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# Introduction

This email thread treats the following topics:

1. Time difference for MIMO with two TAs (R1-2205593)
2. Feature Group 6-1a (R2-2204009, RP-221870)
3. UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN (R1-2205642)
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# Topic #1: Time differentiate for MIMO with two TAs (R1-2205593)

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2211906**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211906.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Apple | **Proposal 1: check with RAN1 to see if RAN4 can still assume MRTD from multiple TRP is within a CP in R18.**  **Observation 1: MTTD is different for different scenarios. RAN4 needs to know which scenarios to be supported when calculating MTTD.**  **Proposal 2: check with RAN1 on the following supported scenarios**   * **Both FR1 and FR2** * **Both sync and async** * **Only intra-frequency** * **Maximum distance between two TRPs: 9km in FR1 and 1.5km in FR2.**     Proposal 3: on scenarios mentioned in proposal 2, MTTD is as following:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Frequency range** | **Deployment** | **MTTD** | | FR1 | Sync | 34.6us | | Async | Half slot | | FR2 | sync | 8.5us | |
| [**R4-2211979**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211979.zip) | On Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Xiaomi | **Observation 1: The two TA of corresponding two UL transmission are both for one cell.**  **Observation 2: The maximum distance of the two TRPs can be within one cell or for different cells.**  **Observation 3: Both FR1 and FR2 need to be considered.**  **Observation 4: Current RAN4 RRM spec has only defined MTTD requirement for inter-band NR CA, NR-DC, EN-DC, NE-DC and intra-band EN-DC cases.**  **Proposal 1: For intra-cell m-TRP case, the maximum uplink transmission timing difference refer to the Rel-18 RAN4 intra-band non-collocated WID defined MTTD requirement.**  **Proposal 2: For inter-cell m-TRP case, the current inter-band CA MTTD requirement can be reused.** |
| [**R4-2212115**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212115.zip) | On Multiple TA for multi-TRP MRTD MTTD limits | InterDigital Communications | ***Observation 1:*** *For NR-DC synchronous case or NR inter-band CA within FR2 the maximum receive time difference defined in 38.133 specification is 8us.*  ***Observation 2:*** *The baseband and time processing may impose limits of the Maximum Receive Time Difference and Maximum Transmit Time Difference for the multi-TRP scenario with 2 TAs scenario.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *For m-TRP with two TAs Maximum Transmit Time Difference limits adopt NR inter-band CA cases as baseline.*    ***Proposal 2:*** *Adopt for intra-cell m-TRP scenario with two**TAs the MTTD within FR1 as 34.6us and within FR2-1 as 8.5us.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *The LS reply mention that for intra-cell m-TRP scenario with two**TAs RAN4 agreed that the MTTD within FR1 is 34.6us and within FR2-1 is 8.5us like the current NR inter-band UL CA timing requirements.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Adopt for intra-cell m-TRP scenario with two**TAs the MRTD within FR1 as 33us and within FR2-1 as 8us and covey this information to RAN1 in the LS reply.* |
| [**R4-2212326**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212326.zip) | Reply LS to RAN1 on mTRP mDCI mTAG TA difference | Qualcomm Incorporated | **Observation 1: The inter-band CA MTTD is an upper-bound for TA difference in the multi-DCI multi-TRP case.**  In TDD bands, there is no meaningful front-end protection for the receiver. Here, for the TDM case, there is the potential for overlapping Tx symbols when there is a TCI-state switch. In our view, some clarification of prioritization or similar treatment in RAN1 would be useful.  Finally, there is the potential of UL and DL symbol overlap, but this is an old problem and is assumed to have been addressed with the proper choice of ‘F’ symbols in the ‘S’ slot.  **Observation 2: For the TDM multi-DCI UL case, there is potential for overlap between UL symbols across TAGs when there is a TCI-state switch.**  These conclusions are FR-agnostic and apply to any TDD band.  **Proposal: (reply LS draft in the annex.)** |
| [**R4-2212468**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212468.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs and Reply LS | Samsung | ***Observation 1:* In RAN4, all the existing MRTD requirements (for NR-CA, EN-DC, NR-DC) have been agreed to apply for the case with multi-TRPs in Rel-16.**  ***Observation 2:* In RAN4, there is no final decision explicitly to define MRTD requirement from two TRPs, but there is one clarification in TS 38.133:**  **The requirements defined in clause [7.6] are also applicable when UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.**  ***Observation 3:* In RAN1, for both intra and inter-cell, multi-TRP operations were limited to within a CP reception in Rel-17, but has not yet concluded that whether the downlink signals arrive within a CP or not in Rel-18**  For RAN4’s reply to RAN1 LS (R1-2205593), the following proposals are provided:  ***Proposal 1:* RAN4 provide the following reply to Q1 raised in RAN1 LS:**   * **RAN4 see the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band sync NR-DC, i.e., 34.6us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR1, and 8.5us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR2-1, can be used as a starting point for RAN1, assumed as the maximum uplink timing difference between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation.** * **Specifically, the maximum uplink timing difference between two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation discussed in RAN4 is the relative transmission timing difference between slot timing boundaries of the TX signals with TA1 and TA2.** |
| [**R4-2212527**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212527.zip) | Discussion on LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | MediaTek Inc. | **Observation 1: Whether to use multiple panels or single panel for UL transmission is up to UE implementation.**  **Observation 2: For two UL signals transmitted from one panel at a time, the power jump problem may lead to the phase of the signal is not contiguous and network may not receive the signals successfully.**  **Proposal 1: For single UE panel, the timing difference between two UL signals transmission at a time should be smaller than one CP.**  **Proposal 2: For multiple UE panels, the timing difference may be larger than one CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.** |
| [**R4-2212672**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212672.zip) | Discussion and draft reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | vivo | **Observation 1 Based on RAN1 agreements, the 2 TA enhancements can be applicable to 3 types of scenarios:**   * **FR1 UE** * **FR2 UE, probably with the simultaneous different QCL-D Rx capability, but is only able to Tx from one panel.** * **FR2 UE that is capable of Tx from 2 different panels.**   **Observation 2 For simultaneous Rx with different panels, the RTD assumption is being discussed in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.**  **Observation 3 MTTD requirements in TS 38.133 define the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference between different TRPs within the single carrier.**  **Proposal RAN4 to provide RAN1 with the following feedback for the LS**   * **For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.** * **For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.** |
| [**R4-2212917**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212917.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. RAN1 has agreed to support two TA enhancement for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP non-collocated scenarios in FR1 and FR2 in Rel-18.   The current MTTD requirements defined in RAN4 are applicable to inter-band carrier aggregation and dual connectivity scenarios, in which it is considered that the UE has separate RX chains. There are currently no MRTD/ MTTD study or requirements specified for MIMO transmissions and non-collocated TRP scenarios  It is not clear from the WI what is the assumption on the UE receiver chain: single or multiple time tracking and control chains for UE RX and TX respectively RAN1 is still discussing UE behaviours of multi-DCI multi-TRP operation with two TA commands   1. RAN4 to discuss the UE Tx/Rx architecture and time tracking and control assumptions for the definition of MTTD requirements. UE behaviors should be further clarified regarding  * UE reference timing tracking behaviors in DL on two TRPs * UE TX timing determination in UL based on two TA commends   The MTTD depends on the TAE at the gNB, the propagation delay difference between both TRPs, and TA step size and adjustment accuracy.   1. RAN4 to discuss the tolerable MTTD for the non-collocated scenarios. The baseline for the discussion can be the values considered in the inter-band CA case.  * If reusing the requirements of the inter-band CA, a UE should be able to track DL timings separately for two non-collocated TRP and also maintain two TX timing based on two TA commands for two non-collocated TRP respectively. |
| R4-2213304 | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | ZTE Corporation | Withdrawn？ |
| [**R4-2213496**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213496.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1: The maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multi-TRPs relies on the maximum downlink receive timing difference between multi-TRPs.**  **Observation 2: In both R16 and R17, RAN4 agreed that the receive timing difference between different TRPs is assumed to be within a CP length.**  **Proposal 1: In R18, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed as a CP length.** |
| [**R4-2213887**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213887.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal: The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:**   * **For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs** * **For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs** |
| [**R4-2213960**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213960.zip) | Discussion on MTTD for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | **Proposal 1: RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.**  **Proposal 2: RAN4 to send a soft response (i.e., not indicating exact values) regarding the design constraints that effect MRTD and MTTD computation.** |
| [**R4-2213961**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213961.zip) | LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | Draft LS reply. |
|  |  |  |  |

## Open issues summary

In Rel-18 discussions on MIMO Evolution for Downlink and Uplink, RAN1 has agreed to support multi-DCI multi-TRP operation with two TAs. With regards to the maximum uplink timing difference between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation, RAN1 made the following conclusion in RAN1#109-e:

**Conclusion: For multi-DCI multi-TRP operation with two TAs, the decision on the maximum uplink timing difference is left up to RAN4.**

* **send an LS to RAN4 asking them the maximum uplink timing difference RAN1 can assume between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation.**

RAN1 would kindly like to ask RAN4 to provide feedback on what maximum uplink timing difference that RAN1 can assume between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation.

### Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: No. The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 defines the limitation on time difference only for inter-cell case. E.g. the concerning signals are from different CCs.
  + Option 2: Yes. The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover both intra-cell case and inter cell case.
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case

* Proposals
  + Option 1: the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)
  + Option 2: the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on number of panels
    - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.
    - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.
  + Option 3: the maximum uplink transmission timing difference refer to the Rel-18 RAN4 intra-band non-collocated WID defined MTTD requirement.
  + Option 4: RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.
  + Option 5: The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:
    - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs
    - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs
  + Option 6: other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case

* Proposals
  + Option 1: the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)
  + Option 2: the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on the number of panels
    - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.
    - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.
  + Option 3: the current inter-band CA MTTD requirement can be reused.
  + Option 4: RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.
  + Option 5: The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:
    - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs
    - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs
  + Option 6: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Reply RAN4’s recommendation based on the conclusion for Sub-topic 1-1/2/3.
  + Option 2: RAN4 to send a soft response (i.e., not indicating exact values) regarding the design constraints that effect MRTD and MTTD computation.
  + Option 3: reply to RAN1 that the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band sync NR-DC, i.e., 34.6us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR1, and 8.5us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR2-1, can be used as a starting point for RAN1, assumed as the maximum uplink timing difference between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP
  + Option 4: clarify the intended scenarios with RAN1 at first.
  + Option 5: other, please specify.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | **For sub-topic 1-1:**  For MTTD, the current requirements only focus on inter-cell case, including intra/inter-band EN-DC, intra/inter-band CA, inter-band NE-DC and inter-band NR-DC.  For MRTD, an clarification was captured in 133, i.e. The requirements defined in clause [7.6] are also applicable when UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers. But not any MRTD requirement under intra-cell case was provided in 133.  So we prefer Option 1.  **For sub-topic 1-2:**  We are fine with Option 3 and Option 5.  For Option 5, since MTTD is mainly defined by MRTD and UE transmission timing error. Regarding to MRTD between mTRP, in R17 FeMIMO topic, RAN4 has identified that the Timing offset between serving cell and the cell with different PCI are within CP.  Regarding to the UE transmission timing error, for intra-cell mTRP, the distance of two TRP is the inter-cell distance. Since not any requirements identified for intra-band CA case, so we can only reference to inter-band CA case. By comparing the MTTD and MRTD in inter-band CA case, it can be shown that the difference between MTTD and MRTD is 1.6µs for FR1, and 0.5µs for FR2. So we estimate the MTTD between mTRP as CP+1.6µs for FR1 and CP+0.5µs for FR2.  **For sub-topic 1-3:**  We are fine with Option 4 and Option 5.  For Option 5, since MTTD is mainly defined by MRTD and UE transmission timing error. Regarding to MRTD between mTRP, in R17 FeMIMO topic, RAN4 has identified that the Timing offset between serving cell and the cell with different PCI are within CP.  Regarding to the UE transmission timing error, for inter-cell mTRP, which is non-colocated, similar as inter-band CA case. So by comparing the MTTD and MRTD in inter-band CA case, it can be shown that the difference between MTTD and MRTD is 1.6µs for FR1, and 0.5µs for FR2. So we estimate the MTTD between mTRP as CP+1.6µs for FR1 and CP+0.5µs for FR2.  **For sub-topic 1-4:**  We are fine with Option 2 and Option 3. |
| IDC | **For sub-topic 1.1:**  We believe that Option 2 is feasible as Rel-18 is focusing on multi-panel UE.  Also, we see benefits and synergies on keeping the deployment size (in terms of propagation time) same as inter-band CA case for MRTD, MTTD respectively.  **For sub-topic 1-2:**  We are fine with Option 4. But we are fine with Option 2 is the number of the UE panels must be mentioned. But we believe that Rel-18 is about multi-panel UE. For option 2, obviously we think of inter-band CA MRTD, MTTD requirements.  **For sub-topic 1-3:**  Option 3 (for multi-panel UE obviously).  **For sub-topic 1-4:**  Option 3. We believe it is feasible. But if the group decides to send a softer message it would be Ok as well (option 2) indicating what kind of design constrains are on the horizon. |
| Apple | **Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case.**  Observation in option 1 aligns with current MRTD/MTTD requirements design.  **Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case**  MTTD and MRTD are symmetric to some extent. RAN1 had assumption in R16 and R17 that MRTD is within CP. It is unclear whether we can still hold this assumption in R18 discussion. If so, we support option 1 and 5. Note that existing MRTD and MTTD assume 9km (FR1) and 1.5km (FR2) distance between the two Nodes, which we believe is larger than typical intra-cell deployment. Another point we would like to highlight is that the WID is not limited to multiple panels capable UE according to our understanding.  **Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case**  Similar with intra-cell case, it is better to check the assumption of MRTD first.  **Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1**  We support option 4, which is necessary to discuss MRTD/MTTD. |
| vivo | **Sub-topic 1-1**  The MRTD/MTTD should cover both the intra-cell case and inter-cell case. However, a tighter TAE requirement for gNB between multi-TRP is normally assumed, for the case when M-TRP transmission is performed. Such tighter TAE is also applicable to both intra-cell case and inter-cell case.  Therefore, we would like to support option 3:  The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover both intra-cell case and inter-cell case, if ‘intra-cell’ here means transmission/reception from serving cell(s) in multiple carriers, and ‘inter-cell’ means reception/transmission to any cell that are not serving cell.  For M-TRP scenario, a tighter TAE requirement, e.g. <CP, for gNB between multi-TRP is normally assumed, for both UL and DL.  **Sub-topic 1-2**  We would like to support option 6  • For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.  • For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.  **Sub-topic 1-3**  Same as intra-cell case, i.e. sub-topic 1-2. Actually we do not see any difference between intra-cell and inter-cell for this issue.  **Sub-topic 1-4**  Same as sub-topic 1-2. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case.  * + We think Option 3. In RAN4, we defined MRTD requirement for CA or DC case and not for MIMO. So far in RAN4, we assumed that for MIMO case RTD is with in CP.   Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case   * + We defined MRTD requirement for CA or DC case and not for MIMO. So far in RAN4, we assumed that for MIMO case RTD is with in CP. MTTD = MRTD + UL margins.   + First, we need to agree on the deployment scenario. That means the maximum distance or separation between TRPs should be agreed. Next thing is UE architecture like single FFT or multiple FFT can be supported needs to be agreed.   + Assuming multiple FFT, scenario can be treated as non-collocated .  Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case  * + We defined MRTD requirement for CA or DC case and not for MIMO. So far in RAN4, we assumed that for MIMO case RTD is with in CP. MTTD = MRTD + UL margins.   + First, we need to agree on the deployment scenario. That means the maximum distance or separation between TRPs should be agreed. Next thing is UE architecture like single FFT or multiple FFT can be supported needs to be agreed.   + Assuming multiple FFT, scenario can be treated as non-collocated .  Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1  * We support Option 2, that is RAN4 to send a soft response (i.e., not indicating exact values) regarding the design constraints that effect MRTD and MTTD computation. Once we had conclusion in RAN4 after further study, we could send a detailed LS. |
| MediaTek | **Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case.**  Support option 1.  According to following requirement, we tend to believe the MRTD/MTTD requirement is applicable for different CC only.   |  | | --- | | 7.5.1 Introduction A UE shall be capable of handling a relative transmission timing difference between subframe timing boundary of E-UTRA PCell and the closest slot timing boundary of PSCell to be aggregated for EN-DC operation.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative transmission timing difference among the closest slot timing boundaries of different carriers to be aggregated in NR carrier aggregation.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative transmission timing difference between slot timing boundary of PCell and subframe timing boundary of E-UTRA PSCell to be aggregated for NE-DC operation.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative transmission timing difference between slot timing boundaries of PCell and the closest slot timing boundary of PSCell to be aggregated in NR DC operation. 7.6.1 Introduction A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference between subframe timing boundary of an E-UTRA cell belonging to the MCG and the closest slot timing boundary of a cell belonging to SCG to be aggregated for EN-DC operation.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference between subframe timing boundary of an E-UTRA cell belonging to the SCG to be aggregated for NE-DC operation and the closest slot timing boundary of a cell belonging to MCG.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference between slot timing boundary of a cell belonging to MCG and the closest slot timing boundary of a cell belonging to the SCG to be aggregated for NR DC operation.  A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference among the closest slot timing boundaries of different carriers to be aggregated in NR carrier aggregation.  The requirements defined in clause 7.6 are also applicable when UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers. |   **Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case**  Support option 2.  To our understanding, it is related to the number of UE Rx panels. If single panel is used, timing difference should be within oneCP. Because, the UL timing is derived from DL timing and, in general, single panel only has one SYNC resource to handle the timing problem. If two panels are used, two SYNC resources may be configured. So, the timing difference may be larger than one CP.  **Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case**  Support option 2. Same comment as sub-topic 1-2.  **Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1** Support option 1. |
| Samsung | **Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case.**  Before the below clarification introduced in Rel-16 eMIMO for mTRP operation, it is clear that MRTD/MTTD requirement specified in TS38.133 applies for inter-cell case.  However, the following clarification (agreed in RAN4#101-e) is provided for MRTD in clause 7.6.1:   |  | | --- | | The requirements defined in clause 7.6 are also applicable when UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers. |   The clause is provided as a compromise to the two “explicit” expressions agreed in previous RAN4 meeting (RAN4#100):   |  | | --- | | **Clarification on applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements for Multi-TRxP**  Agreements:   * Add a clarification on MRTD applicability to multi-TRxP scenario into RAN4 specification   + Option 2a: A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference between slot timing boundaries of any one carrier and the closest slot timing boundary of another carrier in NR carrier aggregation; and if UE receives multiple PDSCHs within one of any of the two carriers, the UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference among the closest slot timing boundaries of two PDSCHs from respective carriers.   + Option 2b: A UE shall be capable of handling a relative receive timing difference between slot timing boundaries of any one carrier and the closest slot timing boundary of another carrier in NR carrier aggregation; and if a UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH from different TRP on the same carrier,  the UE shall be capable of handling a relative timing difference between any one of the slot timing boundaries of any one carrier with multiple PDSCH and the closest slot timing boundary of another carrier in NR carrier aggregation.   + Other options are not precluded |   From the above discussion history, we have the O1 and O2 as mentioned in our paper.  **So our understanding is:**   * **We suggest the Option 1a to better reflects the discussion history and how this compromise clause is derived in R16 eMIMO WI:**    + **Option 1a (new): No. The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 defines the limitation on time difference only for inter-cell case. E.g. the concerning signals are from different CCs, however, the requirements shall also be applicable to the case in which “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”** * **Our interpretation on the above clause is: if mTRP is used on any one of the aggregated NR carriers, the requirement of MRTD still applies, i.e., one of multiple TRPs should be used for the timing reference on this carrier, but not limitation on which one. As long as UE can handle the MRTD from one of multiple TRPs and another carriers, the requirement should be regarded as satisfied.**   **Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case**  Firstly, option 3 (refer to R18 non-collocated intra-band EN-DC/NR-CA WI) contains both EN-DC and NR-CA, which one to follow is still big problem.  **Our proposed option is Option 4.** Based on the timing difference discussions in RAN4 scope, the MRTD/MTTD value for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation can be much comparable to that for NR-NR DC with synchronization operation, which can be treated as the worst case. So that the existing RAN4 MTTD requirement for inter-band sync NR-DC, i.e., 34.6us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR1 and 8.5us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR2-1 respectively as below, can be used as a good starting point to be discussed.  To support two TA, separate DL timing should be maintained, and existing limitation on DL timing (within CP) for R16/17 mTRP should be revisited, otherwise we don’t know how this two Tas for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation works.  **Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case**  Same as sub-topic 1-2 for Option 3. But Option 3 or 4 should be the same if we are discussing MTTD.  **Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1**  **Option 3.** |
| Qualcomm | **For sub-topic 1.1:**  It is not clear to us what is the definition of “inter-cell” and “intra-cell” in the context of the existing MRTD/MTTD. The current timing differences are for serving cells in CA. If the question is about whether MRTD/MTTD can be applied to multi-TRS with the same cell ID as serving cell or a different cell ID from the serving cell, MRTD is not directly related to the question in the RAN1 LS although MRTD is one of the main components of MRTD.  **For sub-topic 1-2:**  We do not understand if we need to discuss the issue separately for intra-cell mTRP and inter-cell mTRP.  We do not understand why single vs. multi-FFT matters here.  If single UE panel needs to be considered, Option 2 would be a starting point. Besides, any impact on Rx/Tx performance/behavior due to DL-UL and UL-DL overlapping in TDD may also need to be considered.  **For sub-topic 1-3:**  Same comment as above. For inter-cell mTRP, it would be more or less the same as CA-like operation on the same carrier, hence, inter-band FR2 MTTD would be a starting point as the maximum timing different UE might be able to deal with for mTRP.  **For sub-topic 1-4:**  In favor of Option 3. In addition, we would also like to bring the following potential issue to RAN1’s attention.  RAN4 have also identified that in the TDM case, there is potential for UL symbol overlap across TAGs in case of a TCI-state switch, and request RAN1 to kindly take this into account if it has not already done so. |
| Huawei | **Sub topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case**  The existing MRTD/MTTD requirements specify the timing difference between different CCs, not the timing difference between different TRPs on the same CC.  **Sub topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case**  Option 1 as starting point.  For R16/R17 multi-TRP scenarios, the timing offset between different TRPs on the same CC are assumed within CP. The R16/R17 assumption can be used as baseline. The case of timing offset larger than CP can be FFS.  **Sub topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case**  Option 1 as starting point.  Inter-cell multiple TRP are also on the same CC. Similarly, R16/R17 assumption can be used as baseline and FFS the case of timing offset larger than CP.  **Sub topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1**  Fine with Option 4.  The maximum uplink transmit timing difference between TRPs is derived from the maximum downlink receive timing difference between TRPs. The clarification on intended scenarios will be helpful for investigating MRTD/MTTD for multi-TRPs. |
| Nokia | Sub-topic 1-1: Option 3: In our view, the existing MRTD/ MTTD requirements are not currently applicable, but the requirements for inter-band CA could be reused as baseline for the definition of requirements in Rel-18, for multi-TRx UEs.  Sub-topic 1-2:  We disagree with Option 1 and Option 2 with single UE TRx chain: the whole purpose of this objective in the WI is to support 2 TAs. In our view, this is needed when the propagation difference between the 2 TRPs is outside of the CP, to allow non-co-located deployments, or different delays between the TRPs in the intra-cell case.  For non collocated scenarios it will be really challenging to keep synchronization within CP, since it also involves the propagation delay.  Therefore, we agree with Option 4 with the following changes: UEs with multiple TRx chains, RAN4 can assume MRTD and MTTD values from inter-band CA scenario as baseline for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.  Sub-topic 1-3:  Same comments as sub-topic 1-2. In our view, the comments apply to both the intra-cell and inter-cell cases since the delay from different TRPs might be outside the CP.  Issue 1-4: We would be ok with Option 1, but if there is no conclusion for these topics, we are OK with Option 2 including asking for any clarification needed from RAN1. Points that might need to be clarified:   * What is the considered UE architecture:   + Multi-TRx with simultaneous transmission capability   + Multi-TRx without simultaneous transmission capability   + What is the expected UE behavior regarding UE reference timing tracking in DL on two TRPs, UE Tx timing determination in UL based on 2 TA commands. |
| Xiaomi | **Sub topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case**  Legacy MRTD and MTTD requirements are defined for different CCs. However, as also mentioned in Samsung comments, the discussion in Rel-16 eMIMO has confirmed that for m-TRP scenario the requirement still apply considering the RTD of the two PDSCH within one CC is within CP. So generally speaking, the option 2 is agreeable.  **Sub topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case**  Option 3. As proponent, we observed that the RAN1 scenario are discussing two TAs for different PDSCH within one CC for intra-cell and inter-cell. To consider the intra-cell m-TRP case, as long as the TAs are already different, we believe the co-location of the two TRPs cannot be assumed. In this case the intra-band non-collocated scenario is proposed. Also to Samsung’s comment, we think the intra-band NR CA should be the requirement to be used.  **Sub topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case**  Option 3. We would like to further clarify that the intra-cell and inter-cell m-TRP is trying to differentiate the distance between the two TRPs. For intra-cell m-TRP, the distance of the two TRPs is within one cell and hence the intra-band requirements can be referred. While for inter-cell m-TRP, the distance of the two TRPs are larger than one cell and hence the inter-band requirements can be referred. This has implied the different propagation delay of FR1 and FR2 which has already been pointed out by many companies and will play a large role on MRTD requirement and consequently to influence the MTTD requirement. Hence with the inter-cell m-TRP considered, the inter-band TRP propagation delay is considered and hence the inter-band CA requirement is referred.  **Sub topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1**  Option 4.  We suggest to further clarify the scenario and also wait for some outcome of the ongoing Rel-18 WID. |

### 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-1** | Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs).  * Proposals   + Option 1: (ZTE, Apple, vivo, Ericsson, MediaTek, Huawei, vivo?, Ericsson?)   No. The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 defines the limitation on time difference only for inter-cell case. E.g. the concerning signals are from different CCs.  (Moderator’s note: inter-cell here meant different CCs.)   * + Option 1a (new): (Samsung, Xiaomi)   No. The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 defines the limitation on time difference only for inter-cell case. E.g. the concerning signals are from different CCs, however, the requirements shall also be applicable to the case in which “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”   * + Option 2: (IDC, xiaomi?)   Yes. The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover both intra-cell case and inter cell case.   * + Option 3 (new): (vivo)   The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover both intra-cell case and inter-cell case, if ‘intra-cell’ here means transmission/reception from serving cell(s) in multiple carriers, and ‘inter-cell’ means reception/transmission to any cell that are not serving cell.  For M-TRP scenario, a tighter TAE requirement, e.g. <CP, for gNB between multi-TRP is normally assumed, for both UL and DL.   * + Option 4 (new): (Ericsson)   In RAN4, we defined MRTD requirement for CA or DC case and not for MIMO. So far in RAN4, we assumed that for MIMO case RTD is with in CP.  Moderator’s summary:  By looking at the comments from companies, it seems the common ground between majority of the companies is that the MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 only covers inter-cell case (different CC). While vivo and Ericsson proposed new options, their views is not conflict with Option 1 where it already states that different CC case is the intention of this question.  Samsung explained the background in Rel-17 and proposed option 1a based on option1.  Xiaomi seems to be also fine with Option 1a according to the comments.  IDC and Nokia express the view that the requirement should be applicable in Rel-18 for multiple TRx UEs. It is not a direct answer to the question in Issue 1-1.  Recommendation for 2nd round:  Moderator would like to propose to further discuss between the following options,   * Option 1 (modified): The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 only defines the time difference limitation for different CC case, e.g. CA and DC, but without MIMO. * Option 1a: The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 only defines the time difference limitation for different CC case. However, the requirements shall also be applicable to the case in which “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.” * Option 2: The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover both intra-cell case and inter cell case. |
| **Sub-topic #1-2** | Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case (single CC)  * Proposals   + Option 1: (Apple, Huawei)   the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)   * + Option 2: (IDC, MediaTek, Qualcomm)   the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on number of panels   * + - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.     - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.   + Option 3: (ZTE, Xiaomi)   the maximum uplink transmission timing difference refer to the Rel-18 RAN4 intra-band non-collocated WID defined MTTD requirement.   * + Option 4: (IDC, Samsung, Nokia)   RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.   * + Option 5: (ZTE, Apple)   The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:   * + - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs     - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs   + Option 6 (new): vivo   • For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.  • For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.  Moderator’s summary:  No clear majority views.  Recommendation for 2nd round  Continue discussion in the 2nd round. Companies please also check whether new Option 6 is agreeable. |
| Sub-topic #1-3 | Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case (multiple CC)  * Proposals   + Option 1: (Apple, Huawei)   the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)   * + Option 2: (MediaTek, Qualcomm)   the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on the number of panels   * + - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.     - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.   + Option 3: (Samsung, IDC, Xiaomi)   the current inter-band CA MTTD requirement can be reused.   * + Option 4: (ZTE, Nokia)   RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.   * + Option 5: (ZTE, Apple)   The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:   * + - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs     - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs   + Option 6 (new): vivo   • For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.  • For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.  Moderator’s summary:  No clear majority views.  Recommendation for 2nd round:  Continue discussion in the 2nd round. Companies please also check whether new Option 6 is agreeable. |
| Sub-topic #1-4 | Sub-topic 1-4: LS reply to RAN1  * Proposals   + Option 1: (MediaTeck, Nokia)   Reply RAN4’s recommendation based on the conclusion for Sub-topic 1-1/2/3.   * + Option 2: (ZTE, Ericsson)   RAN4 to send a soft response (i.e., not indicating exact values) regarding the design constraints that effect MRTD and MTTD computation.   * + Option 3: (ZTE, IDC, Samsung, Qualcomm)   reply to RAN1 that the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band sync NR-DC, i.e., 34.6us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR1, and 8.5us for all cells in MCG and SCG in FR2-1, can be used as a starting point for RAN1, assumed as the maximum uplink timing difference between the two TAs for multi-DCI multi-TRP   * + Option 4: (Apple, Huawei, Xiaomi)   clarify the intended scenarios with RAN1 at first.   * + Option 5: other, please specify.   Moderator’s summary:  It seems Option 1 and Option 3 is highly related whether we can reach consensus on sub-topic 1-1 and sub-topic 1-2. While it seems not realistic given that RAN4 is not aware of the realistic scenario RAN1 assumed.  Recommendation for 2nd round:  Moderator proposes to discuss a LS reply based on a combination of option 2 and option 4 in the 2nd round. In the LS, RAN4 can explain the design constraints that effect MRTD and MTTD computation to RAN1 and ask for further clarification on scenarios from RAN1. |

### 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”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

### Open issue summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs).

*NOTE: the following terminology is used in Option 1/2/3.*

* + - *MRTD/MTTD for CA, DC*
    - *MRTD/MTTD for intra-cell MIMO (single CC and different TRP having same physical cell ID)*
    - *MRTD/MTTD for inter-cell MIMO (single CC and different TRP having different cell ID).*
* Proposals
  + Option 1 (modified): The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 only defines the time difference limitation for different CC case, e.g. CA and DC, but not MIMO.
  + Option 1a: The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 only defines the time difference limitation for different CC case (i.e., CA or DC). However, the requirements shall also be applicable to the case in which “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”
  + Option 2: The current MRTD/MTTD requirement in RAN4 cover CA, DC and intra-cell and inter-cell MIMO.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case (single CC)

* Proposals
  + Option 1:

the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)

* + Option 2:

the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on number of panels

* + - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.
    - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.
  + Option 3:

the maximum uplink transmission timing difference refer to the Rel-18 RAN4 intra-band non-collocated WID defined MTTD requirement.

* + Option 4:

RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.

* + Option 5:

The maximum uplink timing difference can be assumed as:

* + - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs
    - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs
  + Option 6 (new):
    - For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.
    - For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.

### Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case (multiple CC)

* Proposals
  + Option 1:

the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length (single FFT)

* + Option 2:

the maximum transmit timing difference depends on UE capability on the number of panels

* + - For single UE panel, the MTTD between UL signals should be within CP.
    - For multiple UE panels, the MTTD between UL signals may be larger than CP, e.g. MTTD for CA case.
  + Option 3:

the current inter-band CA MTTD requirement can be reused.

* + Option 4:

RAN4 to reuse MRTD and MTTD values of inter-band CA scenario for multi-DCI and multi-TA feature of Rel-18 MIMO.

* + Option 5:

The maximum uplink timing difference

* + - For FR1, not larger than CP+1.6µs
    - For FR2, not larger than CP+0.5µs
  + Option 6 (new):
    - For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, the maximum Tx timing difference between different carriers in CA/DC scenario that UE is required to assumed, is specified in clause 7.5.4 of TS 38.133, and it is up to RAN 1 to define the Tx timing difference within the single carrier.
    - For FR2 UE that is capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.

### Company views’ collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | **Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs)**  As the proponent of Option 1a, we suggest the group to follow Option 1a, considering it gives the complete background and status of the RAN4 specification implementation regarding mTRP.  Our interpretation on the requirement mentioned in Option 1a: if mTRP is used on any one of the aggregated NR carriers, the requirement of MRTD still applies, i.e., one of multiple TRPs should be used for the timing reference on this carrier, but not limitation on which one. As long as UE can handle the MRTD from one of multiple TRPs and another carriers, the requirement should be regarded as satisfied.  **Sub-topic 1-2:**  As the proponent of Option 4, our understanding is two panels are anyway needed, otherwise the two TAs can be achieved. But we also notice that if the signals come from the same direction, it is possible that UE have to use one panel, so we also see the merits of Option 2, which we can also accept.  Furthermore, for 34.6us (for FR1) and 8.5us (for FR2), we can clarify to RAN1 that how the component of 30 and 5us for propagation delay due to ISD is assumed, which may help RAN1 to understand RAN4’s assumption. If RAN1 think intra-cell TRP distance should be reduced from inter-cell distance, it is better to have a clear RAN1 assumption for RAN4 to use for Rel-18.  **Sub-topic 1-3:**  Same as sub-topic 1-2 for Option 3. But Option 3 or 4 should be the same if we are discussing MTTD. |
| Qualcomm | **Sub-topic 1-1:**  In principle, Option 1a is okay. However, we don’t think MRTD needs to be mentioned in the reply LS.  To Samsung:  should this “one or more QCL sources” be “more than one QCL sources” if the RTD is larger than, e.g. CP?  **Sub-topic 1-2:**  Support Option 2.  **Sub-topic 1-3:**  Support Option 2.  Besides, we’d like to mention that in the TDM case, there is potential for overlap between UL symbol symbols across TAGs or DL-to-UL/UL-to-DL symbols when there is a TCI-state switch. |
| Xiaomi | **Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs)**  Option 1a is agreeable. But this is only based on the truth for Rel-16 mTRP that the RTD of two TRPs are within CP. In current LS discussion, it seems that it is not clear with different TA to be considered, the RTD of two TRPs will extend CP or not. This is also the scenario that needs to be clarified by RAN1 in the reply LS.  **Sub-topic 1-2:**  As proponent of option 3 that we think the intra-cell distance will be different from collocated scenario and non-collocated scenario should be considered. However, we also agree that we can further ask RAN1 to clarify the intra-cell TRP distance assumption,  **Sub-topic 1-3:**  For inter-cell m-TRP case, the traditional TRP distance for FR1 and FR2 can be assumed and hence option 3 is preferred. |
| MediaTek | **Sub-topic 1-1:**  Support option 1.  For option 1a, we would like to know does that mean the timing difference for case 1 (black color word) is MRTD?  In addition, please allow us to provide our understanding on R16 eMIMO.     1. For the case when signals from two different TRP on the same CC (block color word), the timing difference is within one CP. It is agreed by RAN1 in R16. 2. For the case when signals from the same TRP on the different CCs (purple color word), the timing difference is captured in MRTD since R15. 3. For the case when signals from two different TRP on the different CCs (red color word), in RAN4 R16 eMIMO, we agreed to reuse the MRTD requirement for this scenario.   So, according to the above observation, to our understanding, the main intention of “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.” is still for different CCs scenario.  Therefore, we think the existing MRTD requirement is for different CC only.  **Sub-topic 1-2:**  Support option 2. As our comment in 1st round, regardless of inter-cell or intra-cell, the UL timing is derived from DL. And, to our understanding, how to transmit UL signals is up to UE implementation, so it may depend on how many panel are used.  Maybe we can reply two possible cases in LS: (1) when signals is transmitted by single panel (2) when two signals are transmitted by two panels are activated.  **Sub-topic 1-3:**  Support option 2. Same comment as Sub-topic 1-2. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs). Our understanding is option 1. Regarding option 1a, we have different understanding on the Rel-16 text specified during eMIMO WI: “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”  We think the existing MRTD specified in TS 38.133 is for different carriers for CA and DC (different CC and different physical cell id) and not for same carrier and MIMO.  In the existing RAN4 spec we did not see TAE of more than 65ns for the MIMO. If we assume 65ns as TAE, MRTD of more than CP cannot be supported. That means, existing MRTD is not specified for MIMO multi-TRP. Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case (single CC) When single CC and multi TRP having single cell ID case, we are not sure about the deployment scenario like the distance between TRPs. Unless distance is known we cannot arrive at a conclusion on MTTD value as we understand that it is not only a UE capability but NW TAE capability also. Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case (multiple CC) When single CC and multi TRP with different cell ID case, we are not sure about the deployment scenario like the distance between TRPs. Unless distance is known we cannot arrive at a conclusion on MTTD value as we understand that it is not only a UE capability but NW TAE capability also. Having said that, we can agree to 34.6 µs if the TAE is assumed as 3 µs or MRTD is agreed as total budget of TAE and propagation delay. |
| InterDigital | Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case (2CCs). Our proposals to apply the inter-band CA MRTD/MTTD for the mDCI two TAs is based on the synergies we saw for the deployments, and not by applicability of the 38.133.  If the deployment is not clear or if the multi-panel UE is not the common understanding in RAN4, we propose to have these questions in the LS reply, along with the inter-band CA deployment assumption numbers.  Sub-topic 1.2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case (single CC)  If the intra-cell and inter-cell cases are different, then s-DCI would work for both or have to be split as well? We believe that we have to treat intra and inter cell in the same way. Also, we need to clarify the deployment scenario and we propose to have these questions in the LS reply, along with the inter-band CA deployment assumption numbers.  Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case (multiple CC)  Inter-band CA may be here the baseline, but if the deployment is not clear, we propose to send the inter-band CA MRTD,MTTD related numbers along with the deployment assumption, and ask RAN1 if the assumed deployment is correct, otherwise to propose the right inter TRP distances.  Overall, we may mention the challenges to define this kind of requirement and the involved factors/parameters. |
| Huawei | **Sub-topic 1-1:**  We can agree with option 1.  The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 are only applied to the time difference between different CCs. RAN4 has not define the requirements on the time difference between different TRPs on a single CC for MIMO case.  **Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case (single CC and different TRP having same physical cell ID)**  Although RAN4 has not defined requirements on time difference between different TRPs for multi-TRP transmission on a single CC, RAN4 has the assumption that the timing offset between different TRPs is within CP since R16. At least the feasibility of the case of timing offset between different TRPs within CP can be confirmed. The feasibility of the case of timing offset between different TRPs longer than CP can be further studied.  **Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case (single CC and different TRP having different physical cell ID)**  The multi-TRP operation shall be TRPs on the same CC, rather than on cross CCs. For inter-cell case, one TRP is associated with serving PCI and the other TRP is associated with a PCI different from serving PCI.  The assumption that the timing offset between different TRPs is within CP is also reused in R17 for inter-cell multi-TRP case. Same as intra-cell multi-TRP case, at least the feasibility of the case of timing offset between different TRPs within CP can be confirmed, and the feasibility of the case of timing offset between different TRPs longer than CP can be further studied. |
| vivo | Sub-topic 1-1: Option 1 is OK. Detailed wording can be discussed in CR.  Sub-topic 1-2: Not sure what does moderator means by ‘Intra-cell(single CC)’, but for this case, timing difference can be discussed by RAN 1.  Sub-topic 1-3: Not sure what does moderator means by ‘Inter-cell(multiple CC)’, but if multiple CC is considered, MTTD would be the max timing difference between CCs in the uplink. |
| ZTE | **Sub-topic 1-1:**  We are fine with Option 1. RAN 4 does not have any requirements on time difference for mTRP in a single CC. But in MIMO topic, RAN4 assumed that the timing offset between different TRP in inter-cell mTRP case is within CP.  **Sub-topic 1-2:**  For the case of intra-cell mTRP, RAN4 does not have any MTTD requirement. Since the MTTD is mainly depend on MRTD and UE transmission timing error. If we believe MRTD between different TRP would not exceed CP, but still UE transmission timing error existing, so we can not say MTTD would not exceed CP.  **Sub-topic 1-3:**  For the case of inter-cell mTRP, maybe it is similar as inter-band CA case, i.e. non co-located, so MTTD under inter-band CA can be a starting point. |

### Summary for 2nd round

The 2nd round outcome is captured in

R4-2214352 WF on RTD for MIMO with two TAs

R4-2214354 LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs

# Topic #2: Feature Group 6-1a (R2-2204009, RP-221870)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2211905**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211905.zip) | On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Apple | **Observation 1: it is RAN4 common understanding that it is not a valid scenario to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  **Observation 2: there is extra power consumption for type 1 UE.**  **Observation 3: discussion on scheduling restriction for UE performing BM/RLM/BFD on RS outside active BWP is needed if RAN4 is to support type 1 implementation.**  **Observation 4: extra power consumption for type 2 UE is limited compared to type 1 UE.**  **Observation 5: discussion on interruption and scheduling restriction for UE performing BM/RLM/BFD on RS outside active BWP is needed if RAN4 is to support type 2 implementation.**  **Observation 6: type 3 may benefit system throughput, depending on progress of other ongoing R18 work items.**  **Observation 7: further study is necessary on interruption and scheduling restriction for UE performing BM/RLM/BFD on RS outside active BWP is needed if RAN4 is to support type 3 implementation.**  **Observation 8: it is more challenging to support RS outside UE CBW than RS outside active BWP but within CBW.**  **Observation 9: current 3GPP design can already support BM/RLM/BFD on the BWP which does not contain initial SSB, i.e. via CSI-RS based BM/RLM/BFD. CSI-RS based RLM is even a mandatory feature since R15.**  **Observation 10: using NCD-SSB can also allow BM/RLM/BFD on the BWP which does not contain initial SSB. However, RAN4 standardization work is still needed since existing NCD-SSB related RAN4 requirements only apply to RedCap UE. Besides, it comes at the price of network signaling overhead compared to existing CSI-RS based approach.**  **Proposal 1: RAN4 shall not further discuss BWP operation without bandwidth restriction issue in R17.**  **Proposal 2: if necessary, study feasibility of supporting BM/RLM/BFD outside active BWP and NCD-SSB based BM/RLM/BFD in R18 RRM enhancement scope.** |
| [**R4-2212140**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212140.zip) | BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Qualcomm Incorporated | **Observation 1: Current RAN4 requirements are artificially limited to the case when RLM-RS is transmitted within the active BWP, however, this is not related to implementation feasibility.**  **Observation 2: It is feasible for the UE to process both the signals within the active BWP and the configured reference signals outside the BWP if the UE supports a channel BW that spans both.**  **Observation 3: From a UE operation and requirements point of view, configuring the bandwidth to receive both the active BWP and the reference signals is same as receiving all signals within the active BWP.**  **Observation 4: If a scenario in which the UE would process concurrently signals within the active BWP and reference signals outside the active BWP were to be introduced, clarifications and applicability changes to the RAN4 specifications would be required.**  Hence, it can be concluded that **from a UE implementation point of view, it is feasible for the UE to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain the reference signals used for RLM/BFD (e.g. SSB). The UE operation is the same as when these signals are withing the active BWP.** |
| [**R4-2212144**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212144.zip) | Views on BWP without Restriction and NCD-SSB | Intel Corporation | **Observation 1**: All of the potential methods for monitoring separate initial BWP from active BWP due to RSs configured outside the active BWP result in increased power consumption and/or hardware complexity for the UE.  **Observation 2:** The existing RAN4 specification does not currently require UEs to monitor RSs outside the active DL BWP, so there would be a specification impact to adding such a capability.  **Observation 3**: The best solution is to pursue the NCD-SSB approach that has been discussed in RAN2 and RAN Plenary. Utilizing an NCD-SSB as the RS would allow an SSB RS to be tracked within the active BWP. This would work with existing UE hardware architectures (FG6-1) and be compatible with existing RAN4 specifications for BM/RLM/BFD.  **Proposal:** For Q2 in the LS, we should not pursue defining RS outside the active BWP but instead respond noting the value of developing the NCD-SSB approach which would work with existing UE hardware architectures (FG6-1) and be compatible with existing RAN4 specifications for BM/RLM/BFD |
| [**R4-2212285**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212285.zip) | Reply LS On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | CMCC | **Proposal 1: Configuring a DL BWP which does not contain SSB associated to the initial DL BWP, while not configuring CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD is not a valid scenario.**  **Proposal 2: Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.**  **Proposal 3: Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.** |
| [**R4-2212548**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212548.zip) | Reply LS on BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | OPPO | **Proposal 1: From a RAN4 specification point of view, the scenario in which UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD is not valid.**  **Proposal 2: UE should be allowed to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB, which is up to UE implementation** **at least in Rel-15/16/17.** |
| [**R4-2212868**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212868.zip) | Discussion on LS on BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Reply to Q1:** Conditionally yes. But the UE would need to have access to the SSB e.g., intra-frequency gaps would be allocated if such are required by the UE.  **Reply to Q2:** The UE should always be allocated intra-frequency measurement gaps to enable the UE to perform intra-frequency measurement including serving cell measurements if such are required by the UE. A UE which does not need intra-frequency measurement gaps for performing SSB measurements outside the active BWP can perform such measurements without gaps. Based on such measurement, the UE would be able to perform SSB based RLM/BFD.  One question to further discuss in RAN4 is whether e.g., SSB based measurement performed outside the active BWP as described above can be considered can be used for RLM/BFD measurements? |
| [**R4-2213052**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213052.zip) | On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | vivo | ***Proposal 1: For UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction, it is feasible for the UE to perform L1 measurements, including RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements, when reference signals which should be SSB in the context of RAN2 LS are outside the active BWP, provided the UE is working in a larger channel bandwidth that includes bandwidth of both active BWP and SSB.***  ***Proposal 2: Expected changes to RRM requirements for UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction could be as follows.***   * ***The UE is required to perform L1 measurements (RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP/downlink timing tracking) when reference signals (SSB) are not contained with active BWP.*** * ***Measurement restriction requirements for L1 measurements with reference signals (SSB) within active BWP are also applicable to when reference signals (SSB) are not contained with active BWP.*** * ***Scheduling restriction requirements for L1 measurements with reference signals (SSB) within active BWP are also applicable to when reference signals (SSB) are not contained with active BWP.*** * ***No interruptions are allowed for UE to perform layer measurements when reference signals (SSB) are not contained with active BWP.***   ***Proposal 3: For UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction, it may be feasible, at least for some of the cases, for the UE to perform L1 measurements, including RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements, when reference signals which should be SSB in the context of RAN2 LS are outside the active BWP, provided measurement gaps are configured for the UE to perform L1 measurements.***  ***Proposal 4: Further study is needed in RAN4 on measurement gaps based L1 measurements.***  ***Proposal 5: For UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction, it is feasible for the UE to perform L1 measurements, including RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements, when reference signals which should be SSB in the context of RAN2 LS are outside the active BWP, provided UE additionally indicates no-gap via NeedForGapsIntraFreq.***  ***Proposal 5a: A measurement gap for L1 measurement should be configured, provided UE additionally indicates gap via NeedForGapsIntraFreq.***  ***Proposal 6: For UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction, it is feasible for the UE to perform L1 measurements, including RLM/BFD/CBD/L1-RSRP measurements, when reference signals which should be SSB in the context of RAN2 LS are outside the active BWP, provided UE additionally indicates nogap-noncsg via intraFreq-needForNCSG.***  ***Proposal 6a: A measurement gap for L1 measurement would be configured, provided UE additionally indicates gap via intraFreq-needForNCSG.***  ***Proposal 6b: A NCSG gap for L1 measurement would be configured, provided UE additionally indicates gap via intraFreq-needForNCSG.***  ***Proposal 7: For UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction, it is not considered that L1 measurements on reference signals (SSB) outside the active BWP are conducted by RF retuning.*** |
| [**R4-2213401**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213401.zip) | Discussion of BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Ericsson | Proposal 1 For a UE which supports ‘*bwp-WithoutRestriction*’, it is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:   * + - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,     - Whether UE is equipped with a separate RF chain   **Proposal 2 RAN4 to further discuss the no interruption conditions for UE supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.** |
| [**R4-2213561**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213561.zip) | Discussion on requirements for bwp-WithoutRestriction | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1: RAN4 to define requirements for L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP for FG 6-1a.**  **Proposal 2: RF re-tuning before and after the measurement should be allowed for UE to perform L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP.**  **Proposal 3: L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP are performed with shared MG or NCSG for L3 measurement.**  **Proposal 4: RAN4 to consider the following updates to the L1 measurement requirements**   * **MGRP/VIRP are accounted in the measurement interval** * **When L1 measurement is performed with MG, CSSF is applied**   **Proposal 5: Requirements for FG 6-1a are defined in Rel-18.** |
| R4-2213591 | Discussion of RRM aspects on BWP without bandwidth restriction | ZTE Corporation | Withdrawn? |
| [**R4-2213650**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213650.zip) | BWP operation without BW restrictions for Non-RedCap Ues | MediaTek inc. | **Proposal 1: RAN4 discussion, analysis, solution, and LS response shall focus solely on non-RedCap UEs where RedCap UEs discussion is out of scope.**  **Observation 1: RAN4 requirements for BM/RLM/BFD based CSI-RS in FR1 can be directly applied for BWP without SSB.**  **Observation 2: RAN4 requirements for BM/RLM/BFD based CSI-RS in FR1 can not be directly applied for BWP without SSB because it is dependent on SSB signals to acquire QCL information.**  **Proposal 2: RAN4 shall not rely on CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD in FR2 for the BWP operation without SSB.**  **Observation 3: One possible UE implementation to perform BM/RLM/BFD outside the active BWP is using large RF and baseband bandwidth to cover both the active BWP and the SSB outside that BWP.**  **Observation 4: Using large BW to perform BM/RLM/BFD outside the active BWP comes at the cost of high-power consumption (i.e., reduced UE power efficiency).**  **Observation 5: With a small gap, UE can perform RF/BB reconfiguration and achieve most UE power saving to measure SSBs outside its active BWP.**  **Proposal 3: For non-RedCap UEs, introduce a new optional Rel-18 UE capability for SSB-based RLM/BFD/CBD/BM using SSBs outside active BWP with a small gap.**  **Observation 6: When UE is configured with narrow BWP for power saving on PCell/PSCell, its traffic load is very likely to be low and its SCells, if any, are likely to be deactivated or dormant.**  **Proposal 4: The support for SSB-based L1 measurements using SSBs outside active BWP is applicable to PCell/PSCell only.**  **Observation 7: Specification of R16 NeedForGap is incomplete and remaining work is to be discussed in Rel-18 RAN4 WI.**  **Observation 8: Coupling Rel-16 NeedforGap with L1 measurement for BWP without restriction requires long and controversial discussion in RAN4.**  **Observation 9: Specification changes are minimized, and controversial discussions can be avoided, if we leverage R17 NCSG to support L1 measurement for BWP without restriction.**  **Proposal 5: For non-RedCap UEs, RAN4 shall introduce a new optional Rel-18 UE capability to indicate the support for SSB-based RLM/BFD/BM on SpCell (i.e. PCell or PSCell) using SSBs outside active BWP with a small gap.**  **Proposal 6: Reuse the UE capability reporting framework from Rel-17 NCSG for the new capability of SSB-based RLM/BFD/BM using SSBs outside active BWP.** |
| [**R4-2213778**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213778.zip) | Discussion of RRM aspects on BWP without bandwidth restriction | ZTE Corporation | **Observation 1: Not any impact on RRM measurement for the UE capable of bwp-WithoutRestriction.**  **Observation 2: The impact from the perspective of RAN4 is: for a UE capable of *bwp-WithoutRestriction*, the UE can only perform RLM based on CSI-RS in the BWP without SSB.**  **Observation 3: The impact from the perspective of RAN4 is: for a UE capable of bwp-WithoutRestriction, the UE can only perform BFD based on periodic CSI-RS in the BWP without SSB.**  **Observation 4: The impact from the perspective of RAN4 is: for a UE capable of bwp-WithoutRestriction, the UE can only perform L1 measurement based on CSI-RS resource configured within the active BWP without SSB.** |

## Open issues summary

In RAN2 LS R2-2204009, the following Questions were raised to RAN4

**Question 1:**

Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.

**Question 2:**

If the answer to question 1 is that this is not valid, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.

In RP-221870,

To task the relevant Working Groups (RAN 1, 2, 4) to make progress on their discussions related to the RAN 2 LS in R2-2204009, aim to ensure that Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” works in an early implementable form in R18, or, possibly R17, and report progress to RAN #97.

### Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: No. From RAN4 specification point of view, it is not a valid scenario.
  + Option 2: Yes.
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.
  + Option 2: UE should be allowed to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB, which is up to UE implementation at least in Rel-15/16/17.
  + Option 3: It is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:
    - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,
    - Whether UE is equipped with a separate RF chain
  + Option 4: To support the concerning scenario, existing RAN4 requirements need to be updated by taking into the following potential aspects.
    - FFS on RF re-tuning before and after the measurement should be allowed for UE to perform L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP.
    - FFS on L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP are performed with shared MG or NCSG for L3 measurement.
    - FFS on Intra-frequency GAP and CSSF for L1 measurement
    - RAN4 shall not rely on CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD in FR2 for the BWP operation without SSB.
  + Option 5: developing the NCD-SSB approach which would work with existing UE hardware architectures (FG6-1) and be compatible with existing RAN4 specifications for BM/RLM/BFD
  + Option 6: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Continue discussion in Rel-17 under TEI17
  + Option 2: In Rel-18 under the umbrella WI “ Rel-18 RRM enhancement”
    - The support of Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” in Rel-17 is left to implementation.
  + Option 3: Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.
  + Option 4: other, please specify.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion

* Proposals
  + Option 1: non-RedCap UEs where RedCap UEs is out of scope.
  + Option 2: other, please specify.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)

* Proposals
  + Option 1: discuss LS reply in 2nd round based on the conclusion for Sub-topic 2-1/2/3/4.
  + Option 2: other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | **For sub-topic 2-2:**  From the legacy specification, UE can only perform RLM/BFD based on the SSB within the active BWP. But from the UE implementation, we do not believe UE can not perform RLM/BFD based on the SSB out of the active BWP, since in fact which depend on the UE RF and baseband bandwidth. As long as UE RF and baseband bandwidth is wide enough to cover both active BWP and the SSB used for RLM/BFD, UE can perform RLM/BFD based on such SSB even they are outside of active BWP. Which is similar as RRM measurement.  So we prefer Option 3 and possible Option 4.  For the last bullet in Option 4, it is too artificial, we believe whether UE need to rely on CSI-RS based BM/RLM/BFD, which is somehow UE capability related.  **For sub-topic 2-5:**  Prefer Option 1. |
| vivo | Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.  Option 1. RLM/BM/BFD is essential functionality to guarantee that good radio link quality is maintained and it is known between UE and NW.  Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.  As provided in our paper R4-2213052, there are three alternatives that UE can be used to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.   * Alt 1. UE works in a larger bandwidth than active BWP so that SSB can be included in the UE working channel bandwidth, which could be either the configured UE carrier channel bandwidth or a larger channel bandwidth that includes bandwidth of both active BWP and SSB. * Alt 2. UE is provided measurement gaps, including NCSG gap pattern, to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB. * Alt 3. UE uses redundant RF chain to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.   Alt 1 has minimum spec changes, which would mainly be applicability of requirements.  Alt 2 needs further study and evaluation. Big impacts to spec, including requirements and signaling, are expected.  Alt 3 needs to specify measurement requirements in RAN4 and new signalling may be needed.  If the feature is supported from Rel-17, then Alt 1 would be the only feasible solution considering minimum spec changes which could be done in R17 maintenance/TEI.  If the feature is to be supported from Rel-18, then all the three alternatives can be considered.  Option 1 is not about what is asked in RAN2 LS, in our understanding.  Option 5 is interesting approach. However, it may not be used to make FG 6-1a workable, which is under the assumption that there is no SSB in the active BWP.  Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “bwp-WithoutRestriction”?  Option 1. At least for Alt 1, the work can be done in Rel-17.  Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion  Option 1 is fine in general. However, for RedCap UE, there is an issue related to this, which was triggered by RAN1 LS two meetings ago, being discussed in RedCap WI.  In this email thread, it is focused on normal UE.  Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)  We should try to figures out technical solutions for BWP without restriction firstly. |
| Apple | **Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  Option 1. RAN4 discussed this in RAN4#103e and we believe it is common understanding that existing RAN4 requirements cannot cover this scenario.  **Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.**  Support option 1. Using CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD has already been supported since R15. RAN4 already has a full set of requirements. For other options, RAN4 needs to discuss all the possible implementations and introduce corresponding requirements which is time consuming. Considering core part design for R17 has completed, RAN4 can discuss these options as enhancement in R18.  **Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?**  We support option 3, which is more like an observation. We are open for further discussion for other possible solutions in R18 considering the timeframe.  **Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion**  Support option 1. RAN2 clearly stated in their LS that “**NOTE:** This LS is for pre-Release-17 behaviour, and RedCap is out of the scope.”  **Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)**  Option 1 is fine. |
| OPPO | **Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  Option 1. It is common understanding that existing RAN4 requirements cannot cover this scenario.  **Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.**  Support option 2. It seems hard for RAN4 to conclude corresponding requirements in R17 due to diverse solutions and limited time. We prefer RAN4 to discuss these options as enhancement in R18, and leave it to UE implementation in R15/16/17.  Besides, Option 1 could be correct understanding that target RS can be SSB or CSI-RS within active BWP.  **Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?**  If RAN4 decide to fix this issue, we are ok to start from either R17 or R18. If it cannot concluded in TEI17, we think R18 eFeRRM could be a good place to continue the discussion.  **Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion**  Support option 1.  **Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)**  Option 1 is fine. |
| Qualcomm | **Sub-topic 2-1:** Option 1, this is not a valid scenario. In our understanding this answer in the LS was not controversial in previous meeting and the reply to Q1 discussed in the previous RAN4 meeting can be used.  **Sub-topic 2-2:** These opitons are not exclusive. Option 1 is feasibl in principle, however, there are no interoperability testing opportunities for CSI-RS based RLM, hence, this option is not valid from a deployment point of view.  UEs can perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP as shown in our paper. Some small changes to the current specifications would be needed. It is also feasible to introduce gaps or NCSG/interruptions for such a scenario, however, this will have bigger system and spec impact and should be taken as lower priority.  We support Option 3. Option 4 can be complimentary to Option 3, a separate feature can be defined for such a scenario. The baseline should be that no measurement gaps or interruptions are needed. There will be a slight increase in UE power consumption, however, this will be compensated by the increase in throughput.  **Sub-topic 2-3:** In our understanding this is a plenary discussion, not a RAN4 discussion. From a RAN4 point of view, requirements can be added to Rel-17.Among all the options, we would pick Option 4 and continue this discussion in RAN plenary considering the input from other WGs  **Sub-topic 2-4:** In our understanding this discussion is about non-RedCap UEs, however, it should be easy to extend to RedCap UEs also.  **Sub-topic 2-5:** Option 1. RAN4 should focus on the feasibility discussions. |
| MediaTek | **Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  We support Option 1, for the same reasons mentioned by Apple and OPPO.  **Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.**  While for BM/RLM/BFD based CSI-RS in FR2 the existing requirements in RAN4 is dependent on the existing of SSB in the active BWP to provide the QCL information. This can be observed from the CSI-RS FR2 requirements where beam sweeping scaling factor (N) is equal to 1, which is not the case for the BM/RLM/BFD based SSB requirements where N = 8. Nevertheless, this issue can be handled by setting the CSI-RS repetition on. Therefore, for CSI-RS based solution, we agree with Apple that the requirements are completed, however, there should be a condition in FR2, where the repetition is set on.  We support option 1 with additional study on the condition for FR2 so the option can be written as:   * Option 1a: Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.   + For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).   Besides, for the SSB-based solutions when SSB is outside the active BWP, RAN4 should further study these solutions taking into consideration that interruption is needed for RF re-tune operation. We also want to highlight that introducing new mechanism is time consuming and given that Rel-17 core part is closed, hence, new requirements should be defined in Rel-18.  **Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?**  We support Option 3 if it is specifically written for CSI-RS based solution as:   * Option 3: Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31 and/or FG-24, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.   + For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).   **Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion**  We support Option 1.  **Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)**  Fine with Option 1. |
| CMCC | Sub-topic 2-1: Option 1. And this is also not a valid scenario from real deployment since network can simply configure CSI-RS for UE within the active BWP, so lack of necessary reference signal in the active BWP is not a valid scenario.  Sub-topic 2-2: We support option 1.  The problem of option 3 is that not all UEs implement in such way, so network still need to configure CSI-RS if there is no SSB within active BWP. Also, we don’t think UE capability is needed for UE using larger BW. Network cannot do anything with such capability.  Sub-topic 2-3: This issue depends on the outcome of previous ones. In our view, no requirements are needed (option 3).  Sub-topic 2-4: Option1 |
| Ericsson | **Sub-topic 2-1:**  At last meeting it was agreed that the RAN4 BM/RLM/BFD requirements are defined for the case when the target RS to perform the BM/RLM/BFD is contained within the UE active BWP, see the agreement below [R4-2211219]:  ***“Agreement****:*   * *RAN4 is to inform RAN2 that RAN4 requirements are defined only for the case when the target RS (SSB or CSI-RS) to perform BM/RLM/BFD is contained within the UE active BWP”*   This agreement corresponds to option 1 and we don’t think any further discussions is needed.  **Sub-topic 2-2:**  The options depend on which release the listed solutions apply. For example, we believe option 3 is already possible based on existing specification and UE capability. However, solutions listed under option 4 and 5 require new RRM work and specification of new requirements which would be possible from new releases (e.g. Rel-18) only. Hence, we would like the issue to be clarified whether applies to existing releases/specifications or new releases (Rel-18). Assuming the former case, we support option 3. Assuming the latter case, solutions listed under option 4 and 5 can be discussed.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  It depends on the type of solutions agreed or assumed. For example, as we have commented above, some of the listed solutions (e.g. UE’s capability to operate using larger BW, Whether UE is equipped with a separate RF chain) can be used already in existing releases/specifications. However, if new solutions such as those listed under option 4 and 5 in sub-topic 2-2 are considered then it is better to introduce associated requirements from Rel-18 as this would require some more work in RAN4 which cannot be done TEI.  **Sub-topic 2-4:**  There is following note in the original LS from RAN2 [R2-2204009]:  ***“NOTE:*** *This LS is for pre-Release-17 behaviour, and RedCap is out of the scope.”*  Thus we support option 1.  **Sub-topic 2-5:**  Option 1 is fine. |
| Intel | **Sub-topic 2-1:**  Option 1: This is not a valid scenario  **Sub-topic 2-2:**  Option 5: In our view, further developing options 3 or 4 is possible, but will lead to an outcome which is not used in practice. Using large BW, separate RF chains, or RF re-tuning all require more complex hardware and/or higher power consumption. We see a need to support an SSB based approach and not limit to only CSI-RS approach which is not widely used to date. The value of BWP would be best realized by using a NCD-SSB approach.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  Option 4: This discussion should be left to RAN Plenary. In general FG 6-1a is already supported from Rel-15. Yet, if it were a widely useful solution, then we would not be having this discussion. We need to look to a solution that works with existing UE architectures based on FG 6-1 rather than FG 6-1a.  **Sub-topic 2-4:**  Option 1: This discussion pertains to non-RedCap UEs. However, the solutions for both non-RedCap and RedCap should be similar, to keep the specification simple. It would not be good to have two completely different solutions to a similar problem.  **Sub-topic 2-5:**  Option 1: discuss LS in 2nd round. |
| CATT | **Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  Same view as Ericsson, the agreement in last meeting is enough. No further discussion or conclusion is needed.  **Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.**  Support option 1. As commented by CMCC, from real deployment, network can simply configure CSI-RS for UE within the active BWP. And we think it is not a very realistic case that network doesn’t configure CSI-RS to UE while there is no SSB configured either. For option 3, it seems not very clear, does it mean a UE capability? In our understanding, the existing capability *bwp-WithoutRestriction* has already reflected the capability that UE can operate using larger BW. And even if with this capability, the requirements for the UE that does not support the capability are still needed which is similar as option 4. In general, we think the basic principle should be that measurement gap or interruption is needed for BM/RLM/BFD.  **Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?**  Option 3. And we think the feature group has been already supported and no new requirements are needed.  **Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion**  Support option 1.  **Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)**  Fine with option 1. |
| Huawei | **Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.**  Option 1. This was already discussed in last meeting.  **Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.**  We are fine with option 1, and we also agree with MTK on the missing part for FR2. In general, CSI-RS based BM/RLM/BFD can already work based on NW implementation.  We also support option 2, assuming it is for BM/RLM/BFD based on SSB outside BWP.  We do not support option 3. The reason is that if UE has to keep large RF BW in order to meet the L1 measurement requirements, the power consumption would be compromised, and the benefit of switching UE to such a small BWP will diminish.  We support option 4 as it can be applicable for all UEs, i.e. RF re-tuning before and after the measurement should be allowed.  We support option 5. We understand it is a good approach to allow different UEs staying in different BWPs and at the same time there is no additional impact on BM/RLM/BFD.  **Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?**  First, it depends on the outcome of sub-topic 2-2, i.e. RAN4 needs to discuss whether and what enhanced RRM requirements are to be defined.  Second, we would like to clarify whether option 3 has any spec impact.  Third, if RAN4 is going to define requirements for BM/RLM/BFD based on SSB outside BWP, we think it should be Rel-18.  **Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion**  Support option 1. It is already clear from the RAN2 LS.  **Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)**  Option 1 is fine. |
| Nokia | Sub-topic 2-1: Option 3  The configuration could work (in PCell and or PSCell) if the UE is configured with intra-frequency measurement gaps or if the UE is capable of operating with a larger BW (than active BWP) that include the SSB (no gaps). In this case, the UE would have access to SSB and UE would be able to evaluate the at least RLM. Hence, it is valid scenario, but clarifications related to the UE requirements may be needed.  Sub-topic 2-2:  We expect if and how to capture UE requirements for this scenario for a UE supporting bwp-WithoutRestriction would need more discussion. Our preference is that the requirements are clarified. Option 2 does not make it clear what the UE behaviour is if configured as discussed. Option 3 is good as starting point for the requirements.  Sub-topic 2-3:  Option 1. It is best to have clarifications regarding the FG 6-1a in Rel-17 and related UE requirements if any new requirements are needed.  Sub-topic 2-4:  Option 1 (according to the LS).  Sub-topic 2-5:  Option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | **Sub-topic 2-1:**  **It’s not valid.**  **Sub-topic 2-2:**  **For Option 3, UE operating in a larger BW is possible. In addition, a relatively small bandwidth gap between SSB and the active BWP would help to widely support this case.**  **We are reluctant to support a separate RF chain and RF retuning solution in Rel-17.**  **While we are open to option 5 from release 17 onwards.**  **Sub-topic 2-3: We share the similar view with Intel, and we think RAN plenary is more suitable to discuss and make decision on this topic.**  **Sub-topic 2-4: Option 1**  **Sub-topic 2-5:**  **Option 1. Additionally, another LS directly to RAN may help the progress.** |

### 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| Sub-topic 2-1: | Sub-topic 2-1: Whether it is a valid scenario in the standard to support the operation of BWP without SSB where the UE does not perform BM/RLM/BFD due to the lack of necessary reference signal (SSB and CSI-RS) in the active BWP.  * Proposals   + Option 1: Vivo, Apple, Oppo, Qualcomm, MediaTek, CMCC, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Huawei, spreadtrum   No. From RAN4 specification point of view, it is not a valid scenario.   * + Option 2:   Yes.   * + Option 3 (New): Nokia   It is valid scenario. but clarifications related to the UE requirements may be needed.  Moderator summary:  The views are quite converged that it is not a valid scenario form RAN4 specification point of view. The below previous RAN4 agreement still apply.   * + - *RAN4 requirements are defined only for the case when the target RS (SSB or CSI-RS) to perform BM/RLM/BFD is contained within the UE active BWP*   Recommendation for 2nd round  none |
| Sub-topic 2-2: | Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.  * Proposals   + Option 1: Apple, Qualcomm, CMCC, CATT, Huawei   Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.   * + Option 1a (New): MediaTek, Huawei   Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.   * + - For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).   + Option 2: Oppo, Huawei   UE should be allowed to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB, which is up to UE implementation at least in Rel-15/16/17.   * + Option 3: ZTE, vivo, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Nokia   It is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:   * + - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,     - Whether UE is equipped with a separate RF chain   + Option 4: ZTE (except last bullet), vivo, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Huawei   To support the concerning scenario, existing RAN4 requirements need to be updated by taking into the following potential aspects.   * + - FFS on RF re-tuning before and after the measurement should be allowed for UE to perform L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP.     - FFS on L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP are performed with shared MG or NCSG for L3 measurement.     - FFS on Intra-frequency GAP and CSSF for L1 measurement     - RAN4 shall not rely on CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD in FR2 for the BWP operation without SSB.   + Option 5: Intel, Ericsson, Huawei   developing the NCD-SSB approach which would work with existing UE hardware architectures (FG6-1) and be compatible with existing RAN4 specifications for BM/RLM/BFD   * + Option 6 (new): Spreadtrum   It is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:   * + - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,   Moderator summary:  The views are quite divergent for different options.  Recommendation for 2nd round  Continue the discussion in the 2nd round. GTW discussion may be needed. |
| Sub-topic 2-3: | Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?  * Proposals   + Option 1: vivo, Oppo   Continue discussion in Rel-17 under TEI17   * + Option 2: Oppo   In Rel-18 under the umbrella WI “ Rel-18 RRM enhancement”   * + - The support of Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” in Rel-17 is left to implementation.   + Option 3: Apple, CMCC, CATT   Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.   * + Option 3a (new): MediaTek   Feature Group 6-1a “bwp-WithoutRestriction” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31 and/or FG-24, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.   * + - For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).   + Option 4 (new): Qualcomm, Intel, Spreadtrum   Leave it to RAN decision.  Moderator summary:  The views are quite divergent for different options. And it depends on conclusion for Issue 2-2.  Recommendation for 2nd round  Continue discussion in the 2nd round. GTW discussion in next Tuesday may be needed. |
| Sub-topic 2-4: | Sub-topic 2-4: scope of the RAN4 discussion  * Proposals   + Option 1: vivo, Apple, Qualcomm, MediaTek, CMCC, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Huawei, Nokia, Spreadtrum   non-RedCap UEs where RedCap UEs is out of scope.   * + Option 2 (new): Qualcomm   It can also be extended to RedCap UE.   * Recommended WF   + TBA   Moderator summary  Views are quite converged. Let’s focus on non-redcap UE.  Recommendation for 2nd round  none |
| Sub-topic 2-5: | Sub-topic 2-5: LS reply to RAN2 (CC RAN)  * Proposals   + Option 1: ZTE, Apple, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Huawei, Nokia, Spreadtrum   discuss LS reply in 2nd round based on the conclusion for Sub-topic 2-1/2/3/4.   * + Option 2: vivo   Focus discussion at first  Moderator summary:  Given this issue is tasked by RAN. LS will be needed anyway. The question is the contents to be replied.  Recommendation for 2nd round   * + - If consensus is reached for Issue 2-2 and 2-3, adopt Option1 based on RAN4 consensus.     - If consensus is not reached for Issue 2-2 and 2-3, send simple LS to report the RAN4 progress to RAN. |

### 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”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

### Open issue summary

Based on the 1st round discussion, the following 2 issues are to be further discussed in the 2nd round.

### Sub-topic 2-2: if the answer to Sub-topic 2-2 is ”no”, how should the UE perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB.

* Proposals
  + Option 1:

Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.

* + Option 1a (New):

Perform BM/RLM/BFD based on CSI-RS are mandatory features, and should be the baseline assumption for supporting *bwp-WithoutRestriction*.

* + - For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).
  + Option 2:

UE should be allowed to perform BM/RLM/BFD when the active BWP does not contain SSB, which is up to UE implementation at least in Rel-15/16/17.

* + Option 3:

It is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:

* + - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,
    - Whether UE is equipped with a separate RF chain
  + Option 4:

To support the concerning scenario, existing RAN4 requirements need to be updated by taking into the following potential aspects.

* + - FFS on RF re-tuning before and after the measurement should be allowed for UE to perform L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP.
    - FFS on L1 measurement on SSB outside BWP are performed with shared MG or NCSG for L3 measurement.
    - FFS on Intra-frequency GAP and CSSF for L1 measurement
    - RAN4 shall not rely on CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD in FR2 for the BWP operation without SSB.
  + Option 5:

developing the NCD-SSB approach which would work with existing UE hardware architectures (FG6-1) and be compatible with existing RAN4 specifications for BM/RLM/BFD

* + Option 6 (new):

It is feasible to perform BM/RLM/BFD on RSs that are not contained within the active BWP based on following:

* + - UE’s capability to operate using larger BW,

### Sub-topic 2-3: in which release and how to introduce enhanced RRM requirements to support Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”?

* Proposals
  + Option 1:

Continue discussion in Rel-17 under TEI17

* + Option 2:

In Rel-18 under the umbrella WI “ Rel-18 RRM enhancement”

* + - The support of Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” in Rel-17 is left to implementation.
  + Option 3:

Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.

* + Option 3a (new):

Feature Group 6-1a “bwp-WithoutRestriction” with mandatory supporting FG 1-7 and /or 2-31 and/or FG-24, and the corresponding requirements can already be supported from Rel-15.

* + - For FR2: the CSI-RS repetition is on (FFS).
  + Option 4 (new):

Leave it to RAN decision.

### Company views’ collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  **Sub-topic 2-3:** |
| MediaTek | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  We would like to remind about the recent agreement from Plenary on this topic:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement:** To task the relevant Working Groups (RAN 1, 2, 4) to make progress on their discussions related to the RAN 2 LS in R2 2204009, aim to ensure that Feature Group 6 1a “ *bwpWithoutRestriction*” works in an early implementable form in **R18, or, possibly R17**, and report progress to RAN #97 |   Now, given that only CSI-RS is the only option that is already completed and can be supported. Also, given that the condition for FR2 (mentioned in Option 1a) can be done by adding a single line in the specs. Thus, we believe Option 1a is the best option if RAN4 aims to respond before RAN plenary #97.  On the other hand, the other solutions require further study and discussion before RAN4 can define the requirements.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  This issue is related to issue 2-2 because to decide on which releases to support FG 6-1a depends on which reference signal is supported in RAN4. In general, as we commented in the previous issue 2-2, the CSI-RS is already supported since Rel-15 and the only changes are needed is to add a condition for the FR2 as given in Option 3a. Thus, we support Option 3a. |
| Intel | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  In our view the best solution is to pursue the NCD-SSB approach (option 5) that has been discussed in RAN2 and RAN Plenary. Utilizing an NCD-SSB as the RS would allow an SSB RS to be tracked within the active BWP. If there is missing functionality keeping in the CSI-RS approach then that should be addressed, but the main focus should be on developing the NCD-SSB based RS solution.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  We prefer to leave to RAN decision. |
| OPPO | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  For option 1/1a, if target RS is CSI-RS within active BWP, it is also feasible for UE to perform BM/RLM/BFD. Option 1a is fine in this case.  Also fine with option 2. We are open to discuss other options as enhancement in R18, but prefer UE implementation in R15/16/17.  For option 3/4/5/6, new UE capability of supporting larger BW or NCD-SSB and corresponding requirements should be introduced. Given that Rel-17 core part is closed, we prefer new requirements should be defined in Rel-18.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  Agree to provide all possible solutions in LS and leave decision to RAN. |
| vivo | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  In RAN2 LS R2-2204009, the background is provided as follows.   |  | | --- | | *On the other hand, the current UE capability signalling allows the UE to indicate:*   * *it supports BWP operation without bandwidth restriction, i.e. configured DL BWP does not contain SSB associated to the initial DL BWP; and* * *it does not support CSI-RS based RLM/BFD.*   *(The corresponding feature group definitions inTR38.822 can be found in Annex.)*  *This indicates that the network may configure a DL BWP which does not contain SSB associated to the initial DL BWP, while not configuring CSI-RS for BM/RLM/BFD. For this scenario, RAN2 come to the following questions.* |   Since questions in RAN2 LS is focusing on BWP operation without restriction while CSI-RS based RLM/BFD/L1-RSRP is not configured, option 1/1a is not the appropriate answer to RAN2 LS.  We are supportive of option 3 and option 4 from pure implementation feasibility perspective.  We are supportive of option 5 with the understanding that it is targeted for Rel-18 and it does not preclude introducing requirements for BWP operation without restriction based on other UE implementations in Rel-17.  For option 6, it depends on how the requirements are specified. It is fine for us to introduce this sort of UE capability if necessary.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  The release discussion is relevant to discussions under sub-topic 2-2 on feasibility of different UE implementations.  For UE working in a large channel BW and following existing RLM/BFD/BM requirements by adding applicability rules, option 1, i.e., continue to work under TEI 17 is the best choice.  For other UE implementations which requires lots of specification work, including NCD-SSB based solution, we understand it is not realistic to do it Rel-17. It has to start from Rel-18 if it is agreeable to do so.  Our preference is to apply existing requirements for RLM/BFD/BM to UE supporting FG 6-1a (or similar UE capability) in Rel-17. It can be up to UE implementation on how to meet the requirements. A UE capability for this can be considered if necessary. In Rel-18, requirements for other UE implementations, including NCD-SSB based solution, can be further studied depending on further RAN plenary discussion. |
| ZTE | **Sub-topic 2-2:**  We are fine with Option 3, 4 and 6. Whether UE can not perform RLM/BFD based on the SSB out of the active BWP, in fact which depend on the UE RF and baseband bandwidth. As long as UE RF and baseband bandwidth is wide enough to cover both active BWP and the SSB used for RLM/BFD, UE can perform RLM/BFD based on such SSB even they are outside of active BWP. Which is similar as RRM measurement. We support further study about it in Rel-18.  **Sub-topic 2-3:**  Maybe Option 4 is a good choice. |

### Summary for 2nd round

2nd round outcome is captured in

R4-2214351 WF on Figure Group 6-1a

R4-2214355 LS on Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*”

# Topic #3: UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN (R1-2205642)

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** |  | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2212909**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212909.zip) | Discussion on UL synchronization for IoT NTN | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. RAN4 to prioritize the definition of requirements for UE transmit timing, UE timer accuracy and timing advance for eMTC/NB-IoT devices, considering the impact of UL segmented transmission for UL synchronization. 2. The TN eMTC / NB-IoT UL timing requirements do not allow the timing adjustment during a UL repetition period. 3. RAN4 to define requirements considering timing adjustment during a UL repetition period. 4. RAN4 to define the UE transmit reference point as: . 5. RAN4 to discuss the impact of initial transmission timing error on segment duration and decoding performance. |
| [**R4-2213572**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213572.zip) | Views on RAN4 action on UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN | Sony | **Observation 1: for eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing and transmit frequency when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration, which may also need RAN4 to clarify the corresponding UE behavior in 36.113.**  **Proposal 1: RAN4 shall clarify the IoT NTN behavior in TS 36.133 for Rel-17 to allow UEs to adjust TA during the ongoing repetition.**  **Proposal 2: RAN4 shall specify the IoT NTN behavior in TS 36.133 to ensure the UE keeps a constant TA value within each segment**  **Proposal 3: RAN4 shall further study if there is any specification impact when UE performs frequency hopping for IoT NTN.** |
|  |  |  |  |

## Open issues summary

An LS from RAN1 is sent to RAN4 with the aspects of UL segmented transmission and leaves it up to RAN4 to specify it for UL synchronization for IoT NTN:

* *UE applies segmented UL transmission according to duration configuration by the network*
* *Different values (e.g., TA) for pre-compensation may be used per segment, where UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is applied from one segment to the next segment*

*RAN1 respectfully requests RAN4 to prioritize the UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN work by considering the above.*

The following Sub-topics will focus the discussion on time adjustment during a UL repetition period, UE transmit reference point and the impact of initial transmission timing error.

### Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: following proposal 1&2
    - Proposal 1: RAN4 shall clarify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 for Rel-17 to allow UEs to adjust TA during the ongoing repetition.
    - Proposal 2: RAN4 shall specify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 to ensure the UE keeps a constant TA value within each segment
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point

* Proposals
  + Option 1: the UE transmit reference point is defined as
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-3: further study on UE transmission timing error

* Proposals
  + Proposal 1: investigate the following cases A-C for UE transmit error impact

1. Case A: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be as close to 0 s as possible. The network-controlled segment duration may be defined such that the transmission timing at the end of the segment is causing an error of Te (due to the timing advance change).
2. Case B: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be -0.5\*Te. Using the same segment duration as in case A, this means the UE stops the transmission when the timing advance change causes an error of 0.5\*Te.
3. Case C: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be -Te. Assuming the network-controlled segment duration is configured similarly to case A, i.e. to stop when the transmission timing error is Te, the network-controlled segment duration can be twice as long as in cases A and B.



* + Proposal 2: RAN4 shall further study if there is any specification impact when UE performs frequency hopping for IoT NTN
  + Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-4: whether LS reply is needed in this meeting?

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes. Simple reply saying that “RAN4 has noted the issue raised by RAN1 and will prioritize UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN”. And RAN4 will inform RAN1 once consensus is reached.
  + Option 2: No. Reply the LS after RAN4 has conclusion in future meetings.
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Sub-topic 3-1: We support Proposal 1 and disagree Proposal 2.  On Proposal 2, what RAN4 should do is to specify requirements based on RAN1 agreement as in RAN1 LS to RAN4 (attached R1-2205642).  **Agreement in 8.14 for IoT NTN**  UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is applied from one segment to the next segment by using one or more of the following methods if supported by UE implementation         1. UE may drop / Insert samples / Puncture OFDM symbols         2. UE may blank subframes / slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe  The total transmission time is not changed  UE autonomously Drop / insert samples / Puncture OFDM symbols or Blank subframes / slots where UE drops a subframe / slot  RAN1 did not make any agreement to preclude UE pre-compensating the TA during the segment. If UE does the UE pre-compensation, there should be no issue as long as the RAN4 timing requirements (e.g. Te\_NTN) are met. There is no need to forbid UE to apply UE pre-compensation during the segment and somehow test for this.    Sub-topic 3-2: Is the intention of Option 1 to clarify the UL transmission reference timing for IoT NTN? Option 1 is the same as the current spec for NR NTN and seems fine. The complete statement, as in 7.1C.1 is attached below for reference:  *The uplink frame transmission takes place (NTA + NTA-offset + NTA,common + NTA,UE-specific)×Tc before the reception of the first detected path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame from the reference cell.*    Sub-topic 3-3: comment on Proposal 1 is provided. Note that the Te\_NTN is the limit of UL transmit error, while UE may not know exactly it's UL transmit error.  If UE doesn't do any pre-compensation, in Case A, for example, although UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be as close to 0 s as possible, the actual UE UL transmit error can be +/- Te\_NTN at the begin of the segement.  And at the end of the segments, the UE UL transmit error becomes +/- Te\_NTN **+ D** (timing drift\*seg duration), and thus the error will exceed Te\_NTN at the end of the segment.  Similar to the Case B/C, the error will exceed Te\_NTN either at the begin or at the end.  If UE does pre-compensation during the segment duration, then there is no need to differentiate Case A/B/C, as long as UE can meet the specified Te\_NTN requirements.    Sub-topic 3-4: Prefer to Option 2 unless RAN4 can reach consensus in this meeting.  On Option 1, simply reply provides less information and it will still need another LS in the future to inform RAN1 the RAN4's conclusion. |
| Ericsson | **Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.** We support option 2 which is in line with current LTE eMTC/NB-IoT timing requirements as quoted below, [section 7.20 in TS 36.133]:  *“When a repetition period is configured on the uplink for which R>1, the UE shall not adjust the uplink transmission timing autonomously during an ongoing repetition period other than at initial transmission as defined above.”*  eMTC/NB-IoT UEs can be configured with large number of repetitions and the impact of adjusting the timing on reception window during an uplink repetition period was discussed and led to the above agreement. Since this issue being discussed for the first time in RAN4 in the NTN context, we are fine to continue the discussions and allow more time to study for the next meeting. **Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point** The reference time from NTN timing requirements is reused for IoT NTN. **Sub-topic 3-3: further study on UE transmission timing error**  We support proposal 2. Since this issue is brought up for the first, more discussions and analysis is needed to identify potential impact. **Sub-topic 3-4: whether LS reply is needed in this meeting?**  This LS (R1-2205642) is only for information and does not require any response. Whether RAN4 still needs to send reply LS depends on outcome of the discussion of the abovementioned issues which need more time. |
| Qualcomm | **Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.**Okay with Proposal 1 and open to further discussion on Proposal 2 unless it does not violate Rel-17 IoT-NTN RAN1 spec.**Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point** Okay with Option 1, but there can be a bit more details that needs some clarifications to define reference timing and so on, i.e. time instances for the definition of the parameters may need clarifications. **Sub-topic 3-3: further study on UE transmission timing error**  Open to further discussion on Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. Share a similar view as MTK’s comment on Proposal 1. **Sub-topic 3-4: whether LS reply is needed in this meeting?**  Either Option 1 or Option 2 is okay. |
| Huawei | Sub-topic 3-1:  P1 is fine, and P2 may need more discussion which should happen in the email thread 239.  Sub-topic 3-2:  Suggest to discuss the issue in the email thread 239. In our view, the issue is related to RAN4 requirements but not the reply LS to RAN1.  Sub-topic 3-3:  Suggest to discuss the issue in the email thread 239. In our view, the issue is related to RAN4 requirements but not the reply LS to RAN1.  Sub-topic 3-3:  Both options are fine. |
| CMCC | **Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.** We support Option 1 and open to Option 2. **Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point** Generally, we are fine with Option 2. The reference time from NTN timing requirements can be reused for IoT NTN. **Sub-topic 3-3: further study on UE transmission timing error**  For this issue, we share similar view with MTK.  In our view, UE is able to perform pre-compensation for each segment transmission, UE is only need to meet the Te\_NTN requirements for each UL segment transmission.  For proposal 2, we are open to have more discussion. **Sub-topic 3-4: whether LS reply is needed in this meeting?**  Either Option 1 or Option 2 is ok for us. |
| Nokia | Sub-topic 3-1: Proposal 2: OK, we agree with Ericsson’s comments that Proposal 2 is aligned with the agreements in RAN1.  The starting point of the definition of requirements for IoT NTN is the current requirements for eMTC/NB-IoT. Currently, the UE is not allowed to adjust the timing advance during the repetition period.  According to RAN1 agreements, in Rel-17 IoT NTN, the UE is allowed to adjust the timing advance in the beginning of each segment within a repetition period.  Sub-topic 3-2: Option 1: OK (proponent). Yes, it was the intention to clarify the UL transmission reference timing for IoT NTN.  Sub-topic 3-3: OK to the further study proposed in proposal 1 (proponent). This is required for NW to determine the segment duration. Proposal 2 can be down-prioritized as UE can perform both time and frequency compensation at the start of every segment.  Sub-topic 3-4: Option 2: OK |
| Sony | **Sub topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period. :**  support both proposal 1 and 2 as the proponent. We believe both aspects (allowing UE change TA between the segments and maintain the TA within each segment) need to be clarified and specified in 36.133.  For proposal 2: it is our understanding that the uplink transmission is segmented for IoT NTN is to allow UE adjust TA between segments and ensure “TA constant per segment” functionality. This is our interpretation on “**UE pre-compensation per segment** of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC **is applied from one segment to the next segment**”. However, we are fine to further discuss this aspect as commented by other companies.  We also have the following text proposal to address both proposals, and we are open to discuss and hear more views how the specification should be revised to cover both aspects.:  *For satellite access, when a repetition is configured on the uplink for which R > 1, the UE shall not adjust the uplink transmission timing autonomously during an ongoing repetition period other than at initial transmission or at the start of a transmission segment boundary, as defined above.* **Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point** General fine to re-use the NR NTN reference time.  **Sub topic 3-3 further study on UE transmission timing error :**  Proposal 1: we are happy to consider the three cases. Our understanding is that case A would be applied. The UE just needs to maintain timing during the UL transmission segment, where the UL transmission segment duration is signalled. Hence, we think it is incorrect to say that “UE stops the transmission when the timing advance change causes an error of 0.5\*Te.” - it is rather the case that the UE finishes the UL transmission segment at the time signalled by the network and then commences the next UL transmission segment with a new value of timing advance applied (a gap between segments can be inserted, as discussed at length in RAN1).  Proposal 2: frequency hopping is another scenario need further discussion to allow UE to change the TA, but fine to have further discussion.  **Sub-topic 3-4: whether LS reply is needed in this meeting:** fine with either option, but a at least a reply would be needed once RAN4 reach agreement. |

### 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| 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.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#3-1** | Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.  * Proposals   + Option 1: following proposal 1&2     - Proposal 1: MediaTek, Qualcomm, CMCC, Sony   RAN4 shall clarify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 for Rel-17 to allow UEs to adjust TA during the ongoing repetition.   * + - Proposal 2: Ericsson, Nokia, Sony   Disagree: MediaTek  RAN4 shall specify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 to ensure the UE keeps a constant TA value within each segment   * + Option 3: Other, please specify   Moderator summary:  There is no clear majority view on either option.  Recommendation for 2nd round.  Continue discussion either in this thread or under thread#239. Chairman’s guidance is needed. |
| **Sub-topic#3-2** | Sub-topic 3-2: UE transmit reference point  * Proposals   + Option 1: MediaTek, Qualcomm, Nokia   the UE transmit reference point is defined as   * + Option 2 (new): Ericsson, CMCC, Sony   The reference time from NTN timing requirements is reused for IoT NTN.  Moderator summary:  After a further check, it seems that option 1 is covered by option 2 and the formula in option 1 is further updated in this meeting under NTN discussion. So the tentative agreement is option 2  Recommendation for 2nd round.  None. |
| **Sub-topic#3-3** | Sub-topic 3-3: further study on UE transmission timing error  * Proposals   + Proposal 1: MediaTek/Qualcomm/CMCC disagree. Sony is fine with Option A. Nokia is open for further study.  1. Case A: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be as close to 0 s as possible. The network-controlled segment duration may be defined such that the transmission timing at the end of the segment is causing an error of Te (due to the timing advance change). 2. Case B: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be -0.5\*Te. Using the same segment duration as in case A, this means the UE stops the transmission when the timing advance change causes an error of 0.5\*Te. 3. Case C: The UE attempts to adjust the initial transmission timing error to be -Te. Assuming the network-controlled segment duration is configured similarly to case A, i.e. to stop when the transmission timing error is Te, the network-controlled segment duration can be twice as long as in cases A and B.      * + Proposal 2: Ericsson, Sony   RAN4 shall further study if there is any specification impact when UE performs frequency hopping for IoT NTN   * + Other, please specify   Moderator summary:  There is no clear majority view on either option.  It is clarified by MediaTek who is the rapporteur of this WI that RAN1 did not make any agreement to preclude UE pre-compensating the TA during the segment. If UE does the UE pre-compensation, there should be no issue as long as the RAN4 timing requirements (e.g. Te\_NTN) are met. There is no need to forbid UE to apply UE pre-compensation during the segment and somehow test for this. This comment is followed by Qualcomm and CMCC.  Give this is the first time for this topic. It is suggested to continue discussion in the next meeting.  Recommendation for 2nd round:  None. |
| Sub-topic 3-4: | Sub-topic 3-4: Whether LS reply is needed in this meeting?  * Proposals   + Option 1: Qualcomm, CMCC, Huawei, Sony   Yes. Simple reply saying that “RAN4 has noted the issue raised by RAN1 and will prioritize UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN”. And RAN4 will inform RAN1 once consensus is reached.   * + Option 2: MediaTek, Ericsson, Qualcomm, CMCC, Huawei, Nokia, Sony   No. Reply the LS after RAN4 has conclusion in future meetings.   * + Option 3: Other, please specify   Moderator summary:  The tentative agreement is Option 2. LS reply can be decided after RAN4 conclude this issue.  Recommendation 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”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

### Open issue summary

*The following issue needs to be discussed in the 2nd round.*

### Sub-topic 3-1: timing adjustment during a UL repetition period.

* Proposals
  + Option 1: following proposal 1&2
    - Proposal 1: RAN4 shall clarify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 for Rel-17 to allow UEs to adjust TA during the ongoing repetition.
    - Proposal 2: RAN4 shall specify the IoT NTN behaviour in TS 36.133 to ensure the UE keeps a constant TA value within each segment
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Company views’ collection

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support Proposal 1. And still concern on Proposal 2, because RAN1 did not make any agreement to preclude UE pre-compensating the TA during the segment.  Besides, in NTN, UE pre-compensation needs to be considered, during the segment, and there should be no issue as long as the RAN4 timing requirements (e.g. Te\_NTN) are met. |
| Qualcomm | We need a further investigation on the impact on IoT UE implementation and performance. The text of “segment-wise pre-compensation” and “remain constant within a segment” in RAN1 seems to mean “UE does not update TA within the segmented block.” Both proposals under Option 1 is not clear whether the wording “constant” and “adjust” are from UE pre-compensation perspective or satellite Rx perspective. Our view is closer to the former.  Further comments on Sub-topics #3-2 and $3-3:  The details need to be discussed in the corresponding WI. There are subtle differences between IoT NTN and NR NTN in terms of the reference point of TA due to segmented block wise UL pre-compensation. We are okay with no further discussion on this as this is not immediately related to reply LS. |
| Sony | Support both proposals under option 1.  For proposal 1, we would also like to discuss further how to address this issue in 36.133. Should we add a clarification under the section of TN IoT and eMTC (7.20.2/ 7.24.2)?  For proposal 2, Our understanding of the LS (and the preceding discussion in RAN1) is that the LS states that the “TA constant per segment” functionality is applied. Otherwise, if TA pre-compensation could be applied within each segment by UEs, then RAN1 can simply say something like “UE can pre-compensate the TA between the repetitions” instead of introducing the concept of segmented UL transmission. We are okay to discuss this issue in RAN4 further to reach a consensus.  On the other hand, setting the requirement is a separate discussion. We are open to further discussing it once we reach a common understanding of proposal 2.  To QC: our understanding is that we are talking about UE pre-compensation aspect. |
| Huawei | We support proposal 1/1a (in the WF) and proposal 2. From our understanding, the intention in RAN1 LS is closer to proposal 2. More specifically, UE does not adjust the UL timing within one segment as the length of the segment is configured by NW. However, we are fine to further discuss the details together with other issues. |

### Summary for 2nd round

The 2nd round outcome is captured in the following document.

R4-2214353 WF on UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on Figure Group 6-1a | Apple |  |
| WF on RTD for MIMO with two TAs | Huawei |  |
| WF on UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN | MediaTek | Chairman, please give guidance whether this WF will continue to be treated in thread 240 or change it to 239. |
| LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | To: RAN1 |
| LS on Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” | Qualcomm | To: RAN, RAN2 |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| [**R4-2211906**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211906.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Apple | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2211979**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211979.zip) | On Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Xiaomi | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212115**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212115.zip) | On Multiple TA for multi-TRP MRTD MTTD limits | InterDigital Communications | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212326**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212326.zip) | Reply LS to RAN1 on mTRP mDCI mTAG TA difference | Qualcomm Incorporated | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212468**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212468.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs and Reply LS | Samsung | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212527**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212527.zip) | Discussion on LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | MediaTek Inc. | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212672**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212672.zip) | Discussion and draft reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | vivo | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212917**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212917.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | To be noted |  |
| R4-2213304 | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | ZTE Corporation | withdrawn |  |
| [**R4-2213496**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213496.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Huawei, HiSilicon | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213887**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213887.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | ZTE Corporation | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213960**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213960.zip) | Discussion on MTTD for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213961**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213961.zip) | LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2211905**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211905.zip) | On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Apple | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212140**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212140.zip) | BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Qualcomm Incorporated | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212144**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212144.zip) | Views on BWP without Restriction and NCD-SSB | Intel Corporation | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212285**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212285.zip) | Reply LS On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | CMCC | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212548**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212548.zip) | Reply LS on BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | OPPO | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212868**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212868.zip) | Discussion on LS on BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213052**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213052.zip) | On BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | vivo | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213401**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213401.zip) | Discussion of BWP operation without bandwidth restriction | Ericsson | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213561**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213561.zip) | Discussion on requirements for bwp-WithoutRestriction | Huawei, HiSilicon | To be noted |  |
| R4-2213591 | Discussion of RRM aspects on BWP without bandwidth restriction | ZTE Corporation | withdrawn |  |
| [**R4-2213650**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213650.zip) | BWP operation without BW restrictions for Non-RedCap Ues | MediaTek inc. | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213778**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213778.zip) | Discussion of RRM aspects on BWP without bandwidth restriction | ZTE Corporation | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2212909**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212909.zip) | Discussion on UL synchronization for IoT NTN | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2213572**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213572.zip) | Views on RAN4 action on UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN | Sony | To be noted |  |

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** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2214351 | WF on Figure Group 6-1a | Apple | Agreeable |  |
| R4-2214352 | WF on RTD for MIMO with two TAs | Huawei | Agreeable | *The WF listed different options for further study.* |
| R4-2214353 | WF on UL Segmented Transmission for UL synchronization for IoT NTN | MediaTek | Agreeable | *The WF listed different options for further study.* |
| R4-2214354 | LS on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | Agreeable |  |
| R4-2214355 | LS on Feature Group 6-1a “*bwp-WithoutRestriction*” | Qualcomm | Agreeable | Carolyn, please help to update t-doc list. This LS is to RAN, RAN1, RAN2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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

# Annex

Contact information

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)