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# Introduction

This thread [113-R18-Others-02] is addressing the draft CR to 38.214 for NR\_MC\_enh-Core under agenda item #9.17 with the focus on the contentious issues of the RAN1#112bis that prevented RAN1 endorsement of the draft CR after 5 rounds of commenting and revising.

[113-R18-Others-02] Email discussion on MC-Enh draft CR for TS38.214 – Mihai (Nokia)

* To be used for coordinating discussions in the draft folder

The RAN1#112bis email discussion summary document can be found in [1], and the latest post-RAN1#112bis, unendorsed draft CR for introducing UL TX switching across up to 4 bands to TS38.214 in [2]

# References

1. [R1-2304205](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Docs/R1-2304205.zip) Summary of email discussion on the introduction of UL Tx switching across up to 4 bands in [112bis-e-R18-38.214-MC\_Enh] Moderator (Nokia)
2. [38214CRdraftv0](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_112b-e/Inbox/drafts/9.18%28Other%29/%5B112bis-e-R18-38.214-MC_Enh%5D/Draft%20CRs/R1-23XXXX%20draft%20CR%2038.214%20NR_MC_enh-Core_ULSwitching-v05.docx)5 Introduction of UL Tx switching across up to 4 bands, Nokia

# Discussion

## Issue #1: Simultaneous UL Tx when SUL is part of the configuration

The following alternatives can be identified when at least one cell with a SUL carrier is part of the UE’s configuration

**Alt 1**: Transmission may take place only on one uplink band at a time

**Alt 2**: One or more of the following simultaneous transmission cases is allowed

1. Transmission on two non-SUL UL bands may take place at the same time if UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair
2. Transmission on one cell’s SUL carrier and another cell’s non-SUL band may take place at the same time if the UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair
3. Transmission on one cell’s SUL carrier and another cell’s SUL carrier may take place at the same time if the UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair

RAN had provided the following guidance on the UL Tx switching cases as below

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN provides following guidance to RAN1/2/4.*** If Rel-18 UL Tx switching is supported,
	+ RAN1/2/4 shall ~~work~~ focus on defining necessary mechanisms and requirements for UL Tx switching across 3 or 4 different bands ~~at least for following scenarios during Rel-18 timeframe~~ in Q3 2022
		- Inter-band UL-CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) and Option 2 (i.e., dual UL) without SUL band
		- Inter-band UL CA Option 1 (i.e., switched UL) for {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s)
			* UL CA framework where UL CA is performed between NULs according to current RAN4 specifications should not be changed
			* Note: switching across any band in this scenario is not precluded
		- Intra-band two contiguous aggregated carriers within one non-SUL band out of 3 or 4 bands
	+ ~~Other~~Further check additional scenarios ~~as below can be discussed~~ in ~~RAN4#104e and~~ RAN#97e, e.g.,
		- {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + {SUL band + corresponding NUL band}
		- Simultaneous transmission across 2 bands in {SUL band + corresponding NUL band} + 1 or 2 other NUL band(s) (excluding simultaneous transmission between SUL and corresponding NUL)

Mechanisms/requirements should not introduce restrictions on what were already supported in current specifications for UL Tx switching |

Please provide your comments on the issue to the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Following the RAN guidance, it’s clear that Alt. 1 is correct.The additional switching behaviors in Alt. 2 would require further discussion and agreement at least in RAN1. Unfortunately, this has not been discussed in Rel-18 or before due to limited TUs.We propose to clearly indicate Alt. 1 in Rel-18 specs to correctly reveal Rel-18 status. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our interpretation of the RAN guidance is the same as Qualcomm’s |
| ZTE | We think what matters here is the resultant UE behavior. Maybe we need to first discuss and clarify the following three cases as listed by the moderator:1. Transmission on two non-SUL UL bands may take place at the same time if UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair
2. Transmission on one cell’s SUL carrier and another cell’s non-SUL band may take place at the same time if the UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair
3. Transmission on one cell’s SUL carrier and another cell’s SUL carrier may take place at the same time if the UE reported ‘DualUL’ for that band pair

Our understanding of the RAN guidance is that, RAN1 only focus on the switchedUL for configuration with SUL in Rel-18. |
| CMCC | We support Alt2.First, the RAN#97 guidance only mentioned that “focus in Q3 2022” without conclusion to preclude the dualUL in 2SUL serving cell scenario.Second, in RAN#99, the following proposals in RP-230810 were agreed which RAN task that RAN4 to assess the additional RAN4 specification impact and UE implementation impact to support the UE configured with 2SUL serving cells in UL TX switching framework. That’s also means RAN has not preclude the 2SUL serving cell Tx switching scenario.Third, during the discuss in last RAN1 meeting, companies didn’t find additional issues need to be addressed to support the three cases in Alt 2. That is the last version draft CR without the sentence “For a band combination including supplementary uplink band~~s~~, for all band pairs only the uplinkTxSwitchingOption set to 'switchedUL' is supported” can have already supported the three cases in Alt 2. |
| China Telecom | According to the change track “work=>focus” and “during Rel-18 timeframe=>in Q3 2022” in the RAN guidance, the guidance is only about the focused discussion in Q3 2022, which does not mean the whole Rel-18. During RAN1 discussion, all the agreements were made not differentiating FDD/TDD/SUL band type. RAN1 spec should focus on the functionality which is band agnostic, and should not have the restriction about only 'switchedUL' is supported when at least one cell with a SUL carrier is configured.There is a RAN4 WID on CA band combination with two SUL cells (RP-223553), which supports simultaneous transmissions between two NULs. 'SwitchedUL' restriction in RAN1 spec would cause unnecessary trouble to the discussions of RAN4. If there is any restriction when SUL is configured, it should be discussed in RAN4 based on operators’ interests but not in the RAN1 CR phase. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The issue#1 should not be discussed in RAN1 because it has no RAN1 spec impact. It can be discussed in RAN4 because it is only related to band combination.For the RAN plenary agreement quoted by some companies, it was introduced to address the question of band combinations, therefore, it should be taken care of by RAN4.For the whole life of this WI, there is no technical reasons to put RRC configuration to the band combinations supporting SUL band. |
| LGE | We have same understanding as Qualcomm and Nokia. We don't understand how Alt. 2 can be inferred from the RAN guidance above.  |
| **Moderator 23.5.** | Qualcomm, Nokia, LGE see Alt.1 according to the RAN guidanceZTE suggest discussing the three cases under Alt.2 and suggests only switched UL configurations are to be focused on if SUL is part of the configuration (same as Alt.1). @ZTE, an attempt to this further down in this moderator comment.CMCC supports Alt.2. @CMCC: is it correct to understand that your view is that all the three simultaneous transmission cases should be supported?@CTC: is it correct to understand that you support Alt.2 and in your view all the three simultaneous transmission cases should be supported?@Huawei, the issue#1 was the key blocking reason for RAN1 not being able to endorse the draft CR for UL Tx Switching in RAN1#112bis, some resolution or way forward seems necessary so that RAN1 is able to proceed.Alt.1 impact to 38.214 is along the square-bracketed text discussed in RAN1#112bis:- For a band combination including supplementary uplink bands, for all band pairs only the *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL' is supported.Alt.2 with all the simultaneous transmission cases supported would have the following RAN1 specification impact:- For a band combination including supplementary uplink bands, for the band pairs where SUL band and non-SUL band belong to the same cell, only the *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL' is supported.**Moderator proposal:** Agree on the RAN1 spec impact (if any) of Alt.1 and Alt.2 (and the simultaneous transmission cases to be supported). |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for FL’s promotion!We support Alt. 1, one more cent for both alternatives, given only single SUL band was discussed the “supplementary uplink bands” should be “supplementary uplink band~~s~~”. @CMCC. Thanks to refer the RAN#99 agreement which clearly reveal the current status, that is the feasibility is to be studied in RAN4. Even with confirmation on the feasibility, the spec impact should be studied on how to support this with UL Tx switching framework in future. |
| China Telecom | Thank you for the FL’s proposal.Yes, our preference is Alt. 2. Unfortunately, companies’ views are still not aligned on this issue. As resolution to proceed, we suggest not to discuss the issue in RAN1 CR phase. As commented before, all previous RAN1 agreements are band agnostic without restriction about only 'switchedUL' is supported when at least one cell with a SUL carrier is configured. RAN1 spec should also be band agnostic without the above yellow highlighted sentence for either Alt1 or Alt 2.  |
| ZTE | Regarding the following sentences, we share similar view as Qualcomm that the “s” needs to be deleted for both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for now, i.e., “For a band combination including supplementary uplink band~~s~~”. We are open to add “s” back if RAN agrees to support dual SUL.Regarding the spec impact for Alt.2, we think one additional spec impact is to clarify whether the “SUL and non-corresponding NUL” belongs to CA branch or SUL branch. Because in RAN1, the spec has two branches, one is CA and another one is SUL. This part has to be clarified in the spec as well.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our understanding, dual SUL configuration is under-discussion with considering “back-to-back transmissions between two SUL carriers” and “back-to-back transmissions between SUL carrier and non-corresponding NUL carrier”, but “simultaneous transmission” between those carriers seems outside of the scope as RAN#99 discussion was mainly on whether dual SUL configuration is allowed or not rather than dual SUL transmission is allowed or not. So, at least b) and c) in Alt.2 would not be allowed in Rel-18.  |
| CMCC | Thanks for the discussion!RAN4 has agreed the LS send to RAN plenary, with the confirmation that “**For a UE configured with two serving cells, each with SUL, UL Tx switching between two SUL carriers and between SUL carrier and non-corresponding NUL carrier can be supported with UL Tx switching framework**”。 Therefore, we think Alt 2 should be supported.1 Overall descriptionRAN4 discussed RAN4 specification impact and UE implementation impact for a UE configured with two serving cells, each with SUL. The agreements are:* For a UE configured with two serving cells, each with SUL, UL Tx switching between two SUL carriers and between SUL carrier and non-corresponding NUL carrier can be supported with UL Tx switching framework. Time mask requirements for switching across three or four uplink bands can be applied. No RAN4 specification impact is observed. No UE implementation issue is observed.
* For a UE configured with two serving cells, each with SUL, back to back transmission between two SUL carriers and back-to back transmission between SUL carrier and non-corresponding NUL carrier without any switching period can be supported by some UE implementations but enabling such feature will require RAN4 work.

2 Actions**To TSG RAN****ACTION:** RAN4 respectfully asks TSG RAN to take the above agreements into account.@Moderator, we think case a) and case b) in Alt 2 can be supported. In addition, we still think the band combination related sentence should not be captured in RAN1 spec, that is neither the TP proposed by Moderator in Alt 1 and Alt 2 are note needed.Alt.1 impact to 38.214 is along the square-bracketed text discussed in RAN1#112bis:- For a band combination including supplementary uplink bands, for all band pairs only the *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL' is supported.Alt.2 with all the simultaneous transmission cases supported would have the following RAN1 specification impact:- For a band combination including supplementary uplink bands, for the band pairs where SUL band and non-SUL band belong to the same cell, only the *uplinkTxSwitchingOption* set to 'switchedUL' is supported.@Qualcomm, as the reply above, we don’t there is additional spec impact to support Alt 2.@ZTE, It is obvious that the “SUL and non-corresponding NUL” belongs to CA branch, because in this case the SUL and non-corresponding NUL are belongs to two serving cells. In addition, according to the band combination define in RP-230719 (New WID on NR CA band combinations with two SUL cells in Rel-18), the 2SUL cells case is belongs to CA, which including both case a) and case b) in Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Thank you CMCC for providing the updated RAN4 status. The LS doesn’t seem to take a stand on simultaneous transmission, only about simultaneous configuration. Still it should give good foundation for RAN to revisit the earlier guidance and provide an update to RAN1#114.It maybe obvious that the 6.1.6.3 spec text applies to switching between SUL and corresponding NUL, but the spec doesn’t quite say this. If read as it is written it would apply to a switch between any SUL carrier and any non-SUL carrier. Unless this is clarified, the RAN1 spec text can be understood to be ruling out Alt2 cases b) and c), while Alt2 case a) should work fine. In our view this aspect calls for clarification in the specifications. |

## Issue #2: Applicability of the minimum time between two switches

Specifying the following RAN1#112 agreement was causing difficulty:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**Confirm the working assumption with following updates(working assumption) If two uplink switching are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switching are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching.
* X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us}
 |

The argument made against the bracketed text was that the minimum separation time should not apply if the UE reported 0 us.

**Alt 1:** Keep the agreement as it was and remove the square brackets on the following

- Within any two consecutive reference slots corresponding to numerology *µUL*, when the UE first performs one uplink switch and later performs another uplink switch and at least three bands are involved in the transmissions before the first switch, between the first switch and the second switch, and after the second switch,

[- the separation time between the start of all transmission(s) after the first switch and the start of all transmission(s) after the second switch is not expected to be less than max {*X*, *Y*}, where

- *X* = 500 µs if the UE reported [*MinSwitchSeparation*] capability, otherwise *X* = 0 µs, and

- *Y* is the switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$applied to the second switch.]

**Alt 2:** Clarify the RAN1#112 agreement by making the modification stating that minimum time between switches definition only applies when the UE reported a non-zero X, by adding the following bullet, and revising the CR text as

* If the UE does not report non-zero X, the minimum time duration definition does not apply

- If the UE reported [*MinSwitchSeparation*] capability, w~~W~~ithin any two consecutive reference slots corresponding to numerology *µUL*, when the UE first performs one uplink switch and later performs another uplink switch and at least three bands are involved in the transmissions before the first switch, between the first switch and the second switch, and after the second switch,

[- the separation time between the start of all transmission(s) after the first switch and the start of all transmission(s) after the second switch is not expected to be less than max {*X*, *Y*}, where

- *X* = 500 µs ~~if the UE reported [~~*~~MinSwitchSeparation~~*~~] capability, otherwise~~ *~~X~~* ~~= 0 µs~~, and

- *Y* is the switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$applied to the second switch.]

Please provide your comments on the issue to the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | In our view, we can wait for the decision on UE features and following that capture the text accordingly. Also, for Alt 2, a clarification question – what does it imply that minimum time duration definition does not apply? Does it mean that there is no restriction on the in terms of gap between the two switching instances? |
| Vivo | Same view as Apple. We can wait for the decision in UE feature. |
| Qualcomm | Same view as Apple and vivo. |
| Nokia, NSB | We would prefer taking a clean agreement on a proposal here, rather than kick the issue to UE features, when UE features session is not supposed to make RAN1 specification-impacting decisions, but implement the FGs around the agreed stage 2 functionality / stage 3 spec.On the topic, we are OK either way.@Apple, our understanding is that if the minimum time duration does not apply, the specification restriction is not binding and no restriction (as is the case in Rel-17) does not exist. |
| ZTE | Based on our understanding, if UE reports X=0us, it means there is no need to have such restriction in terms of gap between the two switching instances. Alt.2 is in line with our understanding and we can support to go with Alt.2 |
| China Telecom | Alt.2 is OK. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To address Apple’s comment, we can focus on the case of 500us in the CR and let how to determine 500us is up to the discussion of UE feature. Therefore, we suggest changes in red- If 500us is determined by UE capability [*MinSwitchSeparation*], within any two consecutive reference slots corresponding to numerology *µUL*, when the UE first performs one uplink switch and later performs another uplink switch and at least three bands are involved in the transmissions before the first switch, between the first switch and the second switch, and after the second switch,~~[~~- the separation time between the start of all transmission(s) after the first switch and the start of all transmission(s) after the second switch is not expected to be less than 500us ~~max {~~*~~X~~*~~,~~ *~~Y~~*~~}, where~~~~-~~ *~~X~~* ~~= 500 µs if the UE reported [~~*~~MinSwitchSeparation~~*~~] capability, otherwise~~ *~~X~~* ~~= 0 µs, and~~~~-~~ *~~Y~~* ~~is the switching gap~~ $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$~~applied to the second switch.]~~ |
| LGE | The issue on X=0us is being discussed on UE features, so we prefer to wait for any decision there. |
| MediaTek | Although there is a discussion in the UE feature on this issue, we see Alt-2 is aligned with the intention of the original RAN1 agreement. We believe all the companies agree on that:* a UE report 500us implies that UE requires a minimum separation gap
* a UE report 0us implies that UE doesn’t require a minimum separation gap (0us is only added to avoid the issue of “in-capability” reporting)

Thus, Alt-2 is aligned with the above understanding, and it will make the specs more clear.We support Alt-2. |
| **Moderator 23.5.** | **Moderator proposal:** As suggested by several companies, let’s take the opportunity to discuss the issue under the UE features and adopt the CR according to the outcome |

## Issue #3: Same SCS definition for contiguous intra-band CA?

RAN1#112bis draft CR had the following statement square-bracketed

[- If there are two contiguous intra-band carriers in one band, the UE may assume that the two carriers will be configured with the same subcarrier spacing.]

This was motivated by the following RAN1#112 conclusion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion [RAN1#112]**For Rel-17 UL Tx switching, if there are two carriers configured on the same band of the uplink transmission for a UE, the UE does not expect that the active UL BWPs of the two carriers on the band are of different numerologies. |

**Alt 1.** Do not capture anything on the same SCS assumption to the specs

**Alt 2.** Capture the suggested text to 38.214 subclause 6.1.6

**Alt 3.** Capture the suggested text as a generic specification statement that applies to intra-band UL CA regardless of UL Tx Switching

Please provide your comments on the issue to the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We prefer to capture the conclusion and support Alt 2 |
| vivo | alt2 is ok |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt. 2 which is to capture this into the spec. |
| Nokia, NSB | We would actually prefer Alt.3 as it is a bit risky to make the limitation conditioned to UL Tx Switching configuration, as that would seem to imply that on regular intra-band UL CA different SCS can be supported. That said, we can accept alt2 as well. |
| ZTE | Since it is agreed as a conclusion, either Alt.1 or Alt.2 is ok for us. However, Alt.3 has never been discussed, we don’t support Alt.3. |
| China Telecom | Alt 1 is preferred.The cited sentence is a conclusion not an agreement for Rel-17 UL Tx switching. Different SCSs of contiguous intra-band carriers can be precluded by other WGs in some way, e.g., some RAN4 requirement for contiguous intra-band UL-CA is based on the same SCSs among carriers in the same band. It is not necessary to be captured in RAN1 spec. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.1 is preferred. Similar comments as China Telecom. |
| LGE | OK with either Alt 1 or Alt 2.  |
| **Moderator 23.5.** | **Moderator proposal:** Try and agree to Alt.2, i.e. to the suggested text to 38.214 subclause 6.1.6 |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK with Alt 2.  |

## Issue #4: Conditions where one Tx switch switches two Tx chains and >2 bands are involved in the switch

In the following draft CR text, three sub-bullets were left in square brackets requiring further discussion.

- If more than two bands are involved in the determination of one uplink switching and if on any two of the bands the UE is configured with [*uplinkTxSwitchingOptionForBandPair*] set to 'dualUL',

- When the UE is to transmit a 2-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 2nd and/or 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 2nd and 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band} and for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.

- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port or 2-port transmission on a carrier on the 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 2-port transmission can be supported on the 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band } and for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.

[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers if UE doesn’t indicate [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*], where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}, otherwise the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}, band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.]

[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 1st and 3rd band, if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, otherwise then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers , where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.]

[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 2nd and/or 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 2nd and 3rd band,

- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 2nd band and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 2nd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 3rd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.

- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 3rd band and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 2nd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}.

- otherwise, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band} and for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.]

- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 3rd band and/or the 4th band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 3rd and 4th band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {1st band, 4th band}, band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}and band pair {2nd band, 4th band}

Please provide your comments on the issue to the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Between the first 2 bullets with square brackets, we prefer second one, i.e.:When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 1st and 3rd band, if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, otherwise then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers , where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.On the text under the third square brackets, we support the text, but it seems one of the scenarios is missing. Basically, the possibility when the associated band for 1st band is configured as 4th band is not included. This will impact how the switching gap will be determined. Basically, the switching gap will be based on the maximum of the switching period that the UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}, band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {4th band, 2nd band}and band pair {4th band, 3rd band}. Therefore, the corresponding case should also be included. Based on this, we propose to add following bullet as well:***- if UE is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 4th band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where NTx1-Tx2 is the max of [uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}, band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {4th band, 2nd band}and band pair {4th band, 3rd band}.*** |
| vivo | For the following two alternative bullets from ZTE and CTC: First, the granularity of the [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] is ‘*Per band (only for the band(s) in the band combination but not included in the pair of bands before and after switching) for each pair of bands before and after switching in each band combination.*’ according to RAN4 LS R4-2303507, and should be reflected in the spec. Second, regarding *N*Tx1-Tx2, as the Tx on the 1st band remains unchanged during the switching of the other Tx, *N*Tx1-Tx2 should be the switching period that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}. Thus, we prefer CTC’s version with following changes.~~[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1~~~~st~~ ~~band and the 2~~~~nd~~ ~~band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1~~~~st~~ ~~band and/or the 3~~~~rd~~ ~~band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of~~ *~~N~~*~~Tx1-Tx2~~ ~~on any of the carriers if UE doesn’t indicate [~~*~~AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4~~*~~], where~~ *~~N~~*~~Tx1-Tx2~~ ~~is the [~~*~~uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod~~*~~] that UE indicates for the band pair {2~~~~nd~~ ~~band, 3~~~~rd~~ ~~band}, otherwise the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of~~ *~~N~~*~~Tx1-Tx2~~ ~~on any of the carriers on the 2~~~~nd~~ ~~band and the 3~~~~rd~~ ~~band, where~~ *~~N~~*~~Tx1-Tx2~~ ~~is the max of [~~*~~uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod~~*~~] that UE indicates for the band pair {1~~~~st~~ ~~band, 2~~~~nd~~ ~~band}, band pair {1~~~~st~~ ~~band, 3~~~~rd~~ ~~band}, band pair {2~~~~nd~~ ~~band, 3~~~~rd~~ ~~band}.]~~[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 1st and 3rd band, if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band for band pair{the 2nd band, the 3rd band}, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, otherwise then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers , where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.]For the bullets from the last round inputs at the last meeting. Similar comments on the granularity of [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*]. The 1st sub-bullet is for 2nd+3rd->1st+2nd (associated band without scheduled ul transmission)The 2nd sub-bullet is for 2nd +3rd ->1st+3rd (associated band without scheduled ul transmission)It seems that the current ‘otherwise’ part refers to the cases where UE does not support [AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4] and when the associated band is the 2nd band or the 3rd band. However, the cases when UE does not indicate [AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4] and the associated band is 4th band cannot be covered in otherwise sub-bullet. This case cannot be covered by ‘When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 3rd band and/or the 4th band….’in the last bullet either, because there is no UL transmission on the associated band. Thus, we suggest changes in green.[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 2nd and/or 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 2nd and 3rd band,- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 2nd band for band pair{the 1st band, the 3rd band}, and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 2nd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 3rd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 3rd band for band pair{the 1st band, the 2nd band}, and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 2nd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}.- otherwise, when the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 2nd band or 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band} and for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.] If the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 4th band, *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of *[uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod]* that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {1st band, 4th band}, band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}and band pair {2nd band, 4th band} |
| Qualcomm | According RAN4 LS below, the advanced UE capability defined by RAN4 is per band per band pair. We propose to clear reveal this in RAN1 spec. Example wording could be “”UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}…”

|  |
| --- |
| R4-2303507**Issue 3: Impact from switching of one Tx chain on the other Tx chain****Scenario of one band with the number of Tx chain unchanged due to switching**When one of the two Tx chains is triggered to switch from one band (named “band A”) to another band (name “band B”), the other Tx chain is maintained on a different band (named “band C” or “band D” in the case of 4-band) and the number of Tx chain on band C or band D is unchanged due to the switching, RAN4 agreed the granularity of the optional UE capability to allow UL transmission on the band with the number of Tx chain unchanged during UL switching as follows: * Per band (only for the band(s) in the band combination but not included in the pair of bands before and after switching) for each pair of bands before and after switching in each band combination.
 |

Between 1st and 2nd alternative wording in the square brackets, we slightly prefer the 2nd which tens to clearly indicate the “[*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}. The 1st alternative tries to preclude the cases needs considering two switching periods but it might miss some cases which also needs to be precluded and create ambiguity.The 3rd part in the bracket is generally ok except the above “per-band pair” issue. One minor cent, we think the first two sub paragraphs are redundant as UE is capable to transmit on 1st & 2nd band before switching. However, we could live with this if majority think it’s necessary to differentiate whether actual transmission is scheduled or not.  |
| ZTE | Regarding the following two options, we support the second one. The first one below is not in line with the previous RAN4 LS, in which the switching period is only determined based on the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers if UE doesn’t indicate [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*], where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}, otherwise the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}, band pair {1st band, 3rd band}, band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.][- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band, and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 1st band and/or the 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 1st and 3rd band, if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of NTx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 2nd band and the 3rd band, otherwise then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers , where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}.]Regarding the following, we think it is NOT needed as it is duplicated with the part already in the draft spec, i.e., “*DualUL-TxState* set to 'oneT', when the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported on one carrier on the 1st band and the 2nd band followed by no transmission on any carrier on these two bands and 1-port transmission on the other carrier on the 3rd band the UE shall consider this as if 1-port transmission was transmitted on the 3rd band and the band associated with the 3rd band as configured by [*AssociatedBand*], otherwise the UE shall consider this as if 2-port transmission took place on the transmitting carrier.- If the UE is configured with *uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState* set to 'oneT', if a band in the band combination is not configured as dualUL for any band pair it belongs to, when the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the band the UE shall consider this as if 2-port transmission took place on the transmitting carrier.”.To summary, this part is not needed.[- When the UE is to transmit a 1-port transmission on one uplink carrier on the 1st band and if the preceding uplink transmission was a 1-port transmission on a carrier on the 2nd and/or 3rd band and the UE is under the operation state in which 1-port transmission can be supported in the 2nd and 3rd band,- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 2nd band and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 2nd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 3rd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.- if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 3rd band and is configured with uplinkTxSwitching-DualUL-TxState set to 'oneT', and the band associated with the 1st band is configured as 3rd band, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers on the 1st band and the 2nd band, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band}.- otherwise, then the UE is not expected to transmit for the duration of *N*Tx1-Tx2 on any of the carriers, where *N*Tx1-Tx2 is the max of [*uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod*] that UE indicates for the band pair {1st band, 2nd band} and for the band pair {1st band, 3rd band}.] |
| China Telecom | Regarding the first 2 bullets with square brackets which are considered as alternatives, the second one is preferred and the first one needs to be removed. Because based on RAN4 LS when the UE is to transmit a 1-port + 1-port transmission each on one uplink carrier on 1st and 2nd band and if Tx chain state at the preceding uplink transmission is 1T + 1T each on 1st band and 3rd band, there is no ambiguity for the switching no matter the UE has [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] or not, i.e. the switch of one Tx chain from 3rd band -> 1st band and the other Tx chain from 1st band -> 2nd band is not supported in this case. Vivo and QC’s suggestion to add “for the band pair {2nd band, 3rd band}” after “if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 1st band” is fine.Regarding the 3rd bullet with square bracket, we think it is needed, since the paragraphs cited by ZTE only specify how the UE determines the Tx state, but does not specify how the switching gap *N*Tx1-Tx2 is determined. We agree with Apple and Vivo the possibility when the associated band for 1st band is configured as 4th band needs also to be included, and Apple’s new sub-bullet is fine to us. We are also OK with Vivo’s modification “if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 2nd band for band pair{the 1st band, the 3rd band}” for the first sub-bullet and “if UE indicates [*AdvancedCapabilityDefinedbyRAN4*] for the 3rd band for band pair{the 1st band, the 2nd band}” for the second sub-bullet. |
| **Moderator 23.5.** | Thank you for all the comments. Given that this issue seems more typical CR discussion, suggest that the inputs will be considered when generating the next draft CR revision, and the issue is not discussed further in RAN1#113 |

## Issue #5: Any other critical issue?

Any other critical issues needing a resolution for RAN1 to be able to endorse the draft CR?

Please provide your comments on the issue to the table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | We think current switching period location part still miss some cases. Assume the band priority is band A>B>C>D, the below switching cases should be clearly covered in the spec:* The highest priority band transmits before and after switch. i.e. A+B->A+C
* The highest priority band is not involved into the switch (i.e. B->C)
 |
| China Telecom | We have comment on the definition of switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$.In section 6.1.6, there is the description about the switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$. However, the description “The switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$is indicated by UE capability *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod2T2T* if *uplinkTxSwitching-2T-Mode* is configured, and *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod* otherwise” applies for clauses 6.1.6.1, 6.1.6.2.0, 6.1.6.3. In section 6.1.6.2.2 about uplink switching with 3 or 4 uplink bands, there is some new definition about the switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$. So the description in section 6.1.6 needs to be updated specifying clear definition for each clause. The suggestion is:

|  |
| --- |
| 6.1.6 Uplink switchingThe UE may omit uplink transmission during the uplink switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$if the conditions defined in this clause are met and the UE is configured with *uplinkTxSwitching*. The switching gap $N\_{Tx1-Tx2}$is indicated by UE capability *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod2T2T* if *uplinkTxSwitching-2T-Mode* is configured, and *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod* otherwise in clauses 6.1.6.1, 6.1.6.2.0, 6.1.6.3, and is determined in clause 6.1.6.2.2 for uplink switching with 3 or 4 uplink bands:  |

 |
| **Moderator 23.5.** | Thank you for all the comments. Given that this issue seems more typical CR discussion, suggest that the inputs will be considered when generating the next draft CR revision, and this issue is not discussed further in RAN1#113 |