, we have a **compromise proposal in the previous Issue 1-2-1**. If a requirement on the first UL transmission timing accuracy after the TCI state switch is defined, no changes in Clause 7.1.2.3 will be needed anymore.  Additionally, we have a few comments on the observations and proposal by other companies:  **To QC:**  We acknowledge that in the case when multiple UEs are considered to be connected to the neighboring non-collocated HST FR2 RRHs, additional interference at UL/DL symbol borders can be present. However, in Rel-17 we have a general approach to consider only CPE per train:  Number of CPE devices per train/carriage:   * RAN4 requirement can be defined based on the baseline of 1 CPE device per train.   Thus, it will be hard to agree on possible scenarios with multiple CPE at this meeting. Moreover, the solution in Proposal 5 is rather complication from NW implementation point of view. For example, it requires monitoring of all connected UEs and their movement directions in the cell, and the definition of the value of offset is not trivial. We are open to discuss this issues further, but in Rel-18 WI.  However, even with one UE in the HST FR2 scenario it is still possible that UL Rx and DL Tx clash at the gNB (see an example below), if UE transmits with wrong timing.    Transmission restriction will avoid such a situation.  **To Samsung:**  We have already posed a number of questions for the UL timing adjustment procedure proposed in your paper. For example, we doubt that both source and target RRHs are capable to receive PRACH simultaneously because PRACH transition occasions are related to SSB that are multiplex in time for different RRHs. Then, it may be uncertainty in UE behavior when TAC and TCI state switch commands are received next to each other.  Nevertheless, we do not insist on the standardization of a particular UL timing adjustment procedure. The most important is to define that UL transmit timing accuracy is within Te when UE transmits for the first time after the TCI state switch. This can be achieved either with Option 4 or with the Proposal from the previous Issue 1-2-1. |
| QC | To Nokia: if only one UE is considered, the interruption to DL can be resolved by scheduling restriction on DL, anyway the DL Rx timing changed a lot and UE can’t track it. Without DL and with one UE in the system, there is no interruption. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 4, and if the impact of wrong UL timing is very limited(since in fact NW can know about it and drop the CG PUSCH, periodic PUCCH/SRS transmitted in wrong UL timing), Option 2 is also fine to us. |
| OPPO | Support option 2. |
| Samsung | Support Option 2. for triggering the RA preamble after TCI switching is performed, the whole procedure to acquire timing is the same as a usual NW behavior to tackle the problem of timing lost issue for a certain UE. Considering there is no dedicated RAN4 requirement to forbid UE to transmit if the timing is lost, we see there is no necessity of introducing such requirement for this case. Furthermore, UE has no information that a TCI switching is intra-RRH or inter-RRH, so if such transmission restriction is given, have to perform this TX restriction for all TCI switching, among which the restriction is not needed for intra-RRH TCI switching.  Response to Nokia: As we provided in our paper, both procedures (from Nokia and from us) are possible ones which is based on implementation. Aligned with you that we also don’t insist to standardize this procedure. But it is also not easy to get your judgement “both source and target RRHs are capable to receive PRACH simultaneously”, especially we emphasize “the network should find out a proper time occassion to make sure RRH1 also received the preamble to derive the proper TA from RRH1 perspective”. |

#### Issue 1-2-3: Threshold on DL timing difference for RACH-based procedure

* Background

This Issue was discussed at RAN4#103-e, Issue 1-3-3 in the email discussion summary [R4-2210490]. The following option was proposed:

Option 1: Apply DL propagation delay time difference threshold both when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17 is enabled and disabled.

The motivation behind the proposal was to optimize UL transmit timing adjustment at intra-RRH TCI state switch when *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is disabled, and RACH preamble transmission is not needed.

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + **Proposal 1** (ZTE): Aim to optimize the scheduling/transmit restriction, the threshold of DL timing difference is useful. For the exact value of threshold, re-use the value determined for one-shot TA adjustment is fine.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are invited to discuss Proposal 1 further.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Ok with Proposal 1, it may be helpful to flexibility UE’s operation to some extent. |
| QC | UE can’t detect large DL timing difference as proposal one, since UE doesn’t have correct DL timing estimation in RACH-based scheme. Therefore, proposal 1 is not feasible. |
| Nokia | We agree with Proposal 1.  Why it is not possible for the UE to evaluate DL timing difference after the TCI state switch similarly to how it is done when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2 is enabled?  With such a threshold defined, the UE will be aware weather PRACH procedure will be triggered or not. |
| ZTE | Proposal 1 is related with Issue 1-2-2. If Option 4 was identified in Issue 1-2-2, the Proposal 1 here is necessary so as to avoid the unnecessary throughput loss. |
| Samsung | RACH based timing adjustment is triggered by gNB by PDCCH order, why this UE-based detection is needed? |

CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2213399**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213399.zip)**, CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | |
| *QC* | *All changes are pending open issue discussion, suggest to return to this CR.* |
| *Company B* |  |
|  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-1**: **Large one-step UL timing adjustment** | **Issue 1-1-1: Large one-step UL timing adjustment**  *Background:*  One group of companies thinks that it could be possible to keep the requirements in Clause 7.1.2.3 without changes to give more implementation flexibility and because it is not easy specify when UE can follow again the requirements in 7.1.2.1 again after the TCI state switch.  Still, many of the companies acknowledge that there is an ambiguity in the formulation of transmit timing requirement after the TCI state switch, especially in the case when target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4]. In this case, a relaxation of transmit timing accuracy is allows and it is not clear how and when the requirement in 7.1.2.1 is applicable again. It is mentioned that a clarification or an addition requirement would help to close the loop.  One additional identified issue is that immediately after the TCI state switch the reference point for UL transmit timing is . Whereases for gradual timing adjustment in 7.1.2.1, the reference timing shall be before the downlink timing of the reference cell.  Following the GtW discussion captured in the Chair notes the following bullet was identified for FFS:   * The gradual timing adjustement step of Tq shall be applied after the one shot uplink timing adjustment after TCI state switch.   *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1[Nokia, Samsung, ZTE]: Clarify the requirement if target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4]   + Option 1a: If target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4], limit the time needed for the UE to follow again clause 7.1.2.1 requirements and to adjust its UL timing within ±Te. It should happen not later than Trs + 2ms after the TCI state switch.   + Option 1b: Same as above, but Tssb is used instead of Trs   + Option 1c: Tq requirement in 7.1.2.1 applicable to UL slots except the first after TCI state switch.   + Option 1d: The gradual timing adjustment step of Tq shall be applied after the one shot uplink timing adjustment after TCI state switch.   + Other options are not precluded * Option 2[QC, OPPO, Huawei]: Keep current specification as it is.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion of the Issue in the second round.  **Issue 1-1-2: Value of relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy**  *Background:*  The current requirement in 7.1.2.3 states that  The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts], and the reference point is .  Most of the commented companies  *Tentative agreements:*  Square brackets around ±[7Ts] in the current requirement can removed.  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1 [QC, ZTE, OPPO, Samsung]: Remove square brackets and use ±7Ts as relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy in the current requirement. * Option 1a [Ericsson]: Remove square brackets and use ±7\*64\*Tc as relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy in the current requirement. * Option 2 [Huawei]: Do not distinguish the case “new target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list” and “in the active TCI state” and use ±7Ts accuracy for both.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Since transmit timing error Te in table 7.1.2-1 is defined in terms of xx\*64\*Tc it makes sense to use form ±7\*64\*Tc from Option 2a.  We seems to have tentative agreement to remove square brackets but the format (Optoin1 vs Option 1a) needs to be confirmed and Option 2 needs to be clarified. |
| **Sub-topic #1-2: Other remaining UL transmit timing issues** | **Issue 1-2-1: Initial UL transmit timing after TCI state switch**  *Background:*  Regarding Option 1, some further clarifications were requested from the companies, e.g., is it for the gradual timing adjustment or for one shot adjustment. It was also raised that such general requirement should not be discussed for the scenarios onside FR2 HST.  Option 2 seems to be already covered in the previous discussions in Issue 1-1-1.  *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1: Power Class 6 UE initial transmission timing error after the TCI state switch shall be less than or equal to ±Te. Enhance the requirement in 7.1.2. * Option 2: Requirements on initial UL transmit timing after TCI state switch agreed in the previous meetings are sufficient, no further requirements are needed. * Other options are not precluded   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  If there is still unclarity regarding Option 2 from the first round, it is recommended to continue the discussion in the Sub-topic 1-1 focused on the case when large one-step timing adjustment is enabled.  Option 1 can be discussed further in the 2nd round.  **Issue 1-2-2: UL timing requirement when large one-step mechanism is disabled**  *Background:*  Out of all available options one Option 2 and Option 4 got sufficient support from the companies.  *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Candidate options:*   * Option 2 [Ericsson, QC, Samsung, OPPO]: No impact on UE behavior (no additional requirements) * Option 4 [CATT, ZTE, Nokia]: After the TCI state switch, the UE shall not transmit except for RACH preamble in the new target TCI before one of the following conditions is fulfilled:   + the new timing advance is acquired and applied in the target TCI state according to the requirements in clause 7.3;   + the UL transmission is scheduled by the gNB. In this case, the requirements in clause 7.1.2.1 apply.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion of the candidate options in the second round.  **Issue 1-2-2: Threshold on DL timing difference for RACH-based procedure**  *Background:*  Some companies see the benefits of introducing such a threshold to optimize the scheduling/transmit restriction. Other companies do not think it is possible or needed.  *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1 [Ericsson, Nokia, ZTE]: Introduce a DL timing difference threshold when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2 is disabled. * Option 2 [QC, Samsung]: No need to introduce the threshold.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion of the candidate options in the 2nd round. |

CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |
| [**R4-2213399**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213399.zip) | **CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  All changes proposed in the CR are pending open issue discussion. Moderator’s recommendation is to revise the CR. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

### Sub-topic 1-1: Large one-step UL timing adjustment

**Way forward on large one-step UL timing adjustment**

Open issue needs further discussion:

* Option 1: Clarify the requirement if target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4]
  + Option 1a: If target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4], limit the time needed for the UE to follow again clause 7.1.2.1 requirements and to adjust its UL timing within ±Te. It should happen not later than Trs + 2ms after the TCI state switch.
  + Option 1b: Same as above, but Tssb is used instead of Trs
  + Option 1c: Tq requirement in 7.1.2.1 applicable to UL slots except the first after TCI state switch.
  + Option 1d: The gradual timing adjustment step of Tq shall be applied after the one shot uplink timing adjustment after TCI state switch.
  + Option 1e: The gradual timing adjustment in 7.1.2.1 with reference timing T\_new - (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) + 2\*(T\_old - T\_new) is applicable to UL slots except the first after TCI state switch.
  + Other options are not precluded
* Option 2: Keep current specification as it is.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Background:*  The current formulation of UL timing adjustment requirements for HST FR2 scenario:   |  | | --- | | **7.1.2.3 One shot large UL timing adjustment for FR2 Power Class 6 UE**  When *highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* is configured and *highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2-r17* is enabled for UE supporting FR2 power class 6 and [*largeOneStepUL-timingFR2-r17*] capability, the following requirements apply to the UE:  - If the absolute value , the requirement in clause 7.1.2.1 apply to the first UL transmission after a TCI state switch.  - Otherwise, the UE transmit timing immediately after TCI state switch shall be and clause 7.1.2.1 requirements don’t apply.  - The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts], and the reference point is .  Above,  - (in units) is the DL timing defined as the time when UE receives downlink frame with new target TCI state.  - (in units) is the DL timing defined as the time when UE receives downlink frame with old source TCI state. |   One group of companies thinks that it could be possible to keep the requirements in Clause 7.1.2.3 without changes to give more implementation flexibility and because it is not easy specify when UE can follow again the requirements in 7.1.2.1 again after the TCI state switch.  Still, many of the companies acknowledge that there is an ambiguity in the formulation of transmit timing requirement after the TCI state switch, especially in the case when target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list and the DL timing difference is larger than [CP/4]. In this case, a relaxation of transmit timing accuracy is allowed and it is not clear how and when the requirement in 7.1.2.1 is applicable again. It is mentioned that a clarification or an additional requirement would help to close the loop.  One additional identified issue is that immediately after the TCI state switch the reference point for UL transmit timing is . Wherease for gradual timing adjustment in 7.1.2.1, the reference timing shall be before the downlink timing of the reference cell.  *Recommendation for the second round:*  Continue the discussion of the options and resolution of newly raised issues. | |
| *QC* | We support option 2. As explained in the first round comment and GTW, Te from 7.1.2.1 is not applicable to 7.1.2.3 because the reference timings are different. We can compromise to have Tq in 7.1.2.1 applicable to UL slots besides the first UL slot after detected cross-RRH TCI state switch, but not Te. |
| *Ericsson* | We agree on above analysis by moderator. The issue is reference point of 7.1.2.1 is untrusted after cross-RRH TCI state switch as refence of UL timing accuracy. It’ unclear to us how to deal with the observation.  If no clear solution can be raised, maybe Option2 is a choice just to leave the issue there. |
| *Nokia* | The main issue is what requirement shall be applied after large one-shot timing adjustment has been performed?  We raised this problem of mismatch in UL timing advance value in between the NW and the UE after the TCI state switch with large one-step timing adjustment back at RAN4#101bis-e.  Immediately after the TCI state switch, the reference point for UL transmit timing is T\_new - (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) + 2\*(T\_old - T\_new). Whereas, for gradual timing adjustment in 7.1.2.1, the reference timing shall be (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) before the downlink timing of the reference cell.  We cannot expect that the NW can infer what timing adjustment was performed at the UE side (i.e., what is the value of 2\*(T\_old - T\_new)).  Moreover, the update of N\_TA value at the NW side without signaling TAC to the UE is not possible either.  Therefore, one way to follow back the 7.1.2.1 requirement after the TCI state switch could be to use T\_new - (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) + 2\*(T\_old - T\_new) as a new reference for gradual timing adjustment after the TCI state switch.  Option 1e: The gradual timing adjustment in 7.1.2.1 with reference timing T\_new - (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) + 2\*(T\_old - T\_new) is applicable to UL slots except the first after TCI state switch. |
| ZTE | We agree with the above analysis by moderator, especially on how to specify when UE can follow again the requirements in 7.1.2.1 after the ‘immediately’ case. Since we do not have good solution to deal with reference timing pointed out by QC, so maybe Option 2 is the helpless choice at this stage.  About Option 1e given by Nokia, we believe after the ‘immediately’ case, the reference timing for both Te and gradual timing adjustment can only be T\_new - (N\_TA + N\_TA\_offset) + 2\*(T\_old - T\_new). |
| Huawei | We support option 1d achieved in GTW. After one shot UL timing adjustment, UE shall perform gradual UL timing adjustment with Tq step (as legacy requirements). |

**Way forward on the value of relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy**

Open issue needs further discussion:

* Option 1: Remove square brackets and use ±7Ts as relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy in the current requirement.
* Option 1a: Remove square brackets and use ±7\*64\*Tc as relaxed UL transmit timing accuracy in the current requirement.
* Option 2: Do not distinguish the case “new target TCI state is not in the active TCI state list” and “in the active TCI state” and use ±7Ts accuracy for both.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Background:*  The current requirement in 7.1.2.3 states that  The UE UL transmission timing error after the TCI state switching procedure shall be less than or equal to ±Te as specified in clause 7.1.2 if the new target TCI state is within active TCI state list, otherwise ±[7Ts], and the reference point is .  In general, the specification text above is based on the agreement at RAN4#103-e [WF, R4-2210608]:   |  | | --- | | Sub-topic 1-2: UL transmit timing accuracy **GtW Agreement**:  If new TCI state within active TCI state list: Adopt ±Te immediately after TCI state switch as the accuracy otherwise ±[7Ts] adopted. |   *Recommendation for the second round:*  In Moderator’s view Option 1a is better aligned with existing accuracy requirements in table 7.1.2-1 and can be considered for agreement.  Option 2 is a new option that requires revision of the previous agreement. Companies are encouraged to comment whether such a revision is needed. | |
| *QC* | Option 2 has correct technical reasoning to support it. The reasoning behind option 2 is that we need to count the timing error contribution on as well as given that UL timing is computed based on both, and their errors can add up. This is a technically correct observation and wasn’t addressed in the previous discussion. Adding up to the calibration error we discussed in the previous meeting, maybe more than 7Ts error margin is needed, but we don’t want to further complicated issue so we assume UE can absorb calibration error into this double DL timing error, and we can stick to option 2.  We understand this is different than the compromise we agreed in the previous meeting, we are open to discuss keep the previous agreement, but we need to understand the feasibility: Te is the minimum timing error on DL that is achievable (UL timing directly follows current DL timing), however, given that UL timing is derived from the difference of two DL timings, how can UE achieve the same timing as following just current DL timing? |
| *Ericsson* | We suggest to keep Option 1 even it isn’t perfect. |
| *Nokia* | Regarding Option1, we think that Optoin1a is a more proper way to define the accuracy. However, we cannot agree on the removal of square brackets before it is clarified how and when gradual timing adjustments in 7.1.2.1 are applicable again after the large one-shot timing adjustment.  Regarding Option 2, we have similar concern as discussed in Issue 1-1-1. If UL transmit timing accuracy is released immediately after the TCI state switch, then the UE still shall be able to follow DL timing accurately again with Te accuracy. When UE is capable of time/frequency tracking of target TCI state, then why it cannot adjust UL timing back within Te with gradual timing adjustment?  With current formulation ,what stops UE from following the release accuracy requirement for the whole period after the TCI state switch? |
| ZTE | We need to respect the previous agreements, so we prefer to keep Option 1 or Option 1a. |
| Huawei | In technical, option 2 is correct. The reason is even if new target TCI state is in the active TCI state list, considering the equation , the double Te error from Tnew and Told are supposed to be introduced, that’s 2\*Te=2\*3.5=7Ts.  We also understood that the current agreement is made based on some compromise. We can also go to option 1 and option 2. |

### Sub-topic 1-2: Other remaining UL transmit timing issues

**Way forward on UL timing requirement when large one-step mechanism is disabled**:

Open issue needs further discussion:

* Option 2: No impact on UE behavior (no additional requirements)
* Option 4: After the TCI state switch, the UE shall not transmit except for RACH preamble in the new target TCI before one of the following conditions is fulfilled:
  + the new timing advance is acquired and applied in the target TCI state according to the requirements in clause 7.3;
  + the UL transmission is scheduled by the gNB.  
    In this case, the requirements in clause 7.1.2.1 apply.
* Option 6: Power Class 6 UE initial transmission timing error after the TCI state switch shall be less than or equal to ±Te. Enhance the requirement in 7.1.2.
* Option 7: Introduce a DL timing difference threshold when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2 is disabled.
* Other options are not precluded

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Background:*  This second-round discussion combines Issues 1-2-1, 1-2-2, 1-2-3 because the main goal of all of them is related to the definition of requirements on UL transmit timing when large one-step timing adjustment is disabled.  In general, one group of companies thinks that there is no need to introduce any additional requirement (Option 2).  Then, there are several alternative ways to introduce the requirement:   * Specifically for the case when large one short timing adjustment is disabled (Option 4) * As a general requirement for all PC 6 UEs, and then consider Clause 7.1.2.3 as a special case (Option 6) * Introduce a DL timing difference threshold when highSpeedLargeOneStepUL-TimingFR2 is disabled (Option 7) to give a UE a possibility to distinguish intra-RRH TCI state switch (DL timing difference below the threshold, and PRACH is not needed) from inter-RRH TCI state switch (DL timing difference is above the threshold, PRACH is needed, and UE should not transmit before timing adjustment).   *Recommendation for the second round*:  Companies are encouraged to discuss further the candidate options and indicate compromises, if any. | |
| *QC* | Option 2. We compromised to remove our option which can correctly resolve the problem to simplify the system design, and we expect option 4 proponents can also compromise to option 2 given that it can’t resolve the issue while our proposal is able to, based on the fact that UE shouldn’t receive DL signal from network before RACH after cross-RRH TCI state switch.  We can’t agree option 6 as explained in the first round comment.  We also explained why option 7 is not feasible in the first round comment, and in fact if we agree with option 2, option 7 is not needed. |
| *Ericsson* | Support Option2, not to introduce more complex conditions.  Regarding Option 7, we slightly support it because it may help network and UE evaluate that the TCI state switch occurs within RRH or cross RRH. |
| *Nokia* | Our primary preference is Option 6. If narrowed down to PC6 UEs, then we do not see an issues with the applicability scope of this requirement anymore.  Option 6 established a common ground for UL timing accuracy after the TCI state switch. Then, the clause 7.1.2.3 is still valid and describes the requirements specifically for the case when Large one-shot timing adjustment in used.  Options 4 and Option 7 are also acceptable for. They are beneficial to describe requirements in the case when Large one-shot timing adjustment in not used. |
| ZTE | In our opinion, Option 2 is one choice, Option 4+Option 7 is another choice.  We further considered the issue raised by QC, in fact not any option can resolve the issue. So, our preference is Option 4+ Option 7, but we can compromise to Option 2.  Regarding to Option 6, based on the analysis by moderator, it seems which is aligned with current 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.2.3, we are fine with it. |

CRs/TPs comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **R4-2214625, Rev. of** [**R4-2213399**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213399.zip)**, CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | |
| *Samsung* | *Thanks for the CR revision.*  *Content-wisely, the CR is okay since only editorial change is included.*  *Just one quick reminder that the cover page needs to be revised accordingly, since the current one may cause big confusion to readers.*  *Also, it is a formal CR, so rev should be”1”, the “clauses affected” should be filled, i.e., TS 38.533 is affected.* |
| *Nokia* | *Thank you for the comment, Jackson!*  *Since no agreements were achieved on the UL transmit timing issues, they are still present in the WF, the change is editorial, it will be OK for us to postpone this CR.*  *Kind regards,*  *Dimitri* |
| *Moderator* | CR is recommended to be postponed. |

# Topic #2: Remaining issues in RRM CORE maintenance

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [R4-2211597](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211597.zip) | Qualcomm, Inc. | **CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB** |
| [R4-2211675](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211675.zip) | CATT | **Discussion on maintenance for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2**  **Proposal 1**: In Table 9.2.5.1-11 & Table 9.2.5.2-7, use Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps as 24 for power class 6 when DRX cycle > 80ms. The same principle is applied in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.  **Proposal 2**: support option 1: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply. The same principle is applied in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.  **Proposal 3**: When HST FR2 flags are configured for other power classes other than PC6, the legacy requirements should be used.  **Proposal 4**: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied |
| [R4-2211676](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211676.zip) | CATT | **CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2** |
| [R4-2213865](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213865.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Discussion on remaining issues of RRC idle, inactive and connected state mobility requirements for HST FR2**  **Proposal 1**: We prefer to respect the previous agreement. So Option 1 is recommended.  **Proposal 2**: We prefer Option 1, i.e. for L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied. |
| [R4-2213889](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213889.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Discussions on remaining issues in RRM enhancements for Rel-17 FR2 HST**  Observation 1: L1-SINR measurement requirements are applicable to FR2 HST.  **Proposal 1**: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.  Observation 2: Legacy requirements for PSS/SSS detection and measurement delays apply to FR2 HST when SMTC periodicity > 40 ms.  Observation 3: When the legacy requirements for PSS/SSS detection and measurement delays apply to FR2 HST UE travelling at the maximum speed 350 km/h, complete mobility failures occur as shown by the simulation results.  **Proposal 2**: For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-11; [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2.]  Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios considered in this release.  **Proposal 3**: For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; [otherwise, T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2.]  Note: Operation with T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios considered in this release. |
| [R4-2213891](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213891.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **CR to TS 38.133: Clarification of intrafrequency cell identification for FR2 HST** |
| [R4-2213892](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213892.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST** |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Issue 2-1: L1-SINR reporting with CSI-RS based CMR and no dedicated IMR configured

* Background

The Issue left open at the previous Ran4#103-e meeting [R4-2210608] with the following options:

* Option 1: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.
* Option 2: Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR
* Other options are not precluded
* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Observation 1 (QC): Interference on SSBs in FR2 HST is rare since (1) trains crossing each other is rare and duration is very short due to high speed (2) no interference across SSBs due to the agreed constraints on consecutive SSBs. With negligible interference, enhanced (faster) L1-RSRP measurement is sufficient for FR2 HST.
  + Proposal 1 (QC): Follow FR1 HST, do not introduce L1-SINR measurement delay requirement enhancement.
  + Proposal 2 (Samsung): For L1-SINR measurements core requirement, do not define enhancement for L1-SINR.
  + Proposal 3 (Ericsson): Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR unless practical use cases can prove the necessity.
  + Proposal 4 (CATT): For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied
  + Proposal 5 (ZTE): We prefer Option 1, i.e. for L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.
  + Observation 1 (Nokia): L1-SINR measurement requirements are applicable to FR2 HST.
  + Proposal 6 (Nokia): For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.
* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 [CATT, ZTE, Nokia]: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.
  + Option 2 [QC, Samsung, Ericsson]: Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR
* Recommended WF
  + Discuss the candidate options in the first round.
  + Companies are encouraged to indicate a capability to compromise since it is the last meeting for Rel-17.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2. We don’t observe the use case of L1-SINR. |
| QC | We don’t see use case for L1-SINR in FR2 HST given the SSB scheduling restriction and fixed deployment and trajectory. |
| CATT | We want to ask the clarification for the title “Issue 2-1: L1-SINR reporting with CSI-RS based CMR and no dedicated IMR configured” and proposals. Is it with CSI-RS or SSB? We support option 1.  For option 2, does it mean all L1-SINR? |
| ZTE | Prefer Option 1. |
| Nokia | In response to CATT’s question, this issue is about L1-SINR reporting with with SSB based CMR and dedicated IMR configured. We have provided a text proposal in a draft CR (R4-2213892).  Support Option 1. |
| OPPO | Support option 2. |
| Samsung | Support Option 2.  Considering the FR2 HST scenario, in which L1-SINR with SSB-based CMR is more important than the one with CSI-RS based CMR, we think only defining requirement for SSB-based CMR is acceptable to us. Based on our link-level analysis for measurement accuracy, even applying the 19444 Hz frequency offset (corresponding to the worst case of bi-directional deployment), the impact on measurement is identified, which is relative limited in the range of 0.6 – 0.9dB compared to AWGN with frequency offset = 0. More detailed results can be found in our accompanying paper [5]. Considering the L1-SINR measurement is the Rel-16 feature, which depends on UE baseband’s support of this optional feature (which is not mandatory one for FR2 HST scenario), we are okay to skip the FR2 HST specific L1-SINR measurement test. For FR2 PC6 UE which support Rel-16 L1-SINR measurement, it can rely on legacy Rel-16 test cases to verify the performance. |
| Huawei | Same view as Ericsson and QC. Doubt L1-SINR has use case in high speed train scenario. |

### Issue 2-2: SMTC in HST FR2 enhanced requirements

* Background

This issue was actively discussed at the RAN4#103-e, and the following WF was achieved [R4-2210608]

**GtW Agreement:**

Option 1 agreed as starting point and further work on the drafting CR revision including table heading and note 3.

**Way forward:**

Further discussion is needed on how to define HST FR2 requirements if SMTC periodicity is > 40 ms.

* Option 1: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply.
* Option 2: Delete NOTE 3, keep table titles without changes and set M2 = 1.5
* Other options are not precluded

In the discussions, NOTE 3 was defined in the following way: When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply

For reference, the subtract from the latest version of TS 38.133 is presented below:

For UE supporting power class 6 with *highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-11; [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2.]

Table 9.2.5.1-2: Time period for PSS/SSS detection, (Frequency range FR2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DRX cycle | TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra |
| No DRX | max(600ms, ceil(Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x SMTC period)Note 1 x CSSFintra |
| DRX cycle≤ 320ms | max(600ms, ceil(1.5 x Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x max(SMTC period,DRX cycle)) x CSSFintra |
| DRX cycle>320ms | ceil(Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement) x DRX cycle x CSSFintra |
| NOTE 1: If different SMTC periodicities are configured for different cells, the SMTC period in the requirement is the one used by the cell being identified | |

Table 9.2.5.1-11: Time period for PSS/SSS detection when [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17*] is configured, (Frequency range FR2) when SMTC period <= 40ms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| DRX cycle | TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra |
| No DRX | max(600ms, ceil(M1Note 2 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x SMTC period)Note 1 x CSSFintra |
| DRX cycle≤ 80ms | max(600ms, ceil(M1Note 2 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x max(SMTC period,DRX cycle)) x CSSFintra |
| 80ms< DRX cycle≤ 320ms | ceil(1.5x Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps Note 3 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x max(SMTC period,DRX cycle) x CSSFintra |
| DRX cycle>320ms | ceil(Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps Note 3 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement) x DRX cycle x CSSFintra |
| NOTE 1: If different SMTC periodicities are configured for different cells, the SMTC period in the requirement is the one used by the cell being identified  NOTE 2: For UE supporting power class 6, M1= 6 if [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* = set1] or M1= 18 if [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* = set2]  NOTE 3: Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. | |

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Proposal 1 (Samsung): For SMTC limit in HST FR2 enhancement requirements, to adopt the below Option 1, i.e.,
    - Option 1: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply.
  + Proposal 2 (CATT): support option 1: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply. The same principle is applied in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.
  + Proposal 3 (ZTE): We prefer to respect the previous agreement. So Option 1 is recommended.
  + Observation 1 (Nokia): Legacy requirements for PSS/SSS detection and measurement delays apply to FR2 HST when SMTC periodicity > 40 ms.
  + Observation 2 (Nokia): When the legacy requirements for PSS/SSS detection and measurement delays apply to FR2 HST UE travelling at the maximum speed 350 km/h, complete mobility failures occur as shown by the simulation results.
  + Proposal 4 (Nokia): For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-11; [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2.]
    - Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios considered in this release.
  + Proposal 5 (Nokia): For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; [otherwise, T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2.]
    - Note: Operation with T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios considered in this release.
* Candidate options:
  + Option 1 [Samsung, CATT, ZTE]: Apply the FR2 HST enhanced requirement only when SMTC <=40ms cases. When SMTC period > 40ms, requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2 apply.
  + Option 2 [Nokia]: Add a clarification Note in Clause 9.2.5.1:  
    Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 (TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2) may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios considered in this release.
* Recommended WF
  + Based on the online and offline discussions at RAN4#103-e it is Moderator’s understanding that even though the companies would like to have more flexibility in the configuration, there is not intent to use legacy requirements in the HST FR2 scenario.  
    Can Option 2 be agreeable?

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We support Option1. |
| QC | We support option 2, but the notes are more appropriate for WF than spec since spec won’t mention “this release”. Suggest to capture the note in WF as a compromised option. |
| CATT | We support option 1. For concern from option 2, we understand. But we don’t think it is necessary to add the note in spec. In similar situation before, if the legacy requirements cannot guaranteed, there is no such note. We accepted to add it in WF. |
| ZTE | Prefer Option 1. |
| Nokia | The performance with legacy requirements under FR2 HST suffers serious performance degradation as shown in our simulation results. After examination on a case-by-case basis, we conclude that the note is useful and added for clarification. We are fine to revise the wording as follows:   * Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios ~~considered in this release~~. |
| Samsung | Based on Nokia’s simulation results, we can accept Option 2. |

### Issue 2-3: Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps for power class 6 UEs

* Background

The requirements on intrafrequency measurement without measurement gaps are defined in Caluse 9.2.5 of TS 38.133:

Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting FR2 power class 1 or 5, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting power class 2, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 3, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 4, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24

Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting power class 1 or 5, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 2, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 3, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 4, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24.

However, power class 6 UEs are not present in the requirements above.

Note, that Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps are not used for the enhanced requirements when DRX cycle <= 80 ms.

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Proposal 1 (CATT): In Table 9.2.5.1-11 & Table 9.2.5.2-7, use Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps as 24 for power class 6 when DRX cycle > 80ms. The same principle is applied in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are welcomed to discuss whether Proposal 1 is agreeable.
  + If Proposal is agreeable, then shall “NOTE 3: Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24” be needed in HST FR2 enhanced tables?

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We can support Proposal 1, it is helpful to better interpretation. |
| QC | Proposal 1 is captured in spec already, can CATT clarify that is there any further agreement is needed? The proposed change in CR is in the table already:  Table 9.2.5.1-11: Time period for PSS/SSS detection when [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17*] is configured, (Frequency range FR2) when SMTC period <= 40ms   |  |  | | --- | --- | | DRX cycle | TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra | | No DRX | max(600ms, ceil(M1Note 2 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x SMTC period)Note 1 x CSSFintra | | DRX cycle≤ 80ms | max(600ms, ceil(M1Note 2 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x max(SMTC period,DRX cycle)) x CSSFintra | | 80ms< DRX cycle≤ 320ms | ceil(1.5x Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps Note 3 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement)x max(SMTC period,DRX cycle) x CSSFintra | | DRX cycle>320ms | ceil(Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps Note 3 x Kp x Klayer1\_measurement) x DRX cycle x CSSFintra | | NOTE 1: If different SMTC periodicities are configured for different cells, the SMTC period in the requirement is the one used by the cell being identified  NOTE 2: For UE supporting power class 6, M1= 6 if [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* = set1] or M1= 18 if [*highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* = set2]  NOTE 3: Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. | | |
| CATT | It hasn’t been fully captured in current spec.  *If removing square bracket can be agreed in the open issue, the current definition is:*  For UE supporting power class 6 with *highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; otherwise, T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2.  Take an example, if UE is PC6, without highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, follow the yellow part, it should be meet the requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2. But in legacy tables in Table 9.2.5.2-2, it uses the definition Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps. . *There is no definition for PC6. It cannot be covered in the FR2 HST table 9.2.5.2-7.* |
| Nokia | Pending the outcome of Issue 2-2. |
| Huawei | Fine with proposal 1 |

### Issue 2-4: Requirement for intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.

* Background

The Issue is the extension of the agreements in the two pervious Issues, applied to the measurements without gaps.

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + Proposal 1 (CATT): The same principle is applied in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to indicated whether the same principle like in the previous two Issue shall be applied both to intra-frequency measurements with and without measurement gaps.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | OK with Proposal 1. |
| QC | Support proposal 1, but suggest to revise CR following 9.2.5 tables. |
| CATT | Support P1. Can go to R4-2211676 directly. |
| ZTE | Fine with Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | Pending the outcome of Issue 2-2. |
| OPPO | Support option 1. |
| Huawei | Fine with proposal 1 |

### Issue 2-5: Applicability of enhanced requirements for other PCs

* Background

At RAN4#102-e it was agreed [R4-2206848]:

Issue 1-2-3: Indication of HST FR2 RRM feature support and Applicability of enhanced RRM requirements (PC 6)

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**   * No enhanced requirement should be applied to other than PC6 UEs even when HST FR2 flags are configured. * PC6 shall be used to identify the feature support of HST FR2 operation. |

* Proposals and/or Observations
  + **Proposal 1** (CATT): When HST FR2 flags are configured for other power classes other than PC6, the legacy requirements should be used.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to share their views whether a new agreement in addition to the previous one from RAN4#102-e is needed.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We agree on proposal 1, that is the reason the HST requirements are defined provided PC6 and flag both are valid. |
| QC | Support proposal 1. |
| CATT | Support proposal 1. |
| ZTE | Fine with Proposal 1. |
| Nokia | A question clarification concerning Proposal 1: What is the impact to the specification? |
| OPPO | Support option 1. |
| Samsung | Option 1 should be the common understanding. |
| H**uawei** | Fine with proposal 1. |

### Issue 2-6: Other

* Recommended WF
  + Companies can bring up any new issues below.

Companies views’ collection for 1st round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | In Clause 3.6.13 Applicability of requirements for FR2 it is stated that  Unless stated otherwise, the requirements for FR2 are applicable to both FR2-1 and FR2-2.  Following the WID, HST FR2 scenarios were analyzed for carriers below 30 GHz.  Thus, we **Propose** to agree that HST FR2 requirements are applicable for FR2-1 only and add a corresponding exception in Clause 3.6.13. |
| CATT | We agree to follow the WID. But for HST FR2, we have already has the applicability in clause 3.6.14. For power class 6, it is only for n257/n258/n261 in 38101 which below 30GHz. |
| Samsung | Same as CATT, it is already very clear the supported band for PC6. |
| Nokia4 | We would like to thank the other companies for the clarification. Since it is clear what bands are supported for PC6 UEs, and all HST FR2 requirements are applicable to PC6 UEs only, we do not see any need to defined the exception in addition to 3.6.14. |

CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2211597**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211597.zip)**, CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB, Qualcomm, Inc.** | |
| *CATT* | *There is no clause 9.5.8.*  *Clause 9.8 is not included.* |
| *Nokia* | *It is not necessary to capture the agreement in the specification. As a compromise, we suggest capturing this in the TR.* |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2211676**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211676.zip)**, CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2 CATT** | |
| *QC* | *Change in 9.2.5 is covered in the FR2 HST tables and may not be necessary. We suggest to align changes in 9.2.6 to 9.2.6 in current spec.* |
| *CATT* | *We think change in 9.2.5 is necessary.*  *If removing square bracket can be agreed in the open issue, the current definition is:*  For UE supporting power class 6 with *highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17* configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; otherwise, T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2.  Take an example, if UE is PC6, without highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, follow the yellow part, it should be meet the requirements in Table 9.2.5.2-2. But in legacy tables in Table 9.2.5.2-2, it uses the definition Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps. . *There is no definition for PC6. It cannot be covered in the FR2 HST table 9.2.5.2-7.* |
| QC | Thanks CATT for clarification, the changes are good for us. |
| Nokia | Pending the outcome of Issue 2-2. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2213891**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213891.zip)**, CR to TS 38.133: Clarification of intrafrequency cell identification for FR2 HST Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | |
| Ericsson | Rely on Issue 2-2 |
| *QC* | Pending issue 2-2 |
| CATT | Rely on Issue 2-2. part of change are overlapped with R4-2211676 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [**R4-2213892**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213892.zip)**, CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | |
| *QC* | Pending issue 2-1 |
| *CATT* | *In latest version 38133.h60, the change of Table 9.8.4.2-3 has already been included. Are we looking into different versions?* |
| Nokia | Thanks for pointing this out, CATT. This could be an editorial mistake.  According to the Chairman notes of the last meeting, the draft CR (corresponding to the changes) was postponed.  **R4-2211089 CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST**  *Type: CR For: Agreement  38.133 v17.5.0 CR-2384 rev Cat: B (Rel-17)   Source: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell*  **Abstract:**  **Decision: Postponed.** |

## Summary for 1st round

Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-topic** | **Status summary** |
|  | **Issue 2-1: L1-SINR reporting with CSI-RS based CMR and no dedicated IMR configured**  *Background:*  The opinions of the companies are still split among two candidate options.  The moderator’s understanding is related only to requirements in Clause 9.8.4.2 L1-SINR reporting with SSB based CMR and dedicated IMR configured and introduced in R4-2213892.  *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Candidate options:*   * Option 1 [CATT, ZTE, Nokia]: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied. * Option 2 [QC, Samsung, Ericsson]: Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR * Option 2a [Samsung]: For FR2 PC6 UE which support Rel-16 L1-SINR measurement, it can rely on legacy Rel-16 test cases to verify the performance.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Continue the discussion of the candidate options in the second round.  It was also found out that Table 9.8.4.2-3: Measurement period TL1-SINR\_Measurement\_Period\_SSB\_CMR\_IMR with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 for FR2 was already implemented in 38.133 by MCC by mistake. Moderator will clarify how to resolve this issue also taking the outcomes of the discussion into account.  **Issue 2-2: SMTC in HST FR2 enhanced requirements**  *Background:*  Seems that the companies do not object removal of square brackets in the requirement applicability rule: [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra (T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra) is given in Table 9.2.5.2-1(2).]  However, the discussion whether and how to define the clarification is still ongoing.  *Tentative agreements:*  Remove square brackets in the applicability rule [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra (T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra) is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2 (2-2).]  *Candidate options:*   * Option 2 [Nokia, Samsung]: Add a Note in the TS: Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios. * Option 3 [QC, CATT]: Add a Note from Option 2 in the WF. * Option 4 [Ericsson, ZTE, CATT]: Do not add a note   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Discuss the candidate options in the 2nd round.  **Issue 2-3: Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps for power class 6 UEs**  *Background:*  In Moderator’s understanding the core of the proposal is to add the definition of Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps as follows:  Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting FR2 power class 1 or 5, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting power class 2, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 3, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 4, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24.  Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting power class 1 or 5, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 2, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 3, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 4, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gap=24.  *Tentative agreements:*  Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps  = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5.  NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Confirm in the second round whether tentative agreement is ageable.  **Issue 2-4: Requirement for intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps**  *Background:*  The majority of the companies seems to support that the same principle as discussed in the previous Issue applicability rules  *Tentative agreements:*  Apply agreements from Issue 2-2 and 2-3 in intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Confirm whether tentative agreement is agreeable given that the agreements in the related Issues 2-2 and 2-3 are achieved first.  **Issue 2-5: Applicability of enhanced requirements for other PCs**  *Tentative agreements:*  When HST FR2 flags are configured for other power classes other than PC6, the legacy requirements should be used.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  Companies are encouraged to describe what are the specification impacts and to confrm on the tentative agreement.  **Issue 2-6: Other**  *Background:*  One of the companies was pointing out that HST FR2 scenarios shall be applicable only for carriers below 30 GHz.  It was clarified that the requirements are defined for power class 6 UEs only (Clause 3.6.14), and it is only for bands n257/n258/n261 in 38.101 which is below 30GHz.  *Tentative agreements:*  None  *Recommendations for 2nd round:*  None |

CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |
| [**R4-2211597**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211597.zip) | **CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB, Qualcomm, Inc.**  Since comments were received and it was no final agreement where to describe the scheduling restriction, the CR is recommended to be revised. |
| [**R4-2211676**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211676.zip) | **CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2 CATT**  It was pointed out that the CR is pending on the outcomes of the ongoing discussion. It is recommended to revise the CR. |
| [**R4-2213891**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213891.zip) | **CR to TS 38.133: Clarification of intrafrequency cell identification for FR2 HST Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  The CR is pending on the outcomes of the ongoing discussion. Moreover, the content is overlapping with CR R4-2211676. Therefore it is recommended to merge this CR into the revision of R4-2211676. |
| [**R4-2213892**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213892.zip) | **CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  The changes in this CR are already applied by MCC by mistake at the previous RAN4#103-e meeting even though the CR was postponed.  It is recommended to revise this CR in case there is a need to remove the table following the discussion in the Issues 2-1. |

## Discussion on 2nd round

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

Open issues

**Way forward on L1-SINR reporting with CSI-RS based CMR and no dedicated IMR configured**

Open issue needs further discussion:

* Option 1: For L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR configured for FR2 HST, the same enhancements as SSB-based L1-RSRP measurements should be applied.
* Option 2: Do not define enhancement for L1-SINR measurements with SSB-based CMR and dedicated IMR
* Option 2a: For FR2 PC6 UE which support Rel-16 L1-SINR measurement, it can rely on legacy Rel-16 test cases to verify the performance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Background:*  The moderator’s understanding is that the Issue is related only to requirements in Clause 9.8.4.2 L1-SINR reporting with SSB based CMR and dedicated IMR configured and introduced in R4-2213892.  Note, that the Table 9.8.4.2-3 was already implemented in the TS by mistake.  *Recommendation for the second round*:  Discuss further the candidate options in the second round. | |
| *QC* | Option 2. We haven’t seen valid use cases for L1-SINR. Given the agreed SSB scheduling restriction and fixed deployment and trajectory, L1-RSRP is sufficient given that interference is either known (fixed deployment and trajectory) or not existing (SSB can’t be overlapped and next to each other). Option 2a has no spec impact and therefore we support it as a compromise. |
| *Ericsson* | Support Option 2. What’s the typical use case of L1-SINR in HST FR2 scenario? |
| *ZTE* | We can support Option 2a as a compromise. |
| Huawei | Same view as QC and Ericsson. Doubt L1-SINR has use case in high speed train scenario. |
| CATT | Support option 1. As same in HST FR1, L1-SINR can be used for beam management. Compared with L1-RSRP, it is better because sinr reflects the interference. For option 2a, we can agree first half pat. But we have questions on “it can rely on legacy Rel-16 test cases to verify the performance”. L1-SINR requirements include delay requirements and accuracy requirements. do you mean the delay requirements are FR1 requirements without considering scaling factor N? which we don’t think so. |
| Nokia | Share the same view as CATT.  In addition, it is important to note that L1-RSRP and L1-SINR requirements are not mutually exclusive. Both requirements are applicable to FR2 HST since there is no applicability rule defined in the current specification specifically for L1-SINR. Hence, network is not restricted to choose L1-RSRP and not L1-SINR for FR2 HST. Further, operators may configure their networks to use L1-SINR instead of L1-RSRP |

**Way forward on SMTC length in HST FR2 enhanced requirements**:

For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-11; [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2].

For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; [otherwise, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2].

The addition of the clarification note needs further discussion:

* Option 2: Add Notes in the TS:  
  Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios.

Note: Operation with TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios.

* Option 3: Add Notes in the WF:  
  Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios.

Note: Operation with TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2 may not be guaranteed for the maximum speed under high-speed deployment scenarios.

* Option 4: Do not add any notes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Background:*  Seems that the companies do not object removal of square brackets in the requirement applicability rule:  [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra (T SSB\_measurement\_period\_intra) is given in Table 9.2.5.2-1(2).]  However, further discussion whether and how to define the clarification notes is still needed.  *Recommendation for the second round:*  Agree on the removal of square brackets in the requirements.  Discuss further the addition of clarification notes. | |
| *QC* | Option 3. WF seems to be a better document to capture it, and can seems to be a better compromised option between option 2 and 4. Note that similar discussion appeared in FR1 HST, and the concern raised then is on the phrase like “maximum speed” in a WID/release specific information that may not be appropriate for specification. |
| *Ericsson* | We can support 3 or 4 |
| *ZTE* | We can compromise to Option 3. |
| CATT | As mentioned in 1st round, in similar situation before, option 3 is better. We prefer option 4 and can accept option 3 as compromised. |
| Nokia | The performance with legacy requirements under FR2 HST suffers serious performance degradation as shown in our simulation results. After examination on a case-by-case basis, it is different from FR1 HST and we conclude that the note is useful and added for clarification. We are fine to further revise the wording as follows:   * Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed ~~for the maximum speed~~ under high-speed deployment scenarios. |
| QC | Hi Dimitri,  Thank you for the update. We spot another issue in this WF: option 3 is what we can compromise to, but that’s conditioned on original option 2 with “maximum speed” included. We commented that it’s not a correct language since it refers to a release specific information, but it’s good for WF. Now option 2 updated to a version that we consider as technically incorrect. If UE is in high speed but not reaching 350km/h, Table 9.2.5.1-2 requirement could be applicable. Could we fix this issue by copy the original option 2 to replace “option 2” in option 3? Thank you.  Best regards,  Sean  Way forward on SMTC length in HST FR2 enhanced requirements:  For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-11; [otherwise, TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.1-2.]  For UE supporting power class 6 with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured, if SMTC <= 40ms, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-7; [otherwise, TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra is given in Table 9.2.5.2-2.]  The addition of the clarification note needs further discussion:  Option 2: Add Notes in the TS:  Note: Operation with TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra in Table 9.2.5.1-2 may not be guaranteed under high-speed deployment scenarios.  Note: Operation with TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra in Table 9.2.5.2-2 may not be guaranteed under high-speed deployment scenarios.  Option 3: Add Notes from Option 2 in the WF.  Option 4: Do not add any notes. |
| Nokia | Hi Yanze, Sean, All,  Regarding the comment from QC:   * removing of “maximum speed” was a compromise proposal from Nokia. If you do more sense in keeping then I will revert the Note text to it’s previous version. |
| QC | Hi Dimitri,  Option 2 is Nokia’s option, we are not interested in revising it, and we just want to keep option 3 the same without impact from Nokia changing option 2.  Best regards,  Sean |
| Nokia | Dear All,  The WF has been uploaded to the Inbox:  [R4-2214469.zip](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/R4-2214469.zip)  In the latest version I have taken into account the last comment from Sean, and added the text of the notes explicitly into Option 3.  If agreements are achieved during the GtW check of the WI, I will revise the WF and reflect those there.  Kind regards,  Dimitri |

**Agreement on Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps for power class 6 UEs**:

Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5.  
NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Background:*  In Moderator’s understanding the core of the proposal is to add the definition of Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps as follows:  Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting FR2 power class 1 or 5, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting power class 2, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 3, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 4, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24.  Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting power class 1 or 5, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 2, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 3, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 4, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gap=24.  *Recommendation for the second round*:  Check whether tentative agreement is agreeable. | |
| *Ericsson* | Support tentative agreement |
| *ZTE* | Fine with the tentative agreement. |
| *CATT* | Agree with tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | “When highspeed flag is not configured” should added otherwise it is not clear. |
| CATT | Dear Yanze,  Than you for the question!  I proposed a tentative agreement that you highlighted as yellow below based on the outcomes for the first round.  However, one of the companies has commented in the second round that:  “When highspeed flag is not configured” should added otherwise it is not clear.  As far as I need to share the final draft of the WF, and there is such a comment, I cannot mark tentative agreement as agreeable.  Therefore, I added it as an option.  Kind regards,  Dimitri  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Yanze Fu **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 12:35 **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1  Dear Dimitri,    Thank you for drafting the WF. but we have question to Issue 2-3. In final draft, these two options are different from that in last version.    In last version “[WF\_104-e\_206\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1\_Core\_v07\_CATT\_Nok.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/WF/WF_104-e_206_HST_FR2_RRM_1_Core_v07_CATT_Nok.docx)”  **[Issue 2-3] Agreement on Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps for power class 6 UEs**:  Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps  = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5.  NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Background:*  In Moderator’s understanding the core of the proposal is to add the definition of Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps as follows:        Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting FR2 power class 1 or 5, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting power class 2, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24.  For a UE supporting FR2 power class 3, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 4, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24.       Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps : For a UE supporting power class 1 or 5, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =40. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 2, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 3, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting power class 4, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps =24. For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gap=24.  *Recommendation for the second round*:  Check whether tentative agreement is agreeable. | | | *Ericsson* | Support tentative agreement | | *ZTE* | Fine with the tentative agreement. | | *CATT* | Agree with tentative agreement. | | Nokia | “When highspeed flag is not configured” should added otherwise it is not clear. |   But in final draft,   |  | | --- | | **Way forward on Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps for power class 6 UEs**:  Open issue needs further discussion:   * Option 1: Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5 when highspeed flag is not configured.   NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.   * Option 2: Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5 when highspeed flag is not configured. |   These two options are different from what we discussed before. Option1/2 are different from the tentative agreement in last version. In addition, we point out in CATT CR, “when high speed flag is not configured” cannot be added. If so, there is no definition for Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps when highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 is configured. There are such cases in tables which the tables are agreed by all companies including Nokia. That is why we cannot agree on option 1.  Best Regards,  Yanze |
| Nokia | Dear Yanze,  Than you for the question!  I proposed a tentative agreement that you highlighted as yellow below based on the outcomes for the first round.  However, one of the companies has commented in the second round that:  “When highspeed flag is not configured” should added otherwise it is not clear.  As far as I need to share the final draft of the WF, and there is such a comment, I cannot mark tentative agreement as agreeable.  Therefore, I added it as an option.  Kind regards,  Dimitri |
| QC | Hi Dimitri,  The original recommended WF on 2-3 is:  *Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps  = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5.*  *NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.*  And we believe this is supported by multiple companies according to the comment, .  However, now the two options listed are:  *Option 1: Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5 when highspeed flag is not configured.*  *NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed.*  *Option 2: Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5 when highspeed flag is not configured.*  Moderator changes the recommendation that is supported by most of the companies but two options that doesn’t align with it, at least CATT and QC can’t accept it. We suggest to at least add the original recommended WF as option 3.  Best regards,  Sean |
| Nokia | Thank you for the comments, Sean and Yanze!  Now I got what was the issue: just a copy-pasting misprint in Option 1.  Option 1 has been corrected to the correct option from the tentative agreement:   * Option 1: Define Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps = 24 and Mmeas\_period\_w/o\_gaps = 24 for PC 6 UEs in Clause 9.2.5.   NOTE 3 from tables Table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2-7 can be removed. |
| Moderator | Dear All,  after further offline checks, seems that Option 1 in the issue discussed below is ageable by all companies.  Therefore, the WF and the second round summary are update accordingly.  [(Draft)R4-2214469\_WF\_104-e\_206\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1\_Core\_v10\_Nok\_Moderator3.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/WF/(Draft)R4-2214469_WF_104-e_206_HST_FR2_RRM_1_Core_v10_Nok_Moderator3.docx)  Kind regards,  Dimitri |

**Discussion of requirement for intra-frequency measurement with measurement gaps**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Background:*  The Issue is the extension of the agreements in the two pervious Issues, applied to the measurements without gaps.  The issue is pending on the agreements is the corresponding issues.  *Recommendation for the second round*:  Agree on the agreement taking into account that the agreement in Issue 2-2 and 2-3 are achived. | |
| *Ericsson* | Recommendation is fine with us. |
| *ZTE* | Fine with the recommendation. |
| *CATT* | Agree with tentative agreement. |
| Moderator | The requirements seem to be not needed because there is an agreement from RAN4#103-e [R4-2210608]  **Agreement:**  For the enhancement of SA intra-frequency measurements with gaps in connected mode for FR2 HST, the same enhancement as for intra-frequency measurements without gaps should be applied. |

**Way forward on applicability of enhanced requirements for other PCs**:

Open issue needs further discussion:

When HST FR2 flags are configured for other power classes other than PC6, whether legacy requirements should be used.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Recommendation for the second round*:  Companies are encouraged to describe what are the expected specification impacts and to agree on the tentative agreement. | |
| *Ericsson* | Agree on the tentative agreement. |
| *ZTE* | Fine with the tentative agreement. |
| *CATT* | Agree with tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | Our question in the first round has not been answered. It is not clear whether such an agreement is needed.  FFS |

CRs/TPs

|  |
| --- |
| **R4-2214560, Rev. of** **R4-2211597, CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB, Qualcomm, Inc.** |
| Hi Sean,  Definition for RRH is needed according to drafting rules as mentioned many times. The following is added:  **Remote Radio Head**: FFS  As a network manufacturer, we will provide the RRH definition if possible before today’s GTW.  The revised version is uploaded to  [R4-221xxxx CR FR2 HST SSB restriction 104\_r5\_Nok.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/R4-221xxxx%20CR%20FR2%20HST%20SSB%20restriction%20104_r5_Nok.docx)  Best regards,  Anthony  **From:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 11:27 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Anthony,  If it’s a place holder without definition, why don’t we use [RRH]? And in fact, although it’s not in spec yet, RRH is commonly understand has remote radio head in FR1 and FR2 HST WID and discussion. If missing definition is the concern you have, we can add that RRH is remote radio head in abbreviation section and remove the reference to 38.101-4. Remote radio head should be a valid term to use, otherwise we probably have to revisit all the discussion in LTE HST, FR1 HST and FR2 HST. If you have definition for RRH other than remote radio head, you can propose and companies can review.  Here is the new version:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/R4-221xxxx%20CR%20FR2%20HST%20SSB%20restriction%20104_r4.docx>  Jackson, I assume this new version is good for Samsung? We’re also welcome comments from other companies.  Best regards,  Sean  **From:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 2:13 PM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Sean,  Let me clarify, the intention. Transmission reception points is a placeholder for RRH before it is defined. Once it is defined we can use RRH. That’s why we propose FFS but you rejected it. There is no definition for transmit/receive point. Do you know it is the same as RRH?  What other options do we have?  All our compromises are not acceptable. We can’t keep discussing this anymore.  Anthony  **From:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 9:30 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Anthony,  Let me understand your view: we have an existing agreement which is described by RRH. You complained that RRH doesn’t follow 3GPP drafting rules since it is not defined in 3GPP. And after Jackson proposed TRP or transmit/receive point, you claimed that both are not defined in 3GPP specification or defined differently.  Dimitri/Jackson, I think we need GTW to resolve this, but let me quote Nokia’s comments below, we want to provide Nokia’s comment to Chair so he understands the background, and we can proceed faster, also to capture these in Chairman note.  Nokia’s comment on explaining why they can’t agree this CR:   * There is no definition available in any 3GPP specification for the transmit/receive point * There is no description of TRP = Transmit/receive Point in any 3GPP technical specification. * In our understanding, RRH is used in 38.101-4 without respecting technical specification drafting rules.   Our comments/compromises are all very straight forward, if you want to quote any of our comment for fairness, feel free to do so.  Jackson, please let us know which wording we should use for GTW discussion, RRH, TRP, or [adjacent transmit/receive point]. No one can accept to use “transmission reception points” and discuss its definition in next meeting, given that this CR is to capture existing agreements.  Best regards, Sean  **From:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 1:00 PM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Sean,  There is no definition available in any 3GPP specification for the transmit/receive point of Jackson. We don’t know what it is. So transmission reception points are general. As mentioned in my previous e-mail, the definition of adjacent transmission reception points to be provided. Companies are encouraged to bring their definition to the next meeting.  TRP is an  abbreviation that is already used in RAN4 specifications, which stands for Total Radiated Power. Using the same abbreviation for two different definitions does not comply with drafting rules and also confusing.  Best regards,  Anthonyalso  **From:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 6:56 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Anthony/Dimitri,  Your change is captured in this new version, but we assume that you’re referring to transmit/receive point as Jackson mentioned from 38.300:  TA                        Timing Advance  TPC                      Transmit Power Control  TRP                      Transmit/Receive Point  Uploaded to:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/R4-221xxxx%20CR%20FR2%20HST%20SSB%20restriction%20104_r3.docx>  We assume with this change, the CR is agreeable. Dimitri, could you please change your recommendation in the summary? Thank you.  Best regards,  Sean  **From:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:43 AM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Sean, Jackson,  Here is another option:  Measurement and evaluation period requirements with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured in clause 4.2.2.3, 8.1.2.2, 8.5.2.2, 9.2.5, 9.2.6, 9.5.4, [9.8.4], delay requirements in clause 6.2.1.2.1, 8.10.3A, and UL timing adjustment in clause 7.1.2.3, are only applicable when any two SSBs from [adjacent transmission reception points] are not on the same or consecutive symbols.  Definition for adjacent transmission reception points to be provided. We can’t compromised any further.  Best regards,  Anthony  **From:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol)  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 6:16 PM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Sean,  RRH in square brackets is still undefined and not respecting drafting rules. As mentioned, it is not an option we can compromise.  Anthony  **From:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 6:05 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Anthony,  We can compromise to your first proposal of removing RRH without adding anything, and we can compromise to using TRP, but not FFS because it doesn’t capture the agreement at all. We also find it very very interesting that you consider “FFS” as a more acceptable language for spec than “RRH” and “TRP”. But different companies may have different view and we respect it.  We believe Jackson’s suggestion on square bracket RRH is the best compromise to satisfy everyone. We’ll wait to see if there is any consensus that can be reached in this thread, and therefore the formal CR to upload to inbox might be delayed.  Best regards,  Sean  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 9:47 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Jackson,  In 38.300, it provides what it stands for. But not definition. You can also find TRP in, e.g., 38.104:  TRP                       Total Radiated Power  There is no description  of TRP = Transmit/receive Point in any 3GPP technical specification. Your proposal is not acceptable to us because it doesn’t change anything even though in square brackets. This is the problem Nokia were facing before.  Another option is  Measurement and evaluation period requirements with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured in clause 4.2.2.3, 8.1.2.2, 8.5.2.2, 9.2.5, 9.2.6, 9.5.4, [9.8.4], delay requirements in clause 6.2.1.2.1, 8.10.3A, and UL timing adjustment in clause 7.1.2.3, are only applicable when any two SSBs from FFS are not on the same or consecutive symbols.  We can provide definition for RRH or TRP later.  Anthony  **From:** He Wang (Jackson) <[h0809.wang@samsung.com](mailto:h0809.wang@samsung.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 5:20 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Anthony,  TRP is widely used in 3GPP, and TS38.300 gives the definition:   |  | | --- | | TA                        Timing Advance  TPC                      Transmit Power Control  TRP                      Transmit/Receive Point  UCI                       Uplink Control Information |   My understanding is TRP is a more general concept widely used in 3GPP which includes RRH...  Is that reasonable explanation?  If Nokia prefer more time to check the good terminology, we are okay for original QC’s proposal with RRH in bracket.  Regards,  Jackson (He Wang)  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Friday, August 26, 2022 12:00 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Jackson,  Thanks for your comments.  Is TRP defined in 38.133 or any 3GPP technical specifications? TRP can be interpreted as Total Radiated Power. The proposed modification by Nokia is to respect drafting rules.  Best regards,  Anthony  **From:** He Wang (Jackson) <[h0809.wang@samsung.com](mailto:h0809.wang@samsung.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 4:56 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG); 'Chu-Hsiang Huang' <[chuhsian@QTI.QUALCOMM.COM](mailto:chuhsian@QTI.QUALCOMM.COM)> **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Anthony,  Thanks for having this text proposal.  But by following this TP, is that means all neighboring SSBs are not allowed to be used simultaneously?  I think based on the existing agreement, within one single RRH, it is of course allowed to have SSBs to be located on the consecutive symbols (i.e., one SSB is next to another SSB).  We unfortunately don’t agree with TP which proposed new (and not agreed) restriction to NW configuration.  To make progress, I suggest maybe “adjacent TRPs” is a good terminology with well defined.  Could we use that instead?  Measurement and evaluation period requirements with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured in clause 4.2.2.3, 8.1.2.2, 8.5.2.2, 9.2.5, 9.2.6, 9.5.4, [9.8.4], delay requirements in clause 6.2.1.2.1, 8.10.3A, and UL timing adjustment in clause 7.1.2.3, are only applicable when any two SSBs from adjacent TRPs ~~[21, clause B.3]~~ are not on the same or consecutive symbols.  Regards,  Jackson (He Wang)  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 11:27 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Sean,  Can you prove that Nokia’s comments were late? Our comments in the first round and second were made before the deadline following the Chairman’s guidelines. Late means after the deadline.  In our understanding, RRH is used in 38.101-4 without respecting technical specification drafting rules. It is about drafting rules and nothing else.  The context of “adjacent” you quoted in 38.214 is very clear. In clause 5.2.2.3.1, it says “adjacent slots” where slots are defined in 38.211 4.3.2           Slots. Is there a corresponding detailed description for RRH in any 3GPP technical specification?  Let’s not create another text proposal by not respecting 3GPP drafting rules. Do the following changes to your text proposal acceptable to you?  Measurement and evaluation period requirements with highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 configured in clause 4.2.2.3, 8.1.2.2, 8.5.2.2, 9.2.5, 9.2.6, 9.5.4, [9.8.4], delay requirements in clause 6.2.1.2.1, 8.10.3A, and UL timing adjustment in clause 7.1.2.3, are only applicable when any two SSBs ~~from adjacent RRHs [21, clause B.3]~~ are not on the same or consecutive symbols.  Nokia have compromise and we expect you to do so.  Best regards,  Anthony  **From:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>  **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 3:06 PM **To:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Anthony and Dimitri,  First, if you still can’t compromise to agree this CR, we suggest to treat this CR in the GTW and we can view together with chair and other companies the agreement and the proposed CR together with Nokia’s proposal of capturing it in TR.  For the wording issue, starting from the first round, Nokia didn’t make any wording suggestions or comment, but even as a late comment, let me address it now.   1. “RRH” as a term for HST is used in 38.101-4, which is agreed in FR1 HST discussion which Nokia was participating in. 2. “adjacent” is also a common 3GPP language use in many specifications, e.g., 38.214 clause 5.2.2.3.1, and there is no ambiguities.   If you have wording suggestions (you stated that “*we try to improve the text to better reflect all aspects*”), please let us know and we can try to incorporate. But what I read from the reply is that you’re asking to capture the agreement in TR instead of improving the text of the CR.  Best regards,  Sean  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 5:07 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Jackson, All,  Thanks for your e-mail.  Based on the interpretation of your comments below, we do not agree with the fact Nokia are stalling the progress of RAN4 work. Please a look at our comments in the first round.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Nokia* | *It is not necessary to capture the agreement in the specification. As a compromise, we suggest capturing this in the TR.* |   We suggest capturing in TR, which means the agreement is still implemented and respected. One of the reasons for TR is what you mentioned: “From NW vendor perspective, we also don’t prefer any additional restriction to NW deployment, but we would still like to follow the existing agreement. “  The question is how to better reflect the above in the text. 3GPP is consensus based. Comments from other companies should be taken into consideration. The TR contains all the background information about deployment scenarios, etc. If the agreement is in the TR, references can be made to the information/diagrams in TR which includes scenarios where restriction is needed.  Another issue is the language of the CR, which is not following the technical specification language. RRH is not a defined 3GPP term. What does “adjacent” mean? It is subject to different interpretations. One can interpret as two things on top of each other.  Hope you don’t misunderstanding our intention, we try to improve the text to better reflect all aspects.  Best regards,  Anthony  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** He Wang (Jackson) **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 4:52 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear Dimitri, Sean a.o,  To be honest, I don’t believe we have TU reserved for core requirement discussion.  In case Session chair can allocate some extra time for FR2 HST (after RRM performance part), we may suggest Chair to treat this.  But, do we really need GTW time? In other words, without compromise, even with some GTW time, can we really make progress?  To Nokia, I think agreement is agreement...  From NW vendor perspective, we also don’t prefer any additional restriction to NW deployment, but we would still like to follow the existing agreement.  BTW, technically, from CR implementation perspective, I don’t see any technical issue....  If CR to implement existing agreement which is also agreed by most of companies can be agreed, how can we make progress?  Regards,  Jackson (He Wang)  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Chu-Hsiang Huang **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 1:26 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Dimitri,  Could you elaborate why this is not critical for implementation? Without this CR, all the mentioned requirement may not be applicable because of SSB measurement interference, like new SSBs can’t be correctly measured or neighboring cell can’t be correctly detected. The agreement captured in this CR is from based on the discussion spam several meeting cycles, compared to the other issues raised in this meeting revising existing CR, we consider this CR has higher priority than those issues. In addition, this CR has majority support except one company, and we believe it is easier to conclude this CR than other topics.  Best regards,  Sean  **From:** Gold, Dimitri (Nokia - FI/Espoo) <[dimitri.gold@nokia-bell-labs.com](mailto:dimitri.gold@nokia-bell-labs.com)>  **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 10:16 AM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Sean, All,  Speaking as a moderator: This CR is definitely in the list of topics for the GtW, equally with the other issues from the Topic#2.  However, since the CR is not critical for the implementation of the HST FR2 feature I do not see a need to prioritize it in a special way.  Unfortunately, it seems that we did not get any dedicated allocation at RRM GtW session tomorrow for HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1.  Kind regards,  Dimitri  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Chu-Hsiang Huang **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 19:48 **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Hi Dimitri, Jackson, Anthony and all,  Given that all the companies (as the comment table shows) support this CR except Nokia, if Nokia can’t compromise, can we discuss this in GTW? Let us explain the CR below:  This CR is to capture the following agreements:  RAN4#103e meeting WF (R4-2210608):  **Issue 2-1-1: Scheduling restriction on SSB**  **Agreement**:  FR2 HST requirement is applicable only when the two SSBs from adjacent RRHs are not on the adjacent symbols.  And the following agreement from RAN4#100e meeting WF (R4-2115335):  **Non-overlapping SSB location**   * RRM requirements specified in RAN4 will NOT consider SSB overlapping case.   These agreements don’t exclude any deployment scenario. The technical discussion like whether these restrictions are applicable to specific scenarios should happen in the open issue discussion stage, not CR stage. The CR should capture the agreement.  According to Ericsson’s comment, they support to capture this agreement in TS. If Ericsson has wording suggestions or concern, we want to see Ericsson’s suggestion, not Nokia’s interpretation of Ericsson’s comment.  If this is a wording issue, from the first round Nokia never suggested any wording or raised wording issue except that last comment after all the companies expressed support. Paste Nokia’s comment below for reference. Therefore, the options should be agreeing QC’s CR or agreeing Nokia’s proposal on capturing the agreement in TR.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Nokia | It is not necessary to capture the agreement in the specification. As a compromise, we suggest capturing this in the TR. |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Nokia | Capturing the applicability in TR is a good compromise because earlier applicability is captured in the TR. One example is:  Note: the applicability of Set 1/2 requirements to the FR2 HST scenarios will be captured in the TR  “Set 1 requirements are developed based on the analysis with Dmin = 10m and Ds = 750m, and the recommended applicable range of Dmin for Set 1 requirement is Dmin <= [30] m. For the deployment with a larger Dmin, set 2 requirements are recommended to be configured by the network.”  Further, there are deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided. Thus, the TR is more appropriate, which can be explicitly specified. |   Paste the comments from all companies below:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | QC | Scheduling restriction is always captured in TS 38.133, we don’t see how UE and network are going to follow the agreed requirement captured in TR. TR is for side information like set 1/2 recommendation, or speed limit/release related information. Requirement should be captured in TS.38.133 | | Nokia | Capturing the applicability in TR is a good compromise because earlier applicability is captured in the TR. One example is:  Note: the applicability of Set 1/2 requirements to the FR2 HST scenarios will be captured in the TR  “Set 1 requirements are developed based on the analysis with Dmin = 10m and Ds = 750m, and the recommended applicable range of Dmin for Set 1 requirement is Dmin <= [30] m. For the deployment with a larger Dmin, set 2 requirements are recommended to be configured by the network.”  Further, there are deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided. Thus, the TR is more appropriate, which can be explicitly specified. | | QC | Note that Nokia’s quoted applicability is a recommendation, not requirement. Moreover,  for Nokia’s statement “are deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided”, we’re not sure what applicability Nokia is referring to (obviously not set 1/2 applicability as it’s not relevant to scheduling restriction) given that there is no applicability rule related to deployment scenario agreed for this scheduling restriction. | | OPPO | Prefer clearly capture scheduling restriction on SSB in TS. We also have the similar concern on deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided | | Ericsson | It is preferable to cover scheduling restrictions for SSB in TS.. In fact, the statement in CR is more about UE’s behavior upon certain SSB configurations. Maybe concern from Nokia is that the SSB configuration itself shall not be in TS. | | ZTE | it is better to reflect the scheduling restriction on SSG in TS, which is more straightforward. | | Huawei | The revised CR is fine to us.  The SSB scheduling issue was ever discussed and had agreement that the SSB from adjacent RRHs shall avoid overlapping. We also think this requirements are supposed to be specified in TS 38.133, like some other requirements, e.g., data scheduling restriction/ measurement restriction ect. |   Best regards,  Sean  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 9:28 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear All,  We have concerns with the CR. It is not clear whether the restriction is for bidirectional or unidirectional. Based on our understanding, there is no issue with bidirectional. Even with unidirectional, it does not occur in scenario below, where RRH1 transmits SSB first and then followed by RRH2 transmits the next SSB:    The question is how to capture this. Another issue as pointed out correctly by Ericsson is the wording. The wording is not suitable for TS but for TR.  We are open to further discuss and how to improve the wording first before deciding on where it should be captured. Let’s work on the text and capturing more details.  Best regards,  Anthony  Nokia  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Zhang Chenchen **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 5:24 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision  Dear all,  ZTE's comments are added in the table.  Best Regards,  Chenchen ZHANG  张晨晨  **ZTE Corporation**    Original  **From:**MingLiL <[000003772399a9aa-dmarc-request@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:000003772399a9aa-dmarc-request@LIST.ETSI.ORG)>  **To:**[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)>;  **Date:**2022年08月24日 23:11  **Subject: Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision**  Dear all,  Ericsson’s comments are added in table.    Best Regards  Ming Li    **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Hanjing (Hw) **Sent:** den 24 augusti 2022 16:45 **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision    Dear Sean and all,    The revised CR is fine to us.  The SSB scheduling issue was ever discussed and had agreement that the SSB from adjacent RRHs shall avoid overlapping. We also think this requirements are supposed to be specified in TS 38.133, like some other requirements, e.g., data scheduling restriction/ measurement restriction ect.    BR,  Han Jing  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 [<mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG>] **On Behalf Of** Roy Hu **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 9:35 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision    Dear Sean and all,    Thanks Sean for the updated CR. It looks fine to us. We also think the scheduling restriction on SSB is different from deployment scenario. It is proper to clearly capture such scheduling restriction in TS, as we usually do.    Besides, please find our comments in the table below.    BRs,  Roy    **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Chu-Hsiang Huang **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 9:26 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision    Hi Anthony and all,  QC further comments are added.    Best regards,  Sean    **From:** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) <[anthony.lo@nokia.com](mailto:anthony.lo@nokia.com)>  **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 5:21 AM **To:** Chu-Hsiang Huang <[chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com)>; [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** RE: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision    **WARNING:** This email originated from outside of Qualcomm. Please be wary of any links or attachments, and do not enable macros.  Dear Sean,    Please find some comments from Nokia in the table below.    Best regards,  Anthony  Nokia    **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Chu-Hsiang Huang **Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:22 AM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211597\_SSB\_scheduling\_restriction\_revision    Hi all,  Thank you Dimitri for the guidance.    Based on the comment in the first round, we see the need to collect company’s opinion on Nokia’s comment. We start the thread early to give companies more time to check.    CATT’s comment is addressed in the new version:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/R4-221xxxx%20CR%20FR2%20HST%20SSB%20restriction%20104_r1.docx>  9.5.8 is removed, 9.8.4 is added in square bracket, and we can finalize it once the related open issue is agreed.    For Nokia’s comment, we list the two options below:  Option 1(QC): capture scheduling restriction requirement on SSB in 38.133  Option 2(Nokia): capture scheduling restriction requirement on SSB in TR but NOT in 38.133  Please comment in the following table.     |  |  | | --- | --- | | Company | Comment | | QC | Scheduling restriction is always captured in TS 38.133, we don’t see how UE and network are going to follow the agreed requirement captured in TR. TR is for side information like set 1/2 recommendation, or speed limit/release related information. Requirement should be captured in TS.38.133 | | Nokia | Capturing the applicability in TR is a good compromise because earlier applicability is captured in the TR. One example is:  Note: the applicability of Set 1/2 requirements to the FR2 HST scenarios will be captured in the TR  “Set 1 requirements are developed based on the analysis with Dmin = 10m and Ds = 750m, and the recommended applicable range of Dmin for Set 1 requirement is Dmin <= [30] m. For the deployment with a larger Dmin, set 2 requirements are recommended to be configured by the network.”  Further, there are deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided. Thus, the TR is more appropriate, which can be explicitly specified. | | QC | Note that Nokia’s quoted applicability is a recommendation, not requirement. Moreover,  for Nokia’s statement “are deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided”, we’re not sure what applicability Nokia is referring to (obviously not set 1/2 applicability as it’s not relevant to scheduling restriction) given that there is no applicability rule related to deployment scenario agreed for this scheduling restriction. | | OPPO | Prefer clearly capture scheduling restriction on SSB in TS. We also have the similar concern on deployment scenarios where the applicability does not apply and scheduling restriction can be avoided | | Ericsson | It is preferable to cover scheduling restrictions for SSB in TS.. In fact, the statement in CR is more about UE’s behavior upon certain SSB configurations. Maybe concern from Nokia is that the SSB configuration itself shall not be in TS. | | ZTE | it is better to reflect the scheduling restriction on SSG in TS, which is more straightforward. | | Huawei | The revised CR is fine to us.  The SSB scheduling issue was ever discussed and had agreement that the SSB from adjacent RRHs shall avoid overlapping. We also think this requirements are supposed to be specified in TS 38.133, like some other requirements, e.g., data scheduling restriction/ measurement restriction ect. |       Here are the comments from the 1st round, for your reference.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | [**R4-2211597**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211597.zip)**, CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB, Qualcomm, Inc.** | | | CATT | There is no clause 9.5.8.  Clause 9.8 is not included. | | Nokia | It is not necessary to capture the agreement in the specification. As a compromise, we suggest capturing this in the TR. | |  |  |     Best regards,  Sean |
| *[Moderator]:*  No final agreement is achieved for the CR text.  It is recommended to Return to the CR at the final GtW session. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **R4-2214563, Rev. of R4-2211676, CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2, CATT.** | |
| Dear Anthony,    Thank you for reply. According to the latest WF, Issue 2-3 is resolved. Issue 2-2 is still under discussing. Due to the deadline tonight, we uploaded current version to inbox: [R4-2214563.zip](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/R4-2214563.zip)  Best Regards,  Yanze  **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 [<mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG>] **On Behalf Of** Lo, Anthony (Nokia - GB/Bristol) **Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2022 7:02 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211676\_revision  Dear Yanze,    Thanks for the e-mail.    As stated in your e-mail, the first bullet “due to no consensus on Issue 2-2 in WF, the additional note are not captured in latest version. Nokia only agrees cosigning if adding the additional note and only agrees to remove the square brackets if the note is added.”, Nokia cannot agree with the CR since the square brackets are removed.  For the third bullet, this is a minor correction, we will come back at the next meeting to better capture the text since the note is deleted.  Best regards,  Anthony      **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 <[3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG)> **On Behalf Of** Yanze Fu **Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 7:30 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211676\_revision    Dear all,    Please find the final draft for your review : [Revised\_R4-2211676\_CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements\_v1.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/Revised_R4-2211676_CR%20on%20RRM%20core%20requirements%20for%20measurement%20procedure%20requirements_v1.docx).    The changes compared to the version in last mail are:   1. Due to no consensus on Issue 2-2 in WF, the additional note are not captured in latest version. Nokia only agrees cosigning if adding the additional note and only agrees to remove the square brackets if the note is added. 2. Update tdoc number 3. For the modification in Nokia’s version: “For a UE supporting FR2 power class 6, Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps =24 when highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 is not configured.” We don’t agree on the modification. If so, there is no definition for Mpss/sss\_sync\_w/o\_gaps when highSpeedMeasFlagFR2-r17 is configured. There are such cases in tables. So we keep the original one.     Best Regards,  Yanze    **From:** 3gpp\_tsg\_ran\_wg4: tsg ran working group 4 [<mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG>] **On Behalf Of** Yanze Fu **Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2022 2:50 PM **To:** [3GPP\_TSG\_RAN\_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG](mailto:3GPP_TSG_RAN_WG4@LIST.ETSI.ORG) **Subject:** Re: [104-e][206] NR\_HST\_FR2\_RRM\_1 - CR-R4-2211676\_revision    Dear all,    Per moderator’s guidance, this sub-thread is used to discuss revised CR of R4-2211676.     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | R4-2211676 |  | CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2 | CATT | Revised | *It is recommended to add Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell as a cosigning company to the revision.* |     The revision can be found in: [Revised\_R4-2211676\_CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B104-e%5D%5B206%5D%20NR_HST_FR2_RRM_1/CRs/Revised_R4-2211676_CR%20on%20RRM%20core%20requirements%20for%20measurement%20procedure%20requirements.docx)  The changes are:   1. add Nokia as a cosigning company.   2. delete NOTE 3 in table 9.2.5.1-11 and Table 9.2.5.2.7 according to current tentative agreements of Issue 2-3 in latest WF.      The addition of the clarification notes in Issue 2-2 haven’t been added in this version. The original changes have already included current tentative agreements of Issue 2-3/2-4/2-5. If any further progress in WF, the CR can be updated then. Thank you.    Best Regards,  Yanze | |
| *Moderator* | No final agreement is achieved for the CR text.  It is recommended to Return to the CR at the final GtW session. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **R4-2214645, Rev. of R4-2213892, CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** | |
| *[Moderator]* | *There is no agreement on the issue in the meeting. The CR is recommended to be postponed.* |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **New Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| R4-2214469 | WF on HST FR2 RRM Core Requirement Maintenance | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Revised to** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2211597 | R4-2214560 | CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB | Qualcomm, Inc. | Revised |  |
| R4-2211676 | R4-2214563 | CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2 | CATT | Revised | *It is recommended to add Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell as a cosigning company to the revision.* |
| R4-2213399 | R4-2214625 | CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised |  |
| R4-2213891 |  | CR to TS 38.133: Clarification of intrafrequency cell identification for FR2 HST | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Merged | *It is recommended to merge the CR with the revision of R4-2211676* |
| R4-2213892 | R4-2214645 | CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Revised |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Revised to** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-22xxxxx |  | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-2214469 |  | WF on HST FR2 RRM Core Requirement Maintenance | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Return to | *The discussion on the CRs related to the issues in the WF are still ongoing:*  *Issue 2-2, 2-3: CR R4-2214563*  *An additional WF might be needed in relation to R4-2214560* |
| R4-2214560 |  | CR: FR2 HST Scheduling restriction on SSB | Qualcomm, Inc. | Return to | *No final agreement was achieved before the final GtW session* |
| R4-2214563 |  | CR on RRM core requirements for measurement procedure requirements for HST FR2 | CATT | Return to | *No final agreement was achieved before the final GtW session* |
| R4-2214625 |  | CR to 38.133 on UL Transmit Timing in HST FR2 Scenario | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Postponed |  |
| R4-2214645 |  | CR to TS 38.133: SSB-based L1-SINR measurements for FR2 NR HST | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Postponed |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents