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# Introduction

This email thread treats the following topic in agenda item 8.1.1

1. Time difference for MIMO with two TAs (R1-2205593)

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| MTK | Ato Yu | [Ato.yu@mediatek.com](mailto:Ato.yu@mediatek.com) |
| Ericsson | Venkat | Venkatarao.gonuguntla@ericsson.com |
| Nokia | Erika Almeida | Erika.almeida@nokia.com |
| Apple | Qiming Li | Li\_qiming@apple.com |
| InterDigital (IDC) | Virgil Comsa | Virgil.comsa@interdigital.com |
| QC | Chu-Hsiang | chuhsian@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Xiaomi | Rui Zhou | zhourui1@xiaomi,com |
| Samsung | Dan Liu | dan1992.liu@samsung.com |

Note:

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

# Topic #1: Title

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc** | **Title** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2215461**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2215461.zip) | Further discussion on Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two Tas | Xiaomi | **Observation 1: The Rel-16 eMIMO agreement on that no core RRM requirement impact on MRTD and MTTD requirements for m-TRP transmission for intra-band CA is based on the RTD is within CP which is agreed by RAN1.**  **Observation 2: With the two TA assumption, the within CP assumption should not be kept.**  **Observation 3: The propagation delay difference has played a large role on the MRTD and corresponding MTTD requirement.**  **Proposal 1: The propagation difference can be considered for intra-band non-collocated case as the inter-band CA.**  **Proposal 2: For inter-cell m-TRP case, the current inter-band CA MTTD requirement can be reused.** |
| [**R4-2215614**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2215614.zip) | On R18 eFeMIMO - MTTD for multi-DCI mult-TRP with two TAs | Apple | **Observation 1: existing MRTD requirements only apply for cells on different carriers and cannot apply among different TRPs on the same carrier.**  **Observation 2: existing MTTD requirements only apply for cells on different carriers and cannot apply among different TRPs on the same carrier.**  **Proposal 1: for both intra-cell and inter-cell multiple TRPs, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length.** |
| [**R4-2216290**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216290.zip) | On maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two Tas | Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Proposal 1: The existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in section 7.5 and 7.6 of TS38.133 only define the timing difference limitation between different CCs for CA or DC operations, not define the timing difference limitation between different TRPs on the same CC for MIMO case.***  ***Proposal 2: For both intra-cell and inter-cell cases, the UL transmit timing difference value for multiple TRPs can be derived from the DL receive timing difference for multiple TRPs, where TTD = RTD + implementation margin.***  ***Proposal 3: In R18, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed as (RTD + 1.6us) for FR1 and (RTD + 0.5us) for FR2, where RTD is the maximum DL receive timing difference assumed in R18 multi-Rx chain DL reception WI.*** |
| [**R4-2216368**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216368.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Vivo | **Observation 1 The 2 TA enhancements for TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission can be applicable to:**   * **FR1 UE** * **FR2 UE, probably with the simultaneous different QCL-D Rx capability, but is only able to Tx from one panel.**   **Observation 2 The 2 TA enhancements for simultaneous multi-DCI uplink transmission can be applicable to:**   * **FR2 UE that is capable of Tx from 2 different panels.**   **Observation 3 For simultaneous Rx with different UE panels, the RTD assumption is being discussed in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.**  **Observation 4 From RAN4 RRM perspective, for TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission, considering the worst case, the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions associated with two TAs should not be less than the transient period specified in RF specs. Overlapping between UL transmission is not allowed.**  **Proposal RAN4 to provide RAN1 with the following additional feedback for the LS**   * **For FR1 UE, or for FR2 UE which is only able to Tx from one panel at a time, only TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission can be supported by the UE. Considering the worst case, the Tx timing difference between two UL transmissions associated with different TAs should meet the restriction that the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions at UE side should not be less than the transient period specified in RF specs.** * **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.** |
| [**R4-2216410**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216410.zip) | Multiple TA for multi-TRP deployments limits | InterDigital | ***Observation 1:*** *With the current cell phase accuracy requirement of 3us, the reception within a CP cannot be assumed for the inter-cell mTRP scenario in FR2.*    ***Observation 2:*** *For NR inter-band CA within FR2 the maximum receive time difference defined in 38.133 specification is 8us.*  ***Observation 3:*** *The simultaneous Rx/Tx for mTRP inter-cell or intra-cell along with a specific MRTD/MTTD may be part of UE capabilities.*  ***Observation 4:*** *If TAE for intra-carrier case applicable requirement of 65ns or intra-band contiguous CA with or without MIMO of 260ns, then within CP reception may be feasible as is.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *For inter-cell m-TRP with two TAs Maximum Transmit Time Difference limits adopt NR inter-band CA cases as baseline.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *RAN4 to study if MIMO (OTA) requirements for TAE are applicable and which one is valid for intra-cell mTRP MRTD starting point for determination.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *RAN4 to study if a common intra-cell/inter-cell TAE of 3us between TRPs is acceptable for FR2-1 mTRP.* |
| [**R4-2216605**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216605.zip) | Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with 2 TAs | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. Existing MRTD/MTTD requirements do not cover the time difference in the same CC. New requirements are needed. 2. Two simultaneous transmissions are always performed on two different Tx chains. There is no need to restrict the propagation delay difference to the CP length. 3. The inter-band NR CA MRTD/MTTD requirements can be used as baseline for the multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs. |
| [**R4-2216716**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216716.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Samsung | ***Observation 1:* 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.”**  ***Proposal 1:* The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 defines the limitation on time difference only for inter-cell case, but it should be also applied in the case “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”**  ***Observation 2:* For NR TDM based PUSCH transmission, UL transmission overlapping happens in the scenario with two TA configured due to the restriction of UE capability, i.e., UE with single Tx.**  ***Observation 3:* If UE supports two independent RF chains/Tx chains with different TAs, the UL signals can be transmitted simultaneously in a CC and then there is no overlapping problem.**  ***Proposal 2:* In multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs, if UL transmission overlapping is allowed and handled in RAN1, the current single TX UE can be reused. If not, UE supporting two independent RF chains/Tx chains with different TAs is more reasonable.**  ***Observation 4: The assumption on time difference within CP may be not feasible for inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs case.***  ***Observation 5:* For co-located intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs case, although the assumption on DL timing difference within a CP simplifies UE implementation. However, co-located deployment does not match the targeted scenario for intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs.**  ***Observation 6:* For non-collocated intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs case, where UE has two panels, the MTTD between multiple TRPs cannot be assumed within a CP length (single FFT).**  ***Proposal 3:* In Rel-18 two TAs multi-DCI multi-TRP scenario, the MTTD between multiple TRPs cannot be assumed within a CP length (single FFT) for both intra- and inter-cell cases, in which multiple panels are used for multiple TRPs respectively.**  ***Proposal 4:* For inter-cell/intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs case, MTTD values are depend on the number of UE panels.**  **- For single UE panel utilized, timing difference shall be restricted within CP.**  **- For multiple UE panels utilized for multi-TRP respectively, 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, shall be followed.** |
| [**R4-2216832**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216832.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** Existing RAN4 requirements for MRTD/MTTD are specified for CA/DC and not MIMO.  **Proposal 2:** Inter-band CA deployment scenario to be agreed as deployment scenario for multi-TRP with multi-DCI and multi-TA case too.  **Proposal 3:** TAE value for inter-band CA to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.  **Proposal 4:** MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA to be reused for intra and inter-cell multi-TRP.  **Proposal 5:** If the proposal 3 and 4 are agreeable, RAN4 to send LS response indicating the same to RAN1. |
| [**R4-2216833**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216833.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | LS draft. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 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.

The following issues were discussed during RAN4#104-e meeting, however, no consensus has been reached.

|  |
| --- |
| * Sub-topic 1-1: Align views on whether MRTD/MTTD requirements in 38.133 cover intra-cell case. * Sub-topic 1-2: MTTD for multiple TRPs for intra-cell case * Sub-topic 1-3: MTTD for multiple TRPs for inter-cell case |

This E-mail thread will further discuss the open issue with regards to the questions raised in RAN1 LS.

### Sub-topic 1-1: MRTD/MTTD requirement in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133 only define the timing difference limitation between different CCs for CA or DC operations, not define the timing difference limitation between different TRPs on the same CC for MIMO case.
  + Option 2: Existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133 only define the timing difference limitation between different CCs for CA or DC operations, but it should be also applied in the case “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 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.”*

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes, how the MRTD/MTTD requirement is applicable for MIMO need to be clarified.
    - E.g., adding “between CCs” after “applicable”
  + Option 2: No. it is clear enough for CA/DC with multiple PDSCH reception for MIMO.
  + Option 3: Other, please specify.

### Sub-topic 1-2: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR1

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-2: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR1**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length.
  + Option 2: MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
  + Option 3: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability,
    - For UE with only single Tx chain, MTTD shall be restricted within CP for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
    - For UE with multiple Tx chains, the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band CA (34.6us) is applicable for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
  + Option 4: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the UL transmit timing difference can be derived from the DL receive timing difference for multi-TRP, where TTD = RTD + 1.6 us.
  + Option 5: Only TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission is supported for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP. No need for any further MTTD requirements. The Tx timing difference between two UL transmissions associated with different TAs should meet the restriction that the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions at UE side should be no less than the transient period in FR1.
  + Option 6: For inter-cell multi-TRP case, adopt MRTD/MTTD for NR inter-band CA cases as baseline. FFS for intra-cell multi-TRP case.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-3: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR2

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-3: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length.
  + Option 2: MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (8.5us) to be reused for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
  + Option 3: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability,
    - For UE only capable of single panel, MTTD shall be restricted within CP for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
    - For UE capable of multiple panels, the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band CA (8.5us) is applicable for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.
  + Option 4: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the UL transmit timing difference can be derived from the DL receive timing difference for multi-TRP, where TTD = RTD + 0.5 us.
    - RTD is the maximum DL receive timing difference assumed in Rel-18 multi-Rx chain DL reception WI.
  + Option 5: For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability
    - Only TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission is supported for UE only capable of Tx from one panel. No need for any further MTTD requirements. The Tx timing difference between two UL transmissions associated with different TAs should meet the restriction that the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions at UE side should be no less than the transient period in FR2.
    - For UE capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.
  + Option 6: For inter-cell multi-TRP case, adopt MRTD/MTTD for NR inter-band CA cases as baseline. FFS for intra-cell multi-TRP case.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-4: TAE for multi-TRP

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Same value for inter-band CA to be used for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP
  + Option 2: Same value for inter-band CA to be used for inter-cell multi-TRP. Further check if MIMO (OTA) requirements for TAE are applicable and which one (65ns or 260ms) is valid for intra-cell mTRP MRTD starting point for determination.
  + Option 3: Other, please specify
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### LS out

TBD.

Depending on the discussion for Sub-topic 1-1/2/3

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

**Sub-topic 1-1: MRTD/MTTD requirement in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Option 1 for MTTD and Option 2 for MRTD.  In Section 7.6.1 of TS38.133, we already have the following statement, which means MRTD requirements have already covered mTRP case.   |  | | --- | | 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. |   We do not have such an extension in MTTD requirements in Section 7.5.  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  Slightly prefer Option 2.  To our understanding, the sentence is already clear enough. But we are also fine to further clarify it, if different companies have different interpretations. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**   * + We agree with Option 1.   + For Option 2, we would like to point that, “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.” is for different CC located at different TRP.   **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 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.”*   * + We think clarification is needed. |
| vivo | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Option 1. MRTD should be for CA/DC only.  For option 2, if UE is in inter-band CA, UE is supposed not able to deal with the MRTD or MTTD for inter-band CA, in one of the aggregated carriers. The wording in the spec is ‘when’ but not ‘for the case of’. The timing difference within each CC is still within CP.  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  Optio 2. No, the wording is already clear. |
| Nokia | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Option1 though we do not think these discussion should be taking place again since in the last meeting, RAN4 sent an LS reply to RAN1 with the following:  “From RAN4 specification perspective, RAN4 so far specifies the maximum transmit timing difference between two uplink carriers as MTTD value in RAN4 specification TS 38.133. In the existing specification, MTTD requirements are specified only for CA and DC scenario.”  Considering option 2, we agree that the requirements are applicable in the case in which the UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any of the aggregated NR carriers”. But again, in our view, the “one or more QCL sources” referred to in this sentence, are in different CCs. |
| Apple | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Option 1 for both MRTD and MTTD. In our understanding, the additional applicability “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.” doesn’t mean MRTD requirements apply between different TRP on the same carrier. On the other hand, MRTD requirements are different for different scenario, e.g. intra-band non-contiguous CA, inter-band CA and even DC. If existing MRTD applies for different TRPs on the same carrier, which MRTD requirement shall be referred to?  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  Apparently, companies have different understandings on issue 1-1-1, which means a certain level of clarification is helpful. Option 1 is a possible solution. |
| InterDigital | **Issue 1-1-1 Agree with Nokia’s comments.** |
| QC | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  We have questions on the implication of option 1 and 2: does option 2 imply that CA requirement applies to MRTD/MTTD and MRTD/MTTD requirements are complete? If this is the case, we should revisit 1-1-1 after concluded other issues. We also have the same question as Apple, to which MRTD requirement does option 2 refer?  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  The wording clarification seems contradict to original wording, the proposal is adding “between CCs”, but the sentence is closed in “*on any one of the aggregated NR carriers*”, which restricting the condition to mTRP on one CC. |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  We support Option 1. The MRTD requirement apply for different CCs In our interpretation, current spec wording means when m-TRP is scheduled in any single carrier of the two CCs for NA CA, still the MRTD requirement apply for different carriers in the case that for m-TRP the different TRP RTD is within CP. Not sure if this is the same interpretation of option 2.  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  This issue has been discussed during Rel-16 eMIMO, it seems still people has different interpretation, then a clarification might be helpful after the group reach concensus. |
| Huawei | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Support option 1.  The existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.6 and 7.5 are defined for the timing difference limitation between different CCs, not for the timing difference limitation between different TRPs on the same CC.  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  Support option 2.  The following clarification in current spec is enough.  *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.* |
| Samsung | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**  Support Both  One should note that option 1 and option 2 are not in conflict with each other. Option 2 just indicate an **applicable case** **rather than define** the timing difference limitation between different TRPs on the same CC for MIMO case.  Option 2 is to clarify that 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 is that : 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.  **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 38.133**  Support option 2.  The current MRTD/MTTD requirements in RAN4 is clear enough for CA/DC with multiple PDSCH reception for MIMO. |

**Sub-topic 1-2: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support Option 1 and Option 5.  Both Option 1 and Option 5 can avoid the UL signal degradation (excluding CP part) due to the overlapping of 2 UL signals. In FR1, UE is expected to use the same RF chain and antenna to transmit signals on the same frequency. Any overlapping would lead to a sudden PA level jump and consequentially phase discontinuity to the UL signals. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 and option 2.  We understand that RAN1 agreed on following, in this meeting.  *For multi-DCI multi-TRP operation with two TAs in a CC, two DL reference timings are supported where each DL reference timing is associated with one TAG*   * *baseline assumption is that the Rx timing difference between the two DL reference timings is no larger than CP length* * *as an optional UE capability, Rx timing difference between the two DL reference timings can be assumed to be larger than CP length*   + *FFS: the maximum Rx timing difference (could be up to RAN4)*   + *Other than UE capability details and relevant configuration, no additional RAN1 specification enhancement specific for this case is expected*   That means RAN4 may need to define two values for UE supporting RTD within CP and RTD larger than CP.  For both option 1 and option 2, MRTD/MTTD shall be agreed along with TAE. |
| Vivo | Option 5. Option 1 is acceptable in case the power difference between different UL transmission associated with different TA is limited.  RAN4 already have transient period in RF spec. It is redundant to have another MTTD requirements. There can be collision between different requirements and UE does not know which to follow. |
| Nokia | **Issue 1-2: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR1**  We are not sure whether all options are valid for FR1 and FR2. Our understanding is that the multi-Rx WI is only being discussed for FR2.  Furthermore, we should clarify the scenarios that are being discussed in FR1: are we considering TDM scenarios, or simultaneous transmissions? From the WID, simultaneous transmissions seem to be limited to objective 6 scenarios, which focus in FR2.  Therefore, our view is that for FR1, there is no need to define MTTD requirements since the UL transmissions will be TDM, so Option 5, with the assumption in Option 1.  However, we still see the benefit from defining 2 TA loops also in this case.  There might be an impact when there is overlap due to using different TAs, but this topic is being discussed in RAN1. |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| InterDigital | We believe that the WI is about FR2. |
| QC | We support option 2 and 6, since mTRP is essentially the same as CA from Rx/Tx timing difference perspective: transmitting from different cell/TRP and may have different timing, and if gNBs can tolerate MTTD in CA, the same MTTD in TRP is feasible. Comments to other options:  For option 4, we don’t think consider multi-Rx WI is necessary given that the multi-Rx may consider joint demod which may lead to tighter requirement, while mTPR doesn’t require joint demod. It’s not obvious what is the MTTD requirement proposed in option 5, given that minimal Tx separation doesn’t imply the maximum Tx timing difference, and it doesn’t specify how the current MTTD requirement applies to mTRP. Option 1 is not feasible if MRTD > CP, which according to issue 1-1-2, MRTD can be larger than CP. |
| Xiaomi | We support option 6. For intra-cell case, we might need more clarification of current RAN1 scenario discussion. As provided by Ericsson that the current RAN1 is discussing different RTD then for intra-cell scenario there might be two different requirements based on the UE capability. |
| Huawei | The MTTD value for multi-TRP is derived from the MRTD value for multi-TRP. In R16/R17, the MRTD value for multi-TRP is assumed to be within CP for considering single-FFT implementation, which limits TRPs are assumed to be very close. However, for R18 two TAs based multi-TRP scenario, non-collocated TRPs are assumed and the propagation delay difference between TRPs typically will not be a small value. For this case, RAN4 needs to study whether single-FFT implementation is still assumed for multi-TRP operation. |
| Samsung | We support option 2 and option 6.  Actually, based on our analysis in RAN4 104-e (R4-2212468), we have suggested to reuse MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP and to take the value a starting point.  *(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.)*   And the aim of option 3 is to find a win-win solution based on the discussions of the last meeting. If no need to discuss/consider UE capability, option 2 is more reasonable.  And, for intra-cell case, there is no definition for the time difference, but we think it may become tighter. RAN4 may also treat the inter-band CA MTTD 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 **as upper-bound** for TA difference in intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs case.  For option 1:  The assumption of within CP cannot be always satisfied due to the TAE for both inter-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs and intra-cell multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs cases,  For option 4:  the basic principles of MTTD (R4-2206919) is defined as   * Define MTTD requirements in FR2-2 based on the following rule:   + MTTD = MRTD + (TA step size / 2+ TA adjustment accuracy + Te) in cc1 + (TA step size / 2 + TA adjustment accuracy +Te) in cc2   Could you also share the derivation of 1.6us?  For Option 5:  How to handle overlapping part between two UL transmission and whether to allow overlapped transmission in case the UE supports STxMP transmission is under discussion in RAN1 scope, we think we can wait for RAN1’s conclusions. |

**Sub topic 1-3: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support Option 1 and Option 5.  The reason is similar as Issue 1-2 when considering single panel UE.  On multi-RX case, we have to wait for the conclude of the other WIs, because the Rx timing difference value is the prerequisite for discussing Tx timing difference. We perhaps need to inform RAN1 that RAN4 has no quick answer for this case. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 and option 2.  We understand that RAN1 agreed on following, in this meeting.  *For multi-DCI multi-TRP operation with two TAs in a CC, two DL reference timings are supported where each DL reference timing is associated with one TAG*   * *baseline assumption is that the Rx timing difference between the two DL reference timings is no larger than CP length* * *as an optional UE capability, Rx timing difference between the two DL reference timings can be assumed to be larger than CP length*   + *FFS: the maximum Rx timing difference (could be up to RAN4)*   + *Other than UE capability details and relevant configuration, no additional RAN1 specification enhancement specific for this case is expected*   That means RAN4 may need to define two values for UE supporting RTD within CP and RTD larger than CP.  For both option 1 and option 2, MRTD/MTTD shall be agreed along with TAE. |
| vivo | Option 5. Option 1 is also acceptable if the power difference between different UL transmission associated with different TA is limited. For multi-panel related issue, we share the view from MTK. |
| Nokia | In principle we are fine with Option 2, For the multi-Rx UE we could assume propagation delay difference from the multiple TRPs larger than CP. For single panel UEs, our view is that the transmissions would be TDM (first bullet in Option 5) |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| InterDigital | Option 2. In our understanding, this discussion is under the assumption of UEs with 2 panels capability. |
| QC | Same comment as 1-2. |
| Xiaomi | Similar comment with FR1 as issue 1-2. |
| Huawei | Option 4.  The MTTD value for multi-TRP is derived from the MRTD value for multi-TRP. For R18 multi-Rx, the MRTD value for multi-TRP in FR2 is under discussion. The conclusion in R18 multi-Rx WI can be used on for deriving the MTTD value. |
| Samsung | Same comment as 1-2. |

**Sub-topic 1-4: TAE for multi-TRP**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Other.  (We assume this TAE is for BS RF requirement.) We do not see the need to update the general BS requirements. It is fine to keep the BS TAE requirement as it is, even if RAN4 may later agree a tighter MRTD requirement. This follows what we did in Rel-16 eMIMO and Rel-17 feMIMO. Only the network who needs to support mTRP needs to guarantee the Rx/Tx timing difference values at UE side. |
| Ericsson | Support option 1 for the UE capable of supporting larger RTD than CP. We could also consider a total budget approach where an MRTD is defined in RRM specification , where MRTD = TAE 0 RF\_Propagation\_difference. This means that one could trade TAE and RF\_Propagation\_difference within total MRTD budget. |
| Vivo | We think TAE is not necessarily related to the Tx timing discussion that to be discussed here. This issue has RAN1 impact. RAN1 can specify dropping rules in case the Tx transmission can not be handled by the UE, if gNB can not manage UL timing perfectly.  We prefer not to discuss this. |
| Nokia | We support option 1, for UE capable of RTD larger than CP. |
| Apple | Maybe some clarification is needed. TAE is one of BS RF requirements. Could proponents clarify why we need to discuss it in RRM session? |
| InterDigital | Option 1for Ues supporting RTD > CP. |
| QC | TAE seems out of the LS scope and belongs to BS RF requirement. |
| Huawei | We have same view as QC. TAE is BS RS requirement. RAN4 to focus on discussion on the MRTD value. There is no need to further divide MRTD into BS TAE and propagation delay difference. |
| Samsung | From our view, TAE belongs to BS RF requirement, but MRTD impacted by TAE, that is MRTD = TAE + . We are fine to use the values indicated in Option 1 now |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest focussing 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 #1-1** | **Issue 1-1-1: Applicability of MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133**   * Proposals   + Option 1: MTK (MTTD), Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, Apple, IDC, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Huawei, Samsung   Existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133 only define the timing difference limitation between different CCs for CA or DC operations, not define the timing difference limitation between different TRPs on the same CC for MIMO case.   * + Option 2: MTK (MRTD), Samsung   Existing MRTD/MTTD requirements in 7.5 and 7.6 of 38.133 only define the timing difference limitation between different CCs for CA or DC operations, but it should be also applied in the case “UE is configured to receive multiple PDSCH transmission occasions from one or more QCL sources on any one of the aggregated NR carriers.”   * Recommended WF   + Option 1 is agreeable   + Further clarify the current requirement applicability for m-TRP and how to exactly interpretate it in issue 1-1-2.   **Issue 1-1-2: whether clarifications are needed for the following note in 7.6.1 of 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.”*   * Proposals   + Option 1: Ericsson, Apple, Xiaomi, QC   Yes, how the MRTD/MTTD requirement is applicable for MIMO need to be clarified.   * + - E.g., adding “between CCs” after “applicable”   + Option 2: MTK, vivo, Nokia, IDC, Huawei, Samsung   No. it is clear enough for CA/DC with multiple PDSCH reception for MIMO.   * + Option 3: Other, please specify. * Recommended WF   + Since the supporting companies are almost equally splitting between option 1 and option 2, it indicates that confusion does exist for the current wording.   + It is recommended to further discuss this issue under TEI in the next meeting since it is a legacy issue.   *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-4** | **Issue 1-4: TAE for multi-TRP**   * Proposals   + Option 1: Ericsson, Nokia, IDC, Samsung   Same value for inter-band CA to be used for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP   * + Option 2:   Same value for inter-band CA to be used for inter-cell multi-TRP. Further check if MIMO (OTA) requirements for TAE are applicable and which one (65ns or 260ms) is valid for intra-cell mTRP MRTD starting point for determination.   * + Option 3: MTK, vivo, QC, Huawei   TAE are BS requirement and is out of the scope of the LS.   * Recommended WF   + Do not change the TAE requirement due to the LS.   + Have further discussion for MRTD/MTTD for multi-TRP with RTD>CP based on the current inter-band CA TAE requirement. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-2** | **Issue 1-2: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR1**   * Proposals   + Option 1: MTK, Ericsson, vivo, Apple   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length.   * + Option 2: Ericsson, Qualcomm, Samsung   MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.   * + Option 3:   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability,   * + - For UE with only single Tx chain, MTTD shall be restricted within CP for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.     - For UE with multiple Tx chains, the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band CA (34.6us) is applicable for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.   + Option 4:   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the UL transmit timing difference can be derived from the DL receive timing difference for multi-TRP, where TTD = RTD + 1.6 us.   * + Option 5: MTK, vivo, Nokia   Only TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission is supported for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP. No need for any further MTTD requirements. The Tx timing difference between two UL transmissions associated with different TAs should meet the restriction that the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions at UE side should be no less than the transient period in FR1.   * + Option 6: Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Samsung   For inter-cell multi-TRP case, adopt MRTD/MTTD for NR inter-band CA cases as baseline. FFS for intra-cell multi-TRP case.   * Recommended WF   2 companies think that the scope does not include FR1 as TMD transmission is used for FR1 and the simultaneous transmissions only concern FR2. This is key for FR1 discussion.   * + It is proposed to further clarify the scope in the 2nd round at first.   If FR1 is in the scope and the RAN1 new agreements (feedback by Ericsson) is confirmed, it seems the following could be agreeable depending on UE capability as well as the supporting companies. It is proposed to check together with the scope in the 2nd round.   * + For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length as baseline.   + MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP as an optional UE capability |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-3** | **Issue 1-3: MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-DCI multi-TRP operation in FR2**   * Proposals   + Option 1: MTK, Ericsson, vivo, Apple   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length.   * + Option 2: Ericsson, IDC, Qualcomm, Samsung   MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (8.5us) to be reused for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.   * + Option 3:   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability,   * + - For UE only capable of single panel, MTTD shall be restricted within CP for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.     - For UE capable of multiple panels, the existing MTTD requirement for inter-band CA (8.5us) is applicable for both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP.   + Option 4:   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the UL transmit timing difference can be derived from the DL receive timing difference for multi-TRP, where TTD = RTD + 0.5 us.   * + - RTD is the maximum DL receive timing difference assumed in Rel-18 multi-Rx chain DL reception WI.   + Option 5: MTK, vivo, Nokia   For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, depending on UE capability   * + - Only TDM based multi-DCI uplink transmission is supported for UE only capable of Tx from one panel. No need for any further MTTD requirements. The Tx timing difference between two UL transmissions associated with different TAs should meet the restriction that the minimal separation between the two UL transmissions at UE side should be no less than the transient period in FR2.     - For UE capable of simultaneous Tx from 2 different panels, RAN4 postpone the discussion until the RTD assumption is concluded in R18 multi-Rx chain WI.   + Option 6: Qualcomm, Xiaomi, Samsung   For inter-cell multi-TRP case, adopt MRTD/MTTD for NR inter-band CA cases as baseline. FFS for intra-cell multi-TRP case.   * Recommended WF   Based on the feedback on RAN1 agreements, companies are invited to check whether the following package is agreeable,   * + For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length as baseline.   + MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP as an optional UE capability |

### 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 issues summary

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options for 2nd round:*

**Issue 1-5-1: Whether FR1 is in the scope for this LS**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Yes
  + Option 2: No, please specify details.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Companies views’ collection for 2nd round

**Sub-topic 1-5-1: Whether FR1 is in the scope for this LS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes. We would like to point that LS is not part multi-RX chain WI in RAN4. It is part of Further MIMO evolution WI (NR\_MIMO\_evo\_DL\_UL-Core) of Rel-18. FR1 and FR2 both are in the scope. |
| MTK | Yes. RAN1 spec is usually FR-agnostic. We believe that FR1 is in the scope. |
| Samsung | We believe that FR1 is in the scope.  But a quick question: should we need to consider all the requency range in Table 7.5.6-1, especially the last two,(FR1,FR1;FR2-1,FR2-1;FR1,FR2-1;FR1.FR2-2)? |
| Apple | FR1 is in the scope. To Samsung, Table 7.5.6-1 is for inter-band DC requirements. We don’t think we need to cover all the cases. Besides, we assume in multi-DCI multi-TRP scope, the two TRPs are one the same carrier. |
| QC | Same view as Apple. |
| Xiaomi | Agree that this work is within the MIMO evolution WID and it is FR-agnostic. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Moderator’s note:**

If FR1 is confirmed to be within the scope, then the following agreement is applicable for FR1 by default.

* + For both intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP, the maximum uplink transmit timing difference between multiple TRPs can be assumed within a CP length as baseline.
  + MRTD and MTTD values for inter-band CA (34.6us) to be reused for intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP as an optional UE capability

### Summary for 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1-5-1** | **Issue 1-5-1: Whether FR1 is in the scope for this LS**   * Proposals   + Option 1: Yes   + Option 2: No, please specify details. * Recommended WF   + TBA   FR1 is in the scope for the LS reply. |

# Topic #2: Title

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-22xxxxx | Company A | Proposal 1:  Observation 1: |

## Open issues summary

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

### Sub-topic 2-1

*Sub-topic description:*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-1: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: TBA
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-2

*Sub-topic description*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-2: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: TBA
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 1-1:  Sub topic 1-2:  ….  Others: |

**Example 2**

Sub topic 1-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Sub topic 1-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

### 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#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### 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)

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

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **New Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
|  | WF on MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-TRPs with 2 TAs | Apple |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| [**R4-2215461**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2215461.zip) | Further discussion on Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two Tas | Xiaomi | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2215614**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2215614.zip) | On R18 eFeMIMO - MTTD for multi-DCI mult-TRP with two TAs | Apple | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216290**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216290.zip) | On maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two Tas | Huawei, HiSilicon | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216368**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216368.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | vivo | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216410**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216410.zip) | Multiple TA for multi-TRP deployments limits | InterDigital | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216605**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216605.zip) | Maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with 2 TAs | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216716**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216716.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for Multi-DCI Multi-TRP with two TAs | Samsung | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216832**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216832.zip) | Discussion on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | To be noted |  |
| [**R4-2216833**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104bis-e/Docs/R4-2216833.zip) | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | To be revised |  |

Notes:

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

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-221xxxx | WF on MRTD/MTTD requirement for multi-TRPs with 2 TAs | Apple | Agreeable |  |
| R4-221xxxx | Reply LS on maximum uplink timing difference for multi-DCI multi-TRP with two TAs | Ericsson | Agreeable |  |

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