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# Introduction

As per chairman’s guidance, three rounds with check points below are planned. This summary is for the first round and is expected to complete by Jan/27.

[104-e-NR-DSS-03] Email discussion/approval for efficient activation/de-activation mechanism for SCells in NR CA – Frank (Huawei)

* 1st check point: Jan 27
* 2nd check point: Feb 1
* 3rd check point: Feb 5

According to the contribution papers under agenda item 8.13.3 for efficient activation/de-activation mechanism for NR CA SCells, and in light of the working assumption and agreements achieved the last meeting, all identified issues are summarized in section and can be discussed in Section 3.

# Summary of issues and priorities

According to all of companies’ contribution documents, all the issues are summarized below, including 7 specific issues and 7 general issues, with more details in Section 3. Please companies provide your views in Section 3 with taking into consideration the information of check points and GTW session.

For the specific issues to activation/deactivation process:

* **Issue-1:** Triggering command for SCell activation/de-activation and temporary RS
* **Issue-2:** Time-domain property of TRS
* **Issue-3:** QCL configuration of TRS
* **Issue-4:** Timeline for temporary RS and SCell activation
* **Issue-5:** Associated BWP for temporary RS
* **Issue-6:** Tactivation reduction with BS assistance but no temporary RS nor SSB
* **Issue-7:** Enhancement for CSI reporting

For general issues, they are mostly extracted from a proposal of one company:

* **Question G1:** Whether or not temporary RS should be introduced for unknown cells?
* **Question G2:** Whether or not temporary RS should be introduced for both FR1 and FR2 case?
* **Question G3:** Whether or not to additionally support AP CSI-RS, P/SP CSI-RS, SRS, and RS based on SSS/PSS as temporary RS, one or more of which may be used during SCell activation depends on network configuration / UE capability.
* **Question G4:** Whether or not support additional functionality of temporary RS during SCell activation, e.g. CSI measurement/acquisition, cell search.
* **Question G5:** Whether RAN1 need to clarify whether to support A-TRS for RRC-based SCell activation.
* **Question G6:** For cases where Rel15/16 TRS structure is re-used for ‘temporary RS’, whether there is need to define a separate ‘temporary RS’ configuration in addition to already existing TRS configuration.
* **Question G7:** whether aperiodic TRS is decoupled with periodic TRS related to the time-domain pattern if aperiodic TRS is served as temporary RS.

According to previous discussions, companies’ top interests and focus seems to be the detailed designs of temporary RS. Therefore, the following discussion order is suggested. Besides any issue is always welcome for any comment, but the first check point and the GTW session on Thursday could focus more on some issues as listed. If any issue reaches potential early consensus based on companies’ feedbacks, it is also surely reviewed by its earliest check point.

## Schedule

* For 1st check point: 1/27, and GTW session on Thursday

Note: The following issues have impacts on details of TRS

* **Issue-1:** Triggering command for SCell activation/de-activation and temporary RS
* **Issue-2:** Time-domain property of TRS
* **Issue-3:** QCL configuration of TRS
* For 2nd check point: 2/01, and potential new GTW session
* **Follow-ups for all issues listed in 1st check point**
* **The remaining issues with potential consensus**
* 3rd check point: 2/05
* **Wrap-up for all issues with potential consensus**

In case of different views or suggestions on the schedule, they are welcome here.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | No objection to the suggestions on the schedule. |
| ZTE | For the three issues listed for 1st check point, from our perspective, Issue-2 has high dependency on RAN4 input. For example, if RAN4 confirms that 1 or 2 slots of TRS is sufficient, then aperiodic TRS is preferred. If RAN4 confirms that more slots of TRS are needed, then maybe periodic TRS is more suitable. Thus, we suggest to focus on Issue-1 and Issue-3 only. |
| Nokia | OK with the suggested schedule, but RAN1 should wait for the RAN4 response on RAN1’s LS out in [R1-2009798](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_103-e/LS/Outgoing/R1-2009798.zip) on TRS time-domain properties before proceeding further in RAN. |
| vivo | Fine with the schedule. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Apple | Agree with Issue 1 and 3.  Share views from ZTE and Nokia regarding the dependency of Issue 2 with RAN4 Reply LS. Not sure how to proceed in RAN1 without RAN4 inputs. |

# Discussions

In current specifications, when a UE receives a SCell activation command in a PDSCH in slot , the UE shall complete SCell activation no earlier than and no later than slot *n*+ [*THARQ* + *Tactivation\_time* + *TCSI\_Reporting*]/ as shown in Figure 1. Therefore, reducing *THARQ*, *Tactivation\_time* and *TCSI\_Reporting* is the key to achieve efficient SCell activation/de-activation mechanism. Companies’ views are summarized in the sections below. In addition to your feedback to Section 2, more detailed comments are welcome.



Figure 1 SCell activation procedure

## THARQ reduction

### Issue-1: Triggering command for SCell activation/de-activation and temporary RS

In the last meeting, some candidates for the trigger of temporary RS and SCell activation are agreed. Combining new alternatives proposed in this meeting, all the candidates and companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Alt 1: The trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell [2]
  + Alt 1.1: A PDSCH TB, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers [6][10][13][15][14]
    - Alt 1.1.1: A PDSCH TB containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers
    - Alt 1.1.2: A PDSCH TB containing one new MAC-CE for both triggers [9][14]
  + Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers [7][10]
    - Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger [1]
    - Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger [1]
    - Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger [1]
    - Alt 1.2.4: A single UL DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 [11]
    - Alt 1.2.5: group-common DCI [12]
    - Alt 1.2.6: at least DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6 [18]
  + Alt 1.3: A PDSCH TB and its scheduling DL grant, e.g. MAC-CE for activation and DL grant for temporary RS [5][10][13]
  + Alt 1.4: A DL grant and a UL grant received in the same slot/OFDM symbols of PDCCH where the DL grant is scheduling a MAC-CE for SCell activation and the UL grant is triggering the RS.
  + Alt 1.5: Rel-15/16 Scell activation MAC-CE and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well [1][3][4][6][8]
  + Alt 1.6: New MAC CE for Scell activation and temporary RS triggering as well as A-CSI-RS transmission [14]
* Alt2: Triggering of temporary RS separately from Scell activation command is not precluded and both ‘separate’ triggers (examples below) and ‘integrated’ triggers (examples in Alt 1) are considered for Scell activation
  + Alt 2.1: Rel-15/16 Scell activation MAC-CE and Rel 15/16 DCI triggering [5]
    - Alt 2.1.1: No NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the Scell activation command; [16]
    - Alt 2.1.2: NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the Scell activation command, and m1 is no earlier than [k1 + 3ms + 1]; [15]
  + Alt 2.2: Rel-15/16 Scell activation MAC-CE and new DCI triggering for temporary RS [16]

Summary of main concerns:

For Alt1,

* Additional spec impact for new MAC CE/DCI of triggering
* Unclear main benefit over reusing the legacy triggerings.

For Alt2,

* Additional spec impact to define a valid window to receive DCI trigger of A-TRS after the DCI scheduling Scell activation command is received. (Beyond the window, such DCI trigger is not effective for Scell activation.)
* Lack of integrity of triggering commands and its resulting false alarm of either one triggering.
* In case of simultaneous activation of multiple Scells, the size of CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList used to A-TRS triggering may be too limited to accommodate all different combinations of Scells, or more frequent RRC updates of CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList may be required.

**Question 1-1: Whether the trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of Scell activation transmitted on an activated cell, i.e. Alt 1 or Alt 2 is selected?**

Taking into the main concerns of both sides, companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Alt.2 (Alt.2.1.2)  Alt.2 can support at least some of the scenarios with minimum (almost zero) spec impact. With the separate signalling, one of them might be errored with a certain probability, but this does not cause critical issue. Hence, RAN1 should agree to support Alt.2.1.2 firstly. Then Alt.1.1.1 and Alt.1.1.2 can be discussed/considered. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 1 (Alt 1.5).  For Alt2, our main concern is that the independent confirmations for separate triggering may lead to missing one of the two triggering:   * If such missing is known to both gNB and UE, additional spec impacts should be in place to define the UE behavior whether UE should go further with Scell activation or TRS reception in case the other triggering is not received. We guess whether additional timer should be defined in RAN2 spec for this. * If such missing is not sync-up between gNB and UE, another set of protocol logic needs to apply, which is very-likely in RAN2 protocol stack. Then more coordinations between two WGs are needed. |
| ZTE | Support Alt.1 (Alt 1.1 or Alt 1.2.6)  As we can see in the current TS 38.133, similar as TCI indication, there are lots of different timelines for different locations of TCI indication for FR2 Scells. If separate indication is adopted for Scell activation and temporary RS, RAN4 may need to define more timelines depending on different locations of these separate indications.  Note, there are too many different alternatives here. Maybe we can first down-select some of them and then further study/compare different solutions. |
| CATT | Technically speaking, either way, i.e. integrated triggering or separate triggering, can work. In order to support the two functionalities, i.e. Scell activation and temporary RS triggering, separate bit fields are needed.  Currently, the situation is very divergent as there are many options under the umbrella of each scheme. For sake of progress, maybe we can try to make some down selection within each bunch of options. It can provide cleared picture on what we are pursuing and facilitate the discussion on which way we should go with finally. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our main motivation for single trigger is the logical simplicity of triggering a procedure with a single trigger rather than splitting it to two separate triggers. DCI trigger would latency-wise be most attractive, but the flexibility of the DCI design is limited and its ability to scale to multiple cells is poor.  If our primary design goal would be to minimize spec impact, we would propose MAC CE for activation and DCI for triggering, but we haven’t seen the new MAC-CE design to be of significant issue.  Hence we have a clear preference for using a MAC CE for both activation and triggering.  One concern in using MAC-CE also for triggering is the linkage of an L2 procedure to L1 timing, but as this is something we have been doing elsewhere, the L2-to-L1 timing linkage needs to be possible already. |
| Vivo | Alt-1.  Alt-2 cannot be supported for free – there are some issues to be resolved once this mechanism is introduced. Firstly, it complicates the processing timeline design as discussed, because the triggering DCI and the Scell activation command may not be received at the same time. Such kind of uncertainty would complicate the design and increase workload of specification and testing. Moreover, the existing DCI triggering only triggers a single TRS burst, which may only be used for either AGC settling or time/frequency tracking, but not both. Consequently, during Scell activation two TRS triggering DCIs are required, which further complicates the design. |
| Ericsson | Alt 2  The main advantage of Alt 2 is it allows reuse of existing Rel15/16 triggers (i.e., Scell activation command MAC CE and DCI based TRS trigger) and avoids the complexity of Alt1.  The disadvantage of Alt 1 is it forces NW/UE to support new triggers even to receive the reference signals that are already supported in Rel15/16 (i.e., TRS) and also forces the unnecessary NW timeline restrictions (i.e., forces the gNB to always decide whether or not to trigger a A-TRS with Scell activation at least 3-4ms in advance of the slot(s) with A-TRS transmission (longer in case of retransmissions).  Then on some of the above comments….   1. “*…complicates the processing timeline design*…”  * UE/NW already support Rel15/16 Scell activation where the timing of RS reception (i.e., SSB or P-TRS) is not fixed compared to activation MAC CE reception. Then UE anyway has to support such SCell activation via SSB/P-TRS reception even in Rel17 (e.g. in scenarios where NW does not trigger ‘temporary RS’, or when operating in legacy NW). So, UE can simply reuse same procedures without any additional complexity. * On the contrary, forced integrated triggering (Alt. 1) places timing restrictions on NW and complicates processing timeline on the NW side.   b) “…. *separate triggering may lead to missing one of the two triggering ….If such missing is not sync-up between gNB and UE, another set of protocol logic needs to apply, which is very-likely in RAN2 protocol stack*”   * L1 triggering of CSI-RS and TRS has been operational since Rel15 and rare error cases (<1% probability), of missing L1 signaling have marginal impact on performance. This is especially true for SCell activation case, where handling of such error cases does not provide sufficient motivation for introduction of new triggering mechanisms (i.e., on rare occasions of missed A-TRS trigger, UE can still use SSB, P-TRS for SCell activation with Rel16 SCell activation delay). * On “*another set of protocol logic needs to apply, which is very-likely in RAN2*”, it should be noted that timeline of how UE acquires sync/AGC for SCell is left to UE implementation (there are no UE procedures defined for this in RAN1 spec). There is no need to change this approach for either Alt 1 or Alt 2.   c) “…*ability to scale to multiple cells is poor*…”, our understanding is existing SCell activation MAC CE and CSI-RS triggering can trigger activation and TRS respectively on multiple cells. So, at least as a baseline the existing triggering should be supported as also indicated by Qualcomm. Then if need for some more flexible triggering is identified, we are open to enhancements being discussed as part of Alt 1. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1, in particular Alt 1.2 and Alt 1.5. We suggest to down select at high level first.  If TRS is always going to be triggered during activation, one joint trigger is sufficient and the rest can be left for procedural enhancement.  For Alt 2, as the temporary RS is likely to be just a reused existing RS, the temporary RS can be triggered in R15/16 way already during the activation. Then we are not very sure what RAN1 needs to do here --- by implementation the gNB can already send the MAC activation command followed by one or more AP RS triggers. There may be a lot of work for RAN4, though. |
| Intel | Alt 1.2.  Alt 2 is not preferred since UE may not received of the two triggers which requires additional handling to align the understandings of gNB and UE. Alt 1.2 is preferred than other alternatives under Alt 1 is due to its lowest latency. |
| Apple | Alt.1 in general. Alt 1.1.2 or Alt.1.6 particularly.  Integrating two tightly coupled components in a single command is always better in terms of reliability. Note that missing TRS triggering DCI can result in misalignment on the TRS vs. SSB resource for activation operation and consequently UE may not meet the activation time requirement defined for a particular setup. In addition, the DCI-based TRS triggering increases the overall activation time since the earliest time instance is after n+k1+3ms to receive the triggering DCI. Addition delay is needed between DCI and TRS transmission. With Alt.1, the TRS triggering is received in slot n and TRS transmission can be immediately after n+k1+3ms. |
| DOCOMO | Alt 1.2.  Alt 1.2 is good choice in terms of latency, and can achieve temporary RS trigger for multiple cells, which is important since multiple cells tend to be activated simultaneously and should be supported.  Also, it should be clarified how UE behaves when the UE which is configured with temporary RS via higher layer signalling receives the existing Rel-15/16 SCell activation command in MAC-CE. One option is just same as legacy, and another option is Alt 2. |
| Futurewei2 | We suggest to consider the resulting efficiency / latency as the main objective to facilitate down selection here. We have the following detailed analysis:   * Whenever a MAC CE is sent, the shortest response time is the MAC-PHY processing time (e.g., 3 ms). * Whenever a DCI is sent, the shortest response time is the PHY processing time (e.g., k). * When a MAC CE is used for SCell activation followed by UE processing temp RS, the shortest timeline should be: 1) MAC CE received 🡪 2) MAC-PHY processing 🡪 3) temp RS processing. Latency may be shortened if there is a seamless transition from 2) to 3).   + However, with separate triggers, Alt 2.1.2 adds a) a potentially non-zero gap and b) PHY processing time between 2) and 3), and hence is unnecessarily slow. That is, 1) MAC CE received 🡪 2) MAC-PHY processing 🡪 a) a potentially non-zero gap 🡪 b) DCI received with PHY processing time 🡪 3) temp RS processing.   + Also another issue is that, this gap may confuse UE to think there may not be a DCI triggering temp RS, leading the UE to invoke the R15/16 behavior.   + Alt 2.1.1 has no NW timing restriction, so it may still experience the same issues, unless the DCI is always received and processed before the end of 2). * In any case, MAC CE followed by temp RS processing with a potential gap in between is slower than processing temp RS while receiving/processing MAC at the same time or without such a gap. Generally using a joint trigger can avoid complicated timeline issue, avoid time gaps, and allow concurrent processing of temp RS and MAC/MAC-PHY as much as possible.   Given the above issues with Alt 2, we suggest to focus on Alt 1 to make progress. |
| Moderator | Thank FutureWei for nice detailed analysis.  Since several companies suggested respective down-selection under Alt. 1 and Alt. 2, please refer to the updated list in Q1-2 and Q1-3 for further comparison between Alt.1 and Alt.2.  Please continue the discussion, we are supposed to have down-selection between Alt 1 and Alt 2 this meeting.   * Please supporters of Alt.1 address the concerns from the other side, especially the potential spec impact and benefit over Alt 2.1. * Please supporters of Alt.2 address the concerns from the other side, especially the potential issues of timeline issue, false alarm, multiple branches of procedures, and any strong concern/drawback about Alt 1.1. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding Alt.1 vs Alt.2 for signalling, we would like just to highlight that Alt.2 can be supported with almost zero RAN1 spec impact. The main task is for RAN4 to establish corresponding SCell activation delay requirement using TRS, which is necessary whichever we choose between Alt.1 and Alt.2. So, there is no reason not to support Alt.2. We are open to discuss benefits of Alt.1 over Alt.2 further once support of Alt.2 is confirmed, but we do not think it is a right direction to argue “Alt.1 vs Alt.2” as Alt.2 does not prevent us from further discussion for Alt.1.  Note that Alt.2 supports flexible time-domain/frequency-domain indication of temp RS assuming that the temp RS = A-TRS (triggering A-TRS on multiple cells and timing indication of A-TRS are already available in the spec).  Having only Alt.1 as the solution for temp RS based SCell activation would be problematic (detailed problem may depend on exact solution from Alt.1). For example, Alt.1.1.3 may result in completion of temp RS trigger process even before the UE finishes decoding PDSCH for MAC-CE SCell activation command. |
| Ericsson | On timeline, as explained earlier, UE has to handle varying time intervals between SCell activation trigger 🡨🡪 RS used for acquiring sync 🡨🡪 RS used for CSI measurement regardless of Alt 1 or Alt 2. It is also already done in Rel15/16. Alt 1 forces a timeline on the NW (as explained above) by forcing only integrated triggering which Alt 2 does not.  On comments from Futurewei -- with a ‘integrated trigger’ in slot n, earliest TRS can be sent is in first slot after n+k1+3ms. Then with Rel15/16 trigger, UE SCell activation is in slot n, the TRS DCI can be sent in slot n with corresponding TRS in same slot. For case of different SCS e.g. 30KHZ SCS scheduling 120kHz SCS there may need to be 1 (120kHz) slot extra delay (assuming UE vendors do not ask for additional relaxations for MAC CE different SCS case). Then issue with forcing ‘integrated trigger’ as explained earlier is NW is forced to decide on a TRS trigger 25-30 slots (i.e., 120kHz SCS) ahead of actual TRS transmission (longer assuming rtx, TDD cell on FR1 etc.). This is the bigger issue in our view. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm, Understand your point, very happy to get either Alt.1 or Alt.2 agreed. But according to the feedback, the arrival time of A-TRS trigger is uncertain and companies have commented with worry about unnecessary sub-branches of procedures. It seems no consensus on almost zero spec impact at this stage. Additionally, we are interested in your view on how to get the same flexibility as MAC-CE SCell activation to indicate any combination of SCell because A-TRS triggering seems to reply on preconfigured list with preconfigured combination of SCells. It may end up with a much larger size of preconfigured list. Not sure if it is small pain from spec impact perspective. |
| Futurewei3 | Based on the discussions so far, we’d like to suggest the following high-level proposal and options to be considered moving forward:  *Proposal: Down select at least one option from below:*   * *Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*   + *Detailed design of MAC CE(s) is up to RAN2* * *Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*   + *Details FFS* * *Option 2: A (Rel-15/16) SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s)*   + *Details FFS*   Some explanations follow.  Part of the reason that we do not use “joint trigger” or “separate triggers” here is because some of the alternatives in the summary contain “two triggers” (e.g., two MAC CEs, one MAC CE and its scheduling grant) but are generally referred to as “joint trigger”. This could be a bit confusing.  In addition, the original Alt2 includes the design of Alt1. This seems to create some contradiction --- opposing Alt1 also indirectly opposes Alt2. Thus we think it’s better to separate them to remove this dependency. Proponents to both types of triggers can still select two options from the above, and proponents of only one type of triggers can select one option.  @Ericsson: Thanks for the comment. However we think the TRS may be monitored before n+k1+3 ms, i.e., it may not wait for the MAC-PHY processing to complete. We can further discuss it as the next level of detail and we do not have to establish/rule out this possibility yet. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for the discussion and thanks Weimin/Jialing for the updated Proposal 1 below.  For Option 2 in the updated proposal, “*Rel-15/16) SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation*” and “*(Rel-15/16) DCI …*” are already supported in the RAN1 specifications. Given this, I am not sure how these can be excluded from RAN1 perspective. Can companies intending to exclude them clarify what RAN1 spec changes are intended?  Just to reiterate our view --  Option 2 works with existing triggers in the spec and the activation timeline management is also similar to Rel15/16 except that it can be faster. i.e., SSB is substituted by on-demand A-TRS when needed. This faster timeline aspect is expected to be covered in the form of new RAN4  requirements by e.g. replacing Rel15/16 ‘time to first SSB’ which is variable with ‘time to first SSB/A-TRS’.  Assuming one of Option 1a/1b below is also selected as new Rel17 trigger (i.e., providing additional flexibility/restrictions depending on company viewpoint), I would guess a harmonized proposal that allows us to move ahead with rest of design could look something like below  **Proposal 1v2**   * Support the following for Rel17 fast SCell activation   + ‘Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE’  for SCell activation and DCI 0\_1 trigger for A-TRS triggering   + One of the following additional triggering mechanism     - MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)       * Detailed design of MAC CE(s) is up to RAN2     - A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)       * Details FFS |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the discussion. Ravi’s proposal is good direction for us, but we would like to suggest a couple of changes.   * For the 1st sub-bullet (MAC-CE for SCell activation + DCI 0\_1 to trigger A-TRS), we would like to make sure that this works with minimum spec impact + minimum implementation impact. So far, there is no case where A-CSI-RS is requested on a SCell that has not been activated. In order to make sure that this aspect is unchanged, we would like to add a following sub-sub-bullet (the description is borrowed from the spec):   + The DCI 0\_1 triggering the A-TRS on the SCell is received after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N  where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe. * For the joint MAC CE triggering mechanism, further discussion is necessary on what configurations should be supported and what indications are necessary. In the end the MAC-CE design should be up to RAN2, but at least for now, RAN1 should keep discussions. If this understanding is correct, it would be good just to say “details FFS”.   **Proposal 1v2**   * Support the following for Rel17 fast SCell activation   + ‘Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE’  for SCell activation and DCI 0\_1 trigger for A-TRS triggering     - The DCI 0\_1 triggering the A-TRS on the SCell is received after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N  where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe   + One of the following additional triggering mechanism     - MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)       * Details FFS       * ~~Detailed design of MAC CE(s) is up to RAN2~~     - A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)       * Details FFS |
| CATT | Thanks a lot for the good discussion.  We also think the updated proposal from Weimin is a good way to forward. We are supportive to the further update from Ravi and Fred. We think DCI format 0\_2 should also be captured in the proposal. Accordingly, we provided some modifications to capture this issue. Hope they are acceptable.  **Proposal 1v2**           Support the following for Rel17 fast SCell activation  o   ‘Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE’  for SCell activation, and DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 trigger for A-TRS triggering    The DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 triggering the A-TRS on the SCell is received after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N  where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe  o   One of the following additional triggering mechanism    MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS  ~~         Detailed design of MAC CE(s) is up to RAN2~~    A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS |
| vivo | Thanks for the good discussion.  Firstly, I think it is too early to agree the green part under the 1st sub-bullet. It restricts the slot n to be the slot of PDSCH, but how about finally “a single DCI” approach is additionally agreed for the activation, where the DCI is a DCI 2\_6-like group common DCI? Then we need to redefine/modify the timing for n. So we prefer the postpone this discussion to avoid unnecessary efforts.  Secondly, if as Ravi said, “Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation” and “Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger A-TRS” are already supported in the RAN1 specifications, then no need to agree an existing feature. Then the proposal should be:  **Proposal 1v3**           Support one the following for Rel17 fast SCell activation    MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS    A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS           Note: this agreement does not intend to remove the Rel-15/16 SCell activation and A-TRS triggering mechanism. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the discussion.  Wanglei’s change is fine for us.  Zichao, “Rel.15/16 MAC-CE + DCI 0\_1/0\_2 A-TRS trigger” is already in the spec but there is no requirement to enable A-TRS based SCell activation in the RAN4 spec, which effectively means it is not yet supported. Since the WID states this is RAN1-based solution, we need to make an agreement for it. Regarding the timeline written by green, this clarification is important for implementation. If this green part is not ensured, the UE has to be ready for A-TRS trigger for SCell(s) even before the UE is aware of the SCell is to be activated. Note that this sub-bullet is UL DCI format based – this is nothing to do with any new potential “group-common DCI”.  In summary, we prefer to keep the Wanglei’s version.  **Proposal 1v2**           Support the following for Rel17 fast SCell activation  o   ‘Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE’  for SCell activation, and DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 trigger for A-TRS triggering    The DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 triggering the A-TRS on the SCell is received after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N  where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe  o   One of the following additional triggering mechanism    MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS  ~~         Detailed design of MAC CE(s) is up to RAN2~~    A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)           Details FFS |
| OPPO | Thanks for the discussion.  First, it seems now we have two parallel proposals, one of which is already there since last meeting and people already get familiar with, the other is popped in the last 24hr to promote a one single proposal which even has a chance to be "existing solution already in spec". I think it is good for FL to tell the group which one should be taken for the next step discussion, given more companies did not join in the discussion for the 2nd proposal and seem to wait for direction from FL, and the time is running.  Then from OPPO's perspective, we do not support the 2nd proposal (Proposal 1v2), because:  -- We still have concern on any "separate" triggering mechanism, with the reasons already marked in FL's summary. Proponents from ALt-2 argued that the chance to have one trigger successfully reach UE but the other unsuccessful is low. We do not think this is a good excuse to ignore the potential issue. We are talking about the protocol, not the performance. From the protocol perspective, no matter how low is the possibility for UE to get one trigger but fail the other, a "good" protocol has to handle that, otherwise there would be a good chance to leave "unspecified UE behavior" in practice with performance impact unknown.  -- Companies argued that the "Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE"  and "Rel-15/16 DCI to identify some TRS" is already supported so this is something naturally agreeable for this discussion. I do not deny these two features are already there in spec, but I do not buy the logic that they can be combined together in Rel-17 fast SCell activation process without further agreement, given these two features were agreed to support different purposes, and the effectiveness of their combination for a new feature is a brand-new topic and UE need the specified behavior in spec to logically connect these two functions for a new feature. Of course, gNB can always use the two functions to pursue fast cell activation, as a best-effort implementation, without getting UE to know the purpose.  -- Besides "Rel15/16 SCell activation command MAC CE + Rel-15/16 DCI to identify some TRS", which is used in Proposal 1v2 discussion logic to promote a specific solution direction given this is something already in spec, I would remind Alt 1.5 from last meeting has the same advantage for spec impacts. Regarding to the comments on disadvantage of Alt 1.5 on beam adaptation,I would say this beam adaptation is not a must-have to support fast cell activation and RAN1 already agreed (as a WA) to indicate SSB QCL source to help UE to determine the right Rx beam; for the Tx beam, I doubt whether adaptation would help given we are talking about single burst transmission of A-TRS. |
| Samsung | Support Alt. 1.  It is simpler and more efficient for the purposes of Rel-17 SCell activation. Also no reason to separate elements that belong to a same functionality. |
| FutureWei | Thank you very much for the discussions!  The new set of proposals (Proposal 1, a few versions of Proposal 1v2, Proposal 1v3) are recommendations to the FL and can be seen as a high-level distilled version of the original one(s), which may facilitate progress at least at the high level. If we can make initial progress along the line of the new proposals, we can come back to the original one(s) for more detailed discussions. We look forward to the FL’s guidance and inputs from companies.  For the MAC CE + DCI option, we are aligned with Fred, Wenfeng, and Wanglei. Even with legacy triggers, the timeline / procedure / behaviors would need to be enhanced for fast activation. The pros and cons of this enhancement will need to be discussed together with other options, so we will still need to down select from 3 options rather than only 2. We suggest to put the detailed timeline that Fred added for further discussion.  @Wenfeng: Please note that Alt. 1.5 is included in Option 1a:  Alt 1.5: Rel-15/16 Scell activation MAC-CE and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well  *Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*  We suggest the following proposal:  *Proposal 1v4: Down select at least one option from below:*  -          *Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*  o   *Details FFS*  -          *Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*  o   *Details FFS*  -          *Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*  o   *Details FFS* |
| Moderator | Thank FutureWei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, vivo, OPPO, CATT, Samsung for your proposals and follow-up discussions.  Summary:  **Alt2 + one of Alt1a/1b:** Ericsson, Qualcomm   * **Pros**: reuse two Rel-15/16 triggers of SCell activation and A-TRS; No new MAC-CE/DCI * **Cons**: additional timeline between two triggers; false alarm of receiving triggers and its resulting protocol failure; two triggering systems for single functionality; * **Potential spec impacts**: opening and cut-off time of receiving subsequent A-TRS trigger; plus the potential spec impacts of Alt1/1b;   **Alt1/1b:** FutureWei, vivo, OPPO, Samsung, DCM, Intel, Apple, Nokia, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon   * **Pros:** integrity and efficiency of trigger; potential latency advantage; flexible indication of a combination of to-be-activated SCells; * **Cons:** new MAC-CE or new DCI field * **Potential spec impacts:** MAC-CE or DCI field   **Neutral:** CATT    Alt1/1b seems still got majority views. FutureWei’s proposal is a better wayforward.  Please find new proposal below |
| Qualcomm | The summary of pros/cons and spec impacts are not correct.  As commented to the summary, timeline is an issue to be discussed for any of alternatives. So, this is not a disadvantage of Alt.2. More than that, timeline issue is significant in Alt.1b.  On Alt.2, there is no problem of false alarm. It should be explained why/how this is the problem. There is no “protocol failure”. Also, “two triggering systems for single functionality” is pointless and unclear advantage.  On Alt.1a/1b, “integrity of trigger”, “potential latency advantage”, “flexible indication” are unclear what are these advantages. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | There are various reasons why companies prefer one or the other solution and what they consider as drawbacks. It looks like proponents of Alt2+Alt1a/1b have not gained additional support, while they haven’t been convinced to move to the other camp either. Perhaps this is a reflection of everyone having done their homework and understanding the general differences of the alternatives, and due to their own reasons are still convinced of the path they have taken. |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 1-1:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*

* + *Alt 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS*
  + *Alt 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS*
  + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*
    - *Details FFS*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | For all the alternatives, careful work on timeline is necessary – this is not the issue only for Alt.2.  With Alt.1a, temporary RS triggering would need to be after the UE acquires the MAC-CE at n + k where k = k1 + 3\*N.  With Alt.1b, SCell activation timeline will be brand new and RAN1 needs to ask RAN2 and RAN4 to work on it.  With Alt.2, “enhancement of timeline” is unclear. This is not an enhancement but is requirement for this feature.  So, we should clarify the aspects as follows.  ***Proposal 1-1:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*   * + *Alt 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*     - *The temporary RS(s) on the SCell can be triggered after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe*   + *Alt 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*     - *FFS: details including timeline of SCell activation and temporary RS(s) triggering*   + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) ~~with enhancement of timeline~~*     - *The DCI format triggering the temporary RS(s) on the SCell is received after the slot n + k, where the slot n is the ending slot of the PDSCH carrying activation command, k = k1 + 3\*N where k1 is a number of slots for a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information for the PDSCH reception and is indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI format scheduling the PDSCH reception and N is a number of slots per subframe* |
| vivo | We can accept the proposal, although we hope that get more progresses can be achieved in this meeting.  Regarding the timeline provided by Qualcomm, we off course agree that timeline is an important issue for all the alternatives, we don’t think they should be resolved in this stage. We should first determine one of more of the candidates, and then spend efforts to resolve the timeline issues. |
| OPPO | For Alt-1b, We would like to know:   1. Whether this DCI-based SCell activation is a pure RAN1 spec functionality or it needs to go into MAC spec by sharing the SCell activation/deactivation framework with MAC-CE based SCell activation/deactivation and RRC based SCell activation/deactivation. If it is the later case, how is the specification settled (which part in RAN1 spec and which part in RAN2 spec)? 2. Would proponent of Alt-1b intend to propose DCI-based SCell deactivation? 3. Which DCI format (legacy vs. new) is used as the information holder?   For the timeline as asked by Qualcomm, although we agree with vivo this is not something urgent to decide, but as an important component for any candidates, it should be clarified for a more informative comparison. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, we failed to see the intention of this proposal. In last RAN1 meeting, RAN1 had listed lots of alternatives for down-selection. Now, it seems we are trying to list the alternatives again but in another format. It seems this doesn’t help the down-selection here.  In our view, we may need to first down-select the alternatives in Alt.1 and Alt.2, respectively. Then, we can compare the down-select between Alt.1 and Alt.2.  If majority companies prefer to go with the FL proposal, we would suggest to add the following note, which may help the down-selection in next RAN1 meeting.  Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation. |
| CATT | We agree with Qualcomm that timeline is important for all the listed alternatives. The timeline should be discussed sooner or later anyway. If companies want more time to check the timeline issue, for sake of progress, maybe a FFS point such as ‘FFS: details including timeline design for Scell activation and/or T-RS triggering’ can be equally added for each alternative.  We are OK with the modification for Alt2 from Qualcomm and the note from ZTE.  Furthermore, only non-fallback UL DCI format can be used for triggering A-TRS. If this is the intention, it should be captured for alt2 in order to avoid any potential ambiguity.  ***Proposal 1-1:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*   * + *Alt 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*     - *FFS: details including timeline design for Scell activation and/or T-RS triggering*   + *Alt 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*     - *FFS: details including timeline design for Scell activation and/or T-RS triggering*   + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 non-ballback UL DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) ~~with enhancement of timeline~~*     - *FFS: details including timeline design for Scell activation and/or T-RS triggering*   Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for follow-ups.  @Qualcomm, in my understanding, the only timeline that is required by three alternatives is the timeline of receiving temporary RS. But additional timeline of receiving the DCI trigger of temporary RS is only required by Alt 2, e.g the DCI has been received later than k1+3ms. Furthermore, Alt 1b may allow earlier reception of temporary RS than Alt 1a and Alt 2 because it has no MAC processing time budget 3ms, which can be discussed together with the timeline of receiving temporary RS. Regarding SCell completion timeline requirement, all three alternatives need it, and it will be updated for temporary RS by RAN4 anyway. Regarding the detailed timeline design, it seems not agreeable now based on companies’ feedbacks, even not for the other proponent of Alt 2, so an FFS is better.  @OPPO, Your questions are more about detailed design, so can be discussed later. In my understanding, for Alt 1b, it seems easy to split the spec impacts between RAN1 and RAN2 given S5.9 of TS 38.321, e.g. adding DCI trigger in TS 38.321 (to be specific, could be “*if an SCell is configured with sCellState set to activated upon SCell configuration, or an SCell Activation/Deactivation MAC CE is received activating the SCell, or an SCell Activation/Deactivation DCI is received activating the SCell*”) and adding DCI design in TS 38.212. Anyway, this is too detailed and can be discussed later. The same DCI can be used for SCell deactivation similar to the DCI for SCell dormancy. But let proponents clarify it later. An FFS at this stage is sufficient.  @CATT it seems no new timeline for SCell activation in Alt 2 since its main purpose is to reuse existing MAC-CE based SCell activation. So the timeline design for SCell activation is removed from Alt 2. |
| Futurewei | Support the current FL proposal.  @OPPO: 1) We think Alt 1b will require RAN2 involvement; the new PHY aspects should include at least trigger reception and temporary RS monitoring, while other aspects may be more relevant to RAN2. We are open for further discussions as the next level of details. 2) We are open to discuss DCI-based deactivation, but prefer to do so only if it does not require new DCI design. We can further discuss if / how much fast deactivation is beneficial. 3) We prefer to use legacy DCI, but we are open to other views.  @ZTE: The initial intention of drafting a variation of the original proposal was to simplify (it is anyway difficult to agree on a large proposal) and to resolve the logic inclusion relationship (original Alt 2 includes Alt 1, so arguments against Alt 1 are also against Alt 2). |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | We support the current FL proposal, and prefer taking a decision still in this meeting |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 1-1-v2:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*

* + *Alt 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Alt 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS*
    - *FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation*
  + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| OPPO | First of all, we share the similar view that the above proposal is just a re-formulate of the list of alternatives from the last meeting – the progress is tiny if not none. The only outstanding change comparing to the earlier agreement from last meeting is the *modification of earlier agreement* in such a way that Alt-2 could be now a standalone alternative rather than including Alt-1. From this aspect, we are not fans of this proposal.  On the other hand, it seems the debate between “integrated trigger” and “separate trigger” would be somehow impacted by the uncertainty coming from issue of “known/unknown SCell”, given potentially even the two triggers are integrated the gNB and UE can still be off-sync regarding to whether the A-TRS is scanned by UE for a SCell activation process and whether the SCell activation taken on UE side is per legacy or per Rel-17 (this happens even if Rel-17 DCI is used as in Alt-1b to trigger everything). This may make the motivation of Alt 1a/1b not as strong as before. Then it seems RAN1 should firstly discuss whether it is ok for RAN1 to accept the existence of “known/unknown SCell” issue (if it is agreed the RAN1 understanding to RAN4 text is changed from last meeting) and then to allow this issue to further intervene the design logic in Uu for the remaining WI work.  Besides narrow-down between Alt 1a/1b and Alt 2, which could be stuck until the “known/unknown SCell” issue is solved in RAN1, ZTE’s suggestion “we may need to first down-select the alternatives in Alt.1 and Alt.2, respectively. Then, we can compare the down-select between Alt.1 and Alt.2” could be a good way to go for this meeting, if any true progress is desired. |
| Ericsson | * + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*   Meaning of “- enhancement of timeline” is not clear above. If intention is to say “with updated RAN4 requirements” it is better to say that explicitly as below than reuse the word timeline in multiple places with different meaning.   * + *Alt 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with ~~enhancement of timeline~~ updated RAN4 requirements*   Also, on *“• Cons: additional timeline between two triggers; false alarm of receiving triggers and its resulting protocol failure; two triggering systems for single functionality*;” in the summary  • false alarm of receiving triggers and its resulting protocol failure – there is no issue with false alarm (NR PDCCH false alarm is very low ~ 1e-6). The UE can miss the PDCCH scheduling the A-TRS, with about ~1% or lower miss rate. There is absolutely no protocol issues with missing an A-TRS trigger, UE will simply follow current spec and activate slower i.e. send valid CQI later. However, this will be quite rare (1% or lower).  • Additional timeline between two triggers – timeline has to be addressed for all schemes. Even with the single trigger there is additional timeline between the time when the activation command is sent and the A-TRS transmission. Proposal 1v2 allows NW to avoid reserving resources unnecessarily for TRS transmission w/o knowing SCell activation command was successfully received by the UE.  • Two triggers for single functionality – Given these two triggers are already in the spec, this seems to be an advantage of the Alt 2. Alt 1a/1b requires specification of a second new triggering mechanism |
| Moderator | Thank you for your comments.  @OPPO, this new proposal does not overturn the previous agreement, if any confusion, a note can be added for clarification, and Alt. x is renamed as Option X as the updated version. Regarding the potential off-sync issue of known/unknown SCell, please see my response in Question G1. It seems no issue. Regarding ZTE’s comment to down selection of sub-alternatives, it has been suggested by ZTE to add the last note for it. It seems the better solution for this meeting. Here, the proposal focuses on the comparison on a higher level, between integrated trigger and separated triggers.  @Ericsson, Regarding enhancement timeline, based on the discussion history, it is not about the RAN4 requirements, but is further explained in the subbullet of FFS. Regarding false alarm, please check the discussion history. Company did feel that a good protocol should be robust enough instead of intentionally overlooking potential false alarm regardless of to what extent false alarm’s performance loss is. In other words, protocol wise, better to avoid false alarm, as well as its resulting larger latency. Regarding timeline, as replied before, there seems two timelines, and some timeline is only required by Alt 2. Your answer seems to only refer to the common timeline, but the “additional timeline” referred to the timeline dedicated to Alt 2. Regarding the issue of “avoid reserving resource unnecessarily for TRS”, it seems related to the common timeline which may have different timeline offset values for Alt 1a/1b/2, e.g. the acknowledgement of Alt 1b does not include 3ms MAC processing budget, providing earlier determination for NW scheduler. Therefore, it can be further discussed later but not sure if it is an issue for NW scheduler implementation issue now. Regarding two triggers, please check the discussion history, companies feel that the two triggers are not introduced for the purpose of temporary RS, and is not convinced that no spec impact is needed and thus not good to claim “already in the spec”.  No comment is received for the new words highlighted in red, so they are turned into normal black in the next version. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | This is all fine, but adding more FFS points is perhaps not taking us forward. |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 1-1-v3:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*

* + *Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS*
    - *FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation*
  + *Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.*
  + *Note: the previous agreement on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective.*

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with this proposal.  Just one question for clarification. If this proposal is agreed, then we have Alt.1/Alt.2 and Option1a/1b/2. In next meeting, which will be the starting point for next RAN1 meeting’s discussion, Alt.1/Alt.2 or Option1a/1b/2? |
| FutureWei | Thanks to Wenfeng for pointing out the agreement from last meeting. We agree that that agreement should be honored for our discussions now. This means that at least one of 1a or 1b needs to be supported and option 2 can be further discussed in addition. In view of that, I revised the proposal to simply align with that previous agreement. I would also suggest we move forward to start selecting 1a and/or 1b and discussing option 2 during this meeting.    **Proposal 1-1-v4:** For efficient activation of SCells,down select at least one option from 1a and 1b and further consider option 2:   * 1. Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS   2. Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS      2. FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation   3. Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS   4. Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.   5. Note: the previous agreement on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | We are generally fine with this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Weimin, Frank:  Thanks for the proposal. We prefer v3 since the intention is already clear from the note. In addition, we suggest to change Option 1b as follows. Currently SCell activation is via a MAC-CE or RRC-config (direct SCell activation). If we use a DCI format to activate one or a group of SCells, that would change RAN2 spec and RAN4 requirement. From RAN1 point of view, the UE starts some procedures based on the timing of 3ms + ACK transmission for MAC-CE SCell activation command as specified in TS38.213 Section 4.3. The impact on this part should be clear.  **Proposal 1-1-v3 (with a suggestion):** For efficient activation of SCells,down select at least one option from below:   * 1. Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS   2. Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including impact on SCell activation related procedures (e.g., TS38.213 Section 4.3, TS38.133 Section 8.3, TS38.321 Section 5.9) and timeline design for SCell activation and for receiving temporary RS      2. FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation   3. Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS   4. Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.   5. Note: the previous agreement on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective. |
| FutureWei | Thanks for the further discussion. About difference of understanding at UE and at gNB, though it is hard to avoid such situation, its impact seems not so critical.  As of the version of proposal, as long as we have the same understanding that previous agreement still holds, we can be flexible. Taking the version Fred sent, as given below, I made some small revision to remove other WG specs and to spell out the implication of the note. We should realize that potential procedure impact may also come from introducing temporary RS.  **Proposal 1-1-v5 ~~(with a suggestion)~~:** For efficient activation of SCells,down select at least one option from below:   * 1. Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS   2. Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)      1. Details FFS including potential impact on SCell activation related procedures ~~(e.g., TS38.213 Section 4.3, TS38.133 Section 8.3, TS38.321 Section 5.9)~~ and timeline design for SCell activation and for receiving temporary RS      2. FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation   3. Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline      1. Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS   4. Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.   5. Note: the previous agreement on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective which means at least one of 1a and 1b will be selected. |
| CATT | For the FFS point under option 1b, we don’t think it is relevant to the main bullet. We are OK to discuss the deactivation via a DCI if necessary, but it should be a separate proposal.  For option 2, one clarification is that what Rel-15/16 DCI is the intended one? It seems the Rel-15/16 DCI is the UL DCI containing CSI request. As we commented before, the current wording is too generic which seems a Rel-15/16 DL DCI is also possible. Considering there are already many options on the table, we think it is better to make the proposal more specific. |
| vivo | We are generally fine with the proposal, with the following modification to the last note to make it clearer:  Note: At least one of 1a and 1b will be selected according to the previous agreement ~~on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective~~. |
| Moderator | Thank you all for follow-ups.  @ZTE, with the notes, especially the note revision provided by vivo, we will down-select it based on the potential agreement.  @OPPO, your question about known/unknown SCell seems no impact on this proposal here, so it can be discussed in Question G1.  @Futurewei, Qualcomm, thank you for your revisions.  @CATT, in current proposal, only Rel-15/16 DCI that can trigger TRS is applicable. If a DL DCI were introduced to trigger temporary RS, it would not be a Rel-15/16 DCI any more. Regarding the deactivation via a DCI, it is required to address a previous company comment whether the MAC-CE SCell deactivation is reused or not if Option 1b is used. It is just an FFS, hope it is OK for you.  @vivo, thank you for your revised note. |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

#### FL proposal

***Proposal 1-1-v6:*** *For efficient activation of SCells,**down select at least one option from below:*

* + *Option 1a: MAC CE(s) contained in a single PDSCH to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Option 1b: A single DCI to trigger both SCell activation and corresponding temporary RS(s)*
    - *Details FFS including potential impact on SCell activation related procedures and timeline design for SCell activation and for receiving temporary RS*
    - *FFS: The same DCI for SCell deactivation*
  + *Option 2: A Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE to trigger SCell activation and a Rel-15/16 DCI to trigger corresponding temporary RS(s) with enhancement of timeline*
    - *Details FFS including timeline design for receiving a DCI trigger of temporary RS, and for receiving temporary RS*
  + *Note: Companies are encouraged to provide complete solutions for fast SCell activation.*
  + *Note:* At least one of 1a and 1b will be selected according to the previous agreement *~~on the definitions of Alt 1 and Alt 2 is still effective~~.*

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question 1-2: if Alt 1 is preferred, which triggering command for SCell activation/de-activation is preferable?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | FFS between Alt.1.1.1 and Alt.1.1.2 after agreeing Alt.2.1.2  RAN1 should support Alt.2.1.2 firstly. Then Alt.1.1.1 and Alt.1.1.2 should be discussed/considered. |
| OPPO | Alt 1.5.  For Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2, we do not think RAN1 needs to differentiate between these two alternatives. It seems purely RAN2 signaling choice.  For Alt 1.2, we feel the functionality does not sufficiently deserve the cost in defining a new DCI. In addition, moving the SCell activation triggering from MAC-CE to DCI may introduce new reliability discussion in RAN1 as well as the protocol re-design in RAN2 (RAN2 needs to add DCI-based cell activation and makes it work with MC-CE based and RRC-based activations/deactivations in the same piece of protocol).  For Alt 1.3, we do not see the functional difference between Alt 1.3 and Alt 1.1.2/Alt 1.5, because what they say is that the TRS is triggered by MAC-CE (Alt 1.1.2) or something uniquely corresponding to that MAC-CE (Alt 1.3/Alt 1.5). Meanwhile, Alt 1.3 may still partially suffer the issue that the reception of PDSCH can separately succeed or fail upon a good DCI reception, which is somehow the problem in Alt 2.  For Alt 1.6, we understand this is actually Alt 1.1.1 with additional interpretation for CSI.  Between Alt 1.1.x and Alt 1.5, Alt 1.5 is preferred due to less spec impact. We are also open to let RAN2 decide among Alt 1.1.x and Alt 1.5. |
| ZTE | We prefer Alt 1.1 and Alt 1.2.6.  If Alt.1.1 is selected, then we can leave the detailed MAC-CE design to RAN2.  For Alt.1.2.6, the current SCell dormancy indication field may be reused to minimize the specification impact. |
| CATT | Alt 1-3 and alt 1-4 are preferred. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1.1.2. |
| vivo | Alt-1.1/1.5/1.6.  At this stage, we don’t have to differentiate 1.1.x, 1.5 and 1.6. They all rely on the MAC CE to trigger the temporary RS. Whether the temporary RS can be used for CSI reporting is a separate issue, and once it is agreed, we can further discuss whether the same trigger is reused.  Considering that Alt-1 is preferred to avoid the timeline uncertainty issue, then Alt-1.3 and Alt-1.4 is not favorable as they cannot resolve the timeline issue.  Alt-1.2 requires significantly increased physical layer overhead if a new DCI field is introduced to an existing DL or UL grant (as SCell activation is not a frequent operation), or lots of design efforts if a new DCI format is introduced. Given that the existing MAC CE based SCell activation works well, this complicity does not justify. |
| Ericsson | As also suggested by QC, RAN1 should support Alt.2 first (either 2.1.1 or 2.1.2 is OK). Then among the sub-alternatives being discussed for Alt1, 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and “TRS triggering via DL DCI that also schedules Rel15/16 MAC CE” (not clear if this is listed above) can be considered further. We do not believe Alt 1.5 is suitable for NR – with that option the TRS location has to be fixed wrt. SCell activation command and adaptation of TRS beam is not possible |
| Futurewei | Alt 1.2 with existing DCI triggers and Alt 1.3. |
| Intel | We prefer Alt 1.2 in general. Existing trigger 1.2.3, 1.2.1 is preferred if they are sufficient for the operation. Otherwise, 1.2.6 can be considered |
| Apple | Alt.1.1.2 and Alt.1.6. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Alt 1.2.6, but other options within Alt 1.2 can be considered. |
| Moderator | Let’s make as much down-selection as possible under Alt 1.  Reasons for down-selection:   * Alt 1.4 got one preference voted, but one negative comment * Alt 1.6 got one preference only, and linked to Alt 1.1.2. It can be taken as an FFS under Alt 1.1.2. * The difference between Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2 seems only about detailed RAN2 signaling design, whose down-selection could be left to RAN2 * The commonality among Alt 1.1.1, Alt. 1.3 and Alt 1.5 is the existing MAC-CE for SCell activation is reused, thus they can be combined by moving Alt. 1.3 as Alt 1.1.3 and Alt 1.5 as Alt 1.1.4. * Main concern for Alt 1.2 is too much potential spec impact, thus existing DCI is preferred to reuse. Alt 1.2.4 and Alt 1.2.5 can be down-selected out unless clearer potential spec impact is provided this meeting. Alt 1.2.6 is refined with referring to reuse the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication.   @OPPO, Alt 1.3 has no the potential issue as Alt 2 because the DCI is the DL DCI scheduling the MAC CE for SCell activation. Description of Alt 1.3 is refined; Additionally, it is not sure if the down-selection between Alt 1.1 and 1.5 can be up to RAN2 considering the concern on adaptation of TRS beam as commented by Ericsson. Your view on adaptation of TRS beam for Alt 1.5 is appreciated.  @Ericsson, the description of Alt 1.3 is refined to address your comment“*TRS triggering via DL DCI that also schedules Rel15/16 MAC CE” (not clear if this is listed above)*”  Here is an updated list for Alt.1.   * Alt 1: The trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell [2]   + Alt 1.1: A PDSCH TB and its associated signaling, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers [6][10][13][15][9][14][5][1][3][4][8]     - Alt 1.1.1: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and a new MAC-CE for temporary RS     - Alt 1.1.2: A PDSCH TB containing one new MAC-CE for both triggers ; FFS: the MAC-CE can trigger A-CSI-RS transmission as well [9][14]     - Alt 1.1.3: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and its scheduling DL grant for temporary RS [5][10][13]     - Alt 1.1.4: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation, and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well [1][3][4][6][8]   + Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers [7][10][1][18]     - Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger [1]     - Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger [1]     - Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger [1]     - Alt 1.2.6: reusing the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6 [18]   Based on the above updated list, an FFS for the necessity of down-selection between Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2 is added according to company comments.  ***Proposal****: If Alt 1 is adopted, then down-select among Alt 1.x.x below*   * *Alt 1: The trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell*   + *Alt 1.1: A PDSCH TB and its associated signaling, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers*      - *Alt 1.1.1: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and a new MAC-CE for temporary RS*     - *Alt 1.1.2: A PDSCH TB containing one new MAC-CE for both triggers ; FFS: the MAC-CE can trigger A-CSI-RS transmission as well*     - *Alt 1.1.3: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and its scheduling DL grant for temporary RS*     - *Alt 1.1.4: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation, and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well*     - *FFS: the down-selection between Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2 can be up to RAN2 signaling design*   + *Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers*     - *Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.4: reusing the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6* |
| Samsung | Support Alt. 1.2.4  No reason not to re-use the Rel-16 design by extending it to cell activation/deactivation. No reason for a gNB/UE to implement another scheme for that purpose that will also incur larger latency. |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 1-2****: If Alt 1 is adopted, then down-select among Alt 1.x.x below*

* *Alt 1: The trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell*
  + *Alt 1.1: A PDSCH TB and its associated signaling, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers* 
    - *Alt 1.1.1: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and a new MAC-CE for temporary RS*
    - *Alt 1.1.2: A PDSCH TB containing one new MAC-CE for both triggers ; FFS: the MAC-CE can trigger A-CSI-RS transmission as well*
    - *Alt 1.1.3: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and its scheduling DL grant for temporary RS*
    - *Alt 1.1.4: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation, and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well*
    - *FFS: the down-selection between Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2 can be up to RAN2 signaling design*
  + *Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers*
    - *Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger*
    - *Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger*
    - *Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger*
    - *Alt 1.2.4: reusing the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| vivo | Thanks for the proposals. I have some questions for clarifications on the 1st proposal:   * + *Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers*     - *Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger*     - *Alt 1.2.4: reusing the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6*   For Alt 1.2.1-3, do you mean to reuse the existing RS trigger to activate the SCell? If yes, it would be good to clarify:   * + *Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers*     - *Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger is reused to activate a SCell*     - *Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger is reused to activate a SCell*     - *Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger is reused to activate a SCell*   I may not understand correctly on the “reusing the mechanism” of Alt 1.2.4. Does it mean to reuse the DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6 to activate the SCell(s), or to introduce one or more new DCI format(s) similar to 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6? |
| Moderator | @vivo, R1-2100045 has analysis for those three alternatives Alt 1.2.1-3. I feel your revision is OK with small adjustment. “*is reused to activate a SCell*” => “*is reused to activate SCell(s)*”  Regarding Alt 1.2.4, it overrides some DCI fields of DCI 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6 to activate SCell as what has been done to activate dormancy SCell.  ***Proposal 1-2****: If Alt 1 is adopted, then down-select among Alt 1.x.x below*   * *Alt 1: The trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell*   + *Alt 1.1: A PDSCH TB and its associated signaling, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers*      - *Alt 1.1.1: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and a new MAC-CE for temporary RS*     - *Alt 1.1.2: A PDSCH TB containing one new MAC-CE for both triggers ; FFS: the MAC-CE can trigger A-CSI-RS transmission as well*     - *Alt 1.1.3: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation and its scheduling DL grant for temporary RS*     - *Alt 1.1.4: A PDSCH TB containing Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation, and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well*     - *FFS: the down-selection between Alt 1.1.1 and Alt 1.1.2 can be up to RAN2 signaling design*   + *Alt 1.2: A DCI for both triggers*     - *Alt 1.2.1: An existing AP CSI-RS trigger is reused to activate SCell(s)*     - *Alt 1.2.2: An existing AP SRS trigger is reused to activate SCell(s)*     - *Alt 1.2.3: An existing AP TRS trigger is reused to activate SCell(s)*     - *Alt 1.2.4: reusing the mechanism of SCell dormancy indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/2\_6* |
| Ericsson | In above proposal, not clear how Alt 1.2.1, 1.2.2,1.2.3 can support activation without any change. Can proponent please clarify? |
| Samsung | Support Alt. 1.2.4.  No reason not to re-use the Rel-16 design by extending it to cell activation/deactivation. No reason for a gNB/UE to implement another scheme for that purpose that will also incur larger latency. |

**Question 1-3: if Alt 2 is preferred, which triggering command for SCell activation/de-activation is preferable?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Alt.2.1.2  RAN1 should support Alt.2.1.2 firstly. Then Alt.1.1.1 and Alt.1.1.2 should be discussed/considered. |
| CATT | Alt 2.1.1 is preferred |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 2.1.1 |
| Ericsson | OK with either 2.1.1 or 2.1.2. We do not see 2.1.2 providing a big restriction as NW may anyway prefer to trigger TRS after n+k1+3ms (i.e., after UE has processed the MAC CE) |
| Futurewei | We do not see the need for new DCI for temporary RS, so we can first remove Alt 2.2. Alt 2.1.1 may be the same as the legacy design. So Alt 2.1.2 is the only choice. But as discussed, we do not support Alt 2. |
| Moderator | Since no preference voted for Alt 2.2, a down-selection under Alt 2 is helpful.  Because a preconfigured list has been used to indicate limited combination of serving cells of A-TRS, its flexibility of indicating combination of SCell seems not as much as Rel-15/16 MAC-CE for SCell activation. An FFS for whether/how to get such flexibility is suggested.  ***Proposal****: If Alt2 is adopted, then down-select between Alt 2.1.1 and Alt 2.1.2*   * *Alt2: Triggering of temporary RS separately from SCell activation command is not precluded and both ‘separate’ triggers (examples below) and ‘integrated’ triggers (examples in Alt 1) are considered for SCell activation*   + *Alt 2.1: Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE and Rel-15/16 DCI triggering for A-TRS*     - *Alt 2.1.1: No NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the SCell activation command;*     - *Alt 2.1.2: NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the SCell activation command, and m1 is no earlier than [k1 + 3ms + 1];*     - *FFS: whether/how to indicate flexible combination of to-be-activated SCells with existing A-TRS trigging for temporary RS* |
| Samsung | Alt. 2.1.1 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 1-3****: If Alt2 is adopted, then down-select between Alt 2.1.1 and Alt 2.1.2*

* *Alt2: Triggering of temporary RS separately from SCell activation command is not precluded and both ‘separate’ triggers (examples below) and ‘integrated’ triggers (examples in Alt 1) are considered for SCell activation*
  + *Alt 2.1: Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE and Rel-15/16 DCI triggering for A-TRS*
    - *Alt 2.1.1: No NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the SCell activation command;*
    - *Alt 2.1.2: NW restriction on slot n+m1 receiving trigger of temporary RS where n is the slot carrying the SCell activation command, and m1 is no earlier than [k1 + 3ms + 1];*
    - *FFS: whether/how to indicate flexible combination of to-be-activated SCells with existing A-TRS trigging for temporary RS*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Ericsson | Alt 2.2 should be kept. From our perspective, it is basically same as Alt 1.1.3 without NW restriction. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | This is fine, but would prefer taking the high-level decision first before proceeding to specifics of each branch |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Tactivation reduction

### Temporary-RS based

#### Issue-2: Time-domain property of TRS

In the previous meeting, TRS is selected as the temporary RS. Some companies further analyze the TRS type, including periodic TRS, aperiodic TRS and semi-persistent TRS. Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* **Opt 2.1** Aperiodic TRS [6][8][13][14][15]
* **Opt 2.2** Periodic TRS [15]
* **Opt 2.3** Semi-persistent TRS [6]

**Question 2: Which TRS above should be selected as the temporary RS? Your views on benefit/gain, specification impact, implementation complexity are encouraged.**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Opt.2.1 and Opt.2.2. |
| OPPO | Comparing to what TRS type should be used (from UE configuration perspective or from gNB transmission perspective), we think it is more important to decide/check first the TRS signal structure that can be used in one-time SCell activation. Our contribution in R1-2100188 shows one issue of using legacy TRS without repetition: for an 2% of chance under SNR of -6dB, the synchronization/tracking error can be as large as 1/4 of symbol duration (far larger than CP), which causes incompatibility with RAN4 MRTD requirements. It also conflicts with RAN1 baseline results in Coverage Enhancement SI for SSB reception, which needs to achieve 1% BLER around -9dB ~ -12dB. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, this issue is highly dependent on RAN4’s input. For example, if RAN4 confirms that 1 or 2 slots of TRS is sufficient, then aperiodic TRS is preferred. If RAN4 confirms that more slots of TRS are needed, then maybe periodic TRS is more suitable. |
| CATT | **Opt 2.1.** Aperiodic TRS is naturally suitable for fast SCell activation, which can be triggered on demand.  There are some restrictions on the periodicity of Periodic TRS, e.g. the periodicity should be equal or larger than 10 ms. In order to reduce the activation delay, a small periodicity is needed for the periodic TRS. The overhead goes up eventually.  For semi-persistent TRS, it may be better from overhead point of view compared to P-TRS. However, it is triggered by MAC CE which will introduce additional delay. |
| Nokia, NSB | Opt.2.1 and Opt.2.2. |
| vivo | Opt 2.1 or Opt 2.3  Opt 2.2 is not preferred, as the delay of SCell activation could be reduced only when the periodicity of the TRS is short, i.e., 10ms (the smallest in Rel-16), or an even smaller number is desirable for fast activation. However, this will cause significant network overhead. |
| Ericsson | Opt 2.1 (2.2 is already supported in Rel15?) |
| Futurewei | Opt 2.1 is definitely required. If the QCL is needed or the link is to be kept alive for efficient activation, long-periodicity P/SP TRS should also be considered. |
| Intel | Assuming one-shot detection is supported, we slightly prefer Opt 2.1 |
| Apple | Opt.2.1 |
| DOCOMO | Opt 2.1.  Opt 2.2 can be additionally considered, in case of the existing Rel-15/16 SCell activation command. |
| Moderator | Majority view prefers Opt 2.1.  @ZTE the minimum periodicity of P-TRS is  slots in TS 38.214 which means longer latency than A-TRS with extended burst if RAN4 replies more burst is needed. Therefore, A-TRS seems still the best regardless of RAN4 reply. Please consider it.  ***Proposal****: For efficient SCell activation, the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS.* |
| Samsung | Also support Opt 2.1 |
|  |  |

With above summary, a potential proposal is,

***Proposal 2-1****: For efficient SCell activation, the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS.*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| OPPO | 1). Regarding to the new proposal under Q2 ( *For efficient SCell activation, the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS.*), we have following comments.  -- First, this proposal seems to go beyond the original Q&A which is about the comparison among AP-P-SP, i.e., the burst periodicity issue. But the new proposal now talks about time-domain property, which does not only touch burst periodicity but also time domain structure inside the burst.  -- As we provided in our contribution as well as the FL summary feedback, we see a need for time domain repetition on burst level exactly for A-TRS.  So if your intention is to go with A-TRS, the following is the right reflection of current discussion:  ***Proposal****: For efficient SCell activation, ~~the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as~~ aperiodic TRS is adopted for temporary RS.*  Note that the wording of "same time domain property between temp RS and A-TRS" also appears in FL proposal  under question 3.1, so we have the concern for that proposal wording as well. |
| Moderator | @OPPO, regarding your revised proposal for A-TRS, it was tried two meeting ago, but it seems to imply the triggering of temporary RS is DCI and thus was not agreed. Here it is about the time-domain behavior aperiodic or periodic. We may not fully understand the difference you mentioned between burst periodicity and time-domain structure of temporary RS. Because the RS has been agreed to be used only in SCell activation procedure so far which has limited effective time, the temporary RS is a burst anyway, and if a burst can comprise of resources repeated in time domain, it can be also regarded as time-domain structure of a burst. If the term of time-domain property causes confusion, can the term “time-domain behavior” that has been used in TS 38.214 be better? |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal |
| OPPO-2 | Then we would like to suggest following:  ***Proposal****: For efficient SCell activation, the TRS used for temporary RS is aperiodic (i.e., not periodic TRS or semi-persistent TRS).*  *Or*  ***Proposal****: For efficient SCell activation, the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS , except time-domain repetition .*   * *FFS whether time-domain repetition is supported for temporary RS.* |
| CATT | We prefer OPPO’s version 1 in the above. |
| vivo | We are fine with the 1st revision in OPPO-2. |

#### Issue-3: QCL configuration of TRS

In current specification, aperiodic TRS should be QCLed with a periodic TRS and the periodic TRS can be QCLed with an SSB. During the SCell activation, for the QCL configuration of TRS, three sub-issues can be discussed, and corresponding companies’ views are summarized.

Issue-3.1: if aperiodic TRS is selected as temporary RS, whether a periodic TRS should be sent first as a QCL source for the temporary RS (aperiodic TRS based)?

* **Opt 3.1.1:** No [2][4][6][11]

**Question 3.1: if aperiodic TRS is selected as temporary RS, whether a periodic TRS should be sent first as a QCL source for the temporary RS (aperiodic TRS based)?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No, if additional periodic TRS has to be sent first as a QCL source, then the periodic TRS can be used as temporary RS for SCell activation which makes the subsequent aperiodic TRS is redundant. Therefore, it is straightforward not to require such periodic TRS as a QCL source. |
| Qualcomm | The question is not crystal clear. The answer should be no, but not sure whether the understanding is aligned.  For known cell, the UE has already measured an SSB before the SCell activation. If the temporary RS is A-TRS, the A-TRS shall be QCLed with the SSB. For this, P-TRS association is not necessary. If the temporary RS is P-TRS, the P-TRS shall be QCLed with the SSB.  For unknown cell, if it is necessary to support temporary RS based SCell activation without using SSB at all, then it is not clear how QCL chain is established. |
| OPPO | No. We suppose the temporary RS is the first signal the UE should deal with (per protocol wise) upon SCell activation. |
| ZTE | No.  Our understanding is that the temporary RS is the first signal upon SCell activation. From this perspective, there is no need to transmit other signals as the QCL source for temporary RS.  Without QCL source for temporary, TRS may need to perform beam sweeping. But this may need to be confirmed with RAN4. |
| CATT | No.  Firstly we would like to further understand the question: the P-TRS is sent during active duration on the to-be-activated cell, or it is required to be sent during the deactivated period? If it is required to be sent during the deactivated period, we share the same understanding with Huawei.  If the intention is to use the P-TRS transmitted during the active period on the known cell, it may be OK. However, considering the P-TRS is unavailable on the unknown cell before it is activated, take SSB as a QCL source is a unified solution for both known cell and unknown cell. |
| Nokia, NSB | In our view, no. |
| vivo | No, otherwise, the activation would likely be further delayed by an additional periodic TRS. The aperiodic TRS can be used as the QCL source during activation, while after the activation, the legacy UE behavior may still be applied. |
| Ericsson | No |
| Futurewei | Not necessary, but can be considered if the QCL requires it. |
| Intel | No. The temporary RS should be the first signal for detection upon SCell activation. |
| Apple | No to minimize the SCell activation latency. We also think Qualcomm comments are valid and should be discussed before making conclusion on this at least ensuring all companies are on the same page. |
| DOCOMO | No |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm, Apple, your comments seem about unknown SCell and P-TRS, so the proposed conclusion is refined,  ***Proposal****: As a conclusion, as least in case of known SCell, if the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS, then no periodic TRS is required to be sent first as a QCL source for the temporary RS.* |

With above summary,

***Proposal 3-1****: As a conclusion, as least in case of known SCell, if the time-domain property of temporary RS is the same as aperiodic TRS, then no periodic TRS is required to be sent first as a QCL source for the temporary RS.*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | Support the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal. |
|  |  |

**Issue-3.2: which source QCL RS can be selected for temporary RS?**

* **Opt 3.2.1:** No need [2][3]
* **Opt 3.2.2:** SSB for at least known SCell [4]

**Question 3.2: which source QCL RS can be selected for temporary RS?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In case of a known SCell, the SSB measured by a UE for measurement report is still detectable according to the definition of known SCell in TS 38.133. Therefore, the SSB can be a QCL source to facilitate temporary RS for AGC and time/frequency synchronization. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Huawei. |
| OPPO | Opt 3.2.1.  RAN1 decided in previous meeting to use TRS as an expedited RS version to replace the slow SSB. If the SSB prior to SCell deactivation can be the QCL source of TRS, it only means likely the expedited TRS is redundant and therefore not needed. |
| ZTE | Opt 3.2.1.  In the legacy SCell activation procedure, most of latency is caused by SSB receiving and measuring. If SSB is required as the QCL source, then the latency gain may be marginal. |
| CATT | We support Option 3.2.2. Share the same views with Huawei. There has to be a source QCL RS for the temporary RS in order to facilitate the RS reception at UE side. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Huawei |
| vivo | Our understanding is that SSB is **not required** to be the QCL source, but **can be** used by the UE as the QCL source if the SCell is known (i.e., not precluding the UE to use the SSB if possible). The key point is that it should not delay the activation procedure. |
| Ericsson | Last measured SSB as also suggested by other companies |
| Futurewei | SSB of the same cell or another cell, or P/SP TRS of the same cell or another cell may be used as the source. |
| Intel | For known cell, a QCL source of SSB can be determined for the temporary RS. However, as vivo commented, it doesn’t mean UE need to monitor the SSB first then the temporary RS, when UE receives a trigger for fast SCell activation |
| DOCOMO | We agree with vivo. |
| Moderator | @OPPO, ZTE, your comments seem about unknown SCell. We could focus on known SCell first, then unknown SCell.  ***Proposal****: For efficient SCell activation with assistance of temporary RS, a SSB of the to-be-activated SCell can be indicated as a QCL source for the temporary RS in case of known SCell*   * *FFS: the case of unknown SCell* * *FFS: other QCL source, e.g. the SSB/P-TRS of another active cell* |
| Samsung | Prefer to discuss together with the TRS design and the case of unknown SCell. It is not a critical aspect for progressing the design. |

With above summary,

***Proposal 3-2****: For efficient SCell activation with assistance of temporary RS, a SSB of the to-be-activated SCell can be indicated as a QCL source for the temporary RS in case of known SCell*

* *FFS: the case of unknown SCell*
* *FFS: other QCL source, e.g. the SSB/P-TRS of another active cell*

Comments are welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| OPPO | Regarding to new proposal under question 3.2 (QCL source for temp RS), quite some companies commented that the UE is not required to utilize this QCL source even it is indicated. So it is better to add this as a sub-bullet. |
| Moderator | @OPPO, Regarding your comment “the UE is not required to utilize this QCL source even it is indicated”, I would like to hear more views from companies. In our understanding, current specification has no text to force UE to utilize any indicated QCL source, therefore, such bullet seems not necessary. It is appreciated if you could clarify what its spec impact could be. |
| Samsung | Prefer to discuss together with the TRS design and the case of unknown SCell. It is not a critical aspect for progressing the design. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | Agree with Samsung, better take a time-out and focus first on the big picture. |
| vivo | Generally fine with the proposal. |

**Issue-3.3: for which subsequent RS/channel can temporary RS serve as QCL source?**

* **Opt 3.3.1:** subsequent CSI-RS [2][3][14][16]
* **Opt 3.3.2:** SSB [3]
* **Opt 3.3.3:** initial PDCCH/PDSCH DMRS [16]
* **Opt 3.3.4:** subsequent periodic TRS after SCell activation [4]
* **Opt 3.3.5:** No change to existing QCL framework [15]

**Question 3.3: for which subsequent RS/channel can temporary RS serve as QCL source?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Opt.3.3.5 |
| OPPO | Opt 3.3.1, Opt 3.3.2 |
| ZTE | Our understanding is that at least Opt 3.3.1 can be supported. We can FFS other options. |
| CATT | We support option 3.3.5. For option 3.3.1-3.3.4, we are not sure how these options can help to expedite the procedure of SCell activation. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Qualcomm |
| vivo | Opt 3.3.5 is the baseline.  If any optimization is needed, Opt 3.3.4 can be considered. But we are also open to other options (e.g., Opt 3.3.2). |
| Ericsson | If fast activation can be achieved by 3.3.5 then it is good but we are not sure if it is possible. We are OK to discuss this further |
| Futurewei | Opt 3.3.5. |
| Apple | Opt.3.3.1. |
| DOCOMO | At least Opt 3.3.1 |
| Moderator | Company views seem not converged. It may not be helpful to conclude it as Opt. 3.3.5 now because it has no spec impact and no critical issue for other options have been identified yet. Therefore, **suggest to keep it open for further discussion.** |
| Samsung | Prefer option 3.3.5.  OK to leave open but it would be better conclude the main design issues first instead of revisiting this issue each time. |
| Nokia, NSB  Feb 2nd | OK to leave open for now (preference 3.3.5 as indicated earlier) |

#### Issue-4: Timeline for temporary RS and SCell activation

Based on the triggering command, some timelines for temporary RS and SCell activation are proposed. Companies’ views on it are summarized as follows:

* **Opt 4.1**

*“The TRS is triggered r slots after the UE sends HARQ-ACK to the triggering MAC CE, plus 0.5ms MAC-to-PHY processing delay, where r is configured by RRC or indicated by MAC CE.”*[6]

* **Opt 4.2**

*“Offset between Scell activation and temporary RS can be configured by RRC singling and starting point of the offset is the HARQ-ACK feedback slot of triggering command”* [10]

* **Opt 4.3**

*“The actual slot for the triggered TRS can be r slot after the slot the UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH converting TRS triggering MAC CE, where the r can be configured by RRC, or more flexibly, indicated by the MAC CE.*”[13]

* **Opt 4.4**

*“The timing of A-TRS transmission is defined relative to the PUCCH transmission that carries the HARQ-ACK for triggering command, and the offset value of TRS transmission is indicated in triggering command.”[14]*

**Question 4: which timeline of temporary RS and SCell activation should be supported?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | With Alt.2.1.2 for Issue 1, the triggered A-TRS on to-be-activated SCell(s) is used instead of SSB, if the UL DCI triggering the A-TRS is no earlier than slot n + k, where n is the slot where the PDSCH carrying the SCell activation command ends, and k is [k1 + 3ms + 1]. |
| OPPO | The alternatives provided from FL are all related to HARQ-ACK. We think the timeline of TRS transmission should not bind to the HARQ-ACK transmission, where the false detection of HARQ-ACK by gNB could be a trouble-maker. Instead, the timeline of TRS transmission should be associated with HARQ-ACK timing slot (Opt 4.2, but not necessarily the actual HARQ-ACK on PUCCH) or simply the triggering MAC-CE transmission slot. |
| ZTE | It is more appropriate to discuss this issue after RAN1 has decided the triggering command for SCell activation and temporary RS activation. We can postpone the discussion from our perspective. |
| Nokia, NSB | This seems like a premature discussion, would need an agreement on the scheme first before it pays to discuss in detail the timeline setup. |
| vivo | Opt 4.1 or 4.3, assuming that Alt 1.1/1.5/1.6 is agreed. |
| Futurewei | Opt 4.1 or 4.3 |
| CATT | We share the same views with ZTE and Nokia. |
| Intel | Opt 4.3 or 4.4. it gNB doesn’t detect the ACK feedback (UE doesn’t transmit HARQ-ACK or gNB misses the detection), gNB may not transmit the temporary RS. |
| Apple | Opt.4.4 |
| DOCOMO | We share the same view with ZTE, Nokia and CATT. |
| Samsung | Agree with previous comments on deferring this discussion. Need to know first the scheme to be used. |

#### Issue-5: Associated BWP for temporary RS

All the BWP(s) configured on a cell are inactive before the cell is activated. If a UE measures the triggered temporary RS during SCell activation procedure, the measurement on the target BWP should be allowed despite of the activation state of the BWP. On which BWP the UE measures the temporary RS should be considered. Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* **Opt 5.1** The BWP configured by “*firstActiveDownlinkBWP-Id”* [3][4][6][18]
* **Opt 5.2** gNB indicates the BWP along with the indication of triggering the temporary RS [5][11][18]

**Question 5: Which option listed above is preferable? Your views on benefit/gain, specification impact, implementation complexity are encouraged.**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Opt.5.1 |
| OPPO | Opt 5.1 |
| ZTE | Opt 5.2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Opt 5.2, or opt 5.3 (BWP explicitly configured by RRC). |
| vivo | Opt 5.1 |
| Ericsson | Opt. 5.1 |
| Futurewei | The configured BWP can be the default, and the default can be overwritten by the trigger (e.g., a TRS trigger) if the trigger explicitly indicates another BWP. |
| CATT | Although we propose option 5.2 in our contribution as the preference, we don’t have strong view on this issue. We can follow the majority view. |
| Intel | Opt 5.1 |
| Apple | Opt. 5.1 |
| DOCOMO | Opt 5.2 |
| Samsung | Opt 5.1 – that is why *firstActiveDownlinkBWP* was anyway introduced. |
|  |  |

### The To-be-activated Scell acquires essential information for activation enhancement from an active cell

#### Issue-6: Tactivation reduction with BS assistance but no temporary RS nor SSB

It is proposed in [4][18] that activation time of the To-be-activated cell can be reduced by acquiring activation information (e.g. synchronization and AGC-related information) from active cell(s) which are co-located with the To-be-activated cell. For example, the BS provides a UE the information of co-located reference active cells or QCL-source cell to assist the activation of the To-be-activated cell, which may speed up the procedure of synchronization and AGC.

**Question 6: Whether it is beneficial for Tactivation reduction that BS assistance information or common property (e.g. frequency/timing synchronization, path loss, coupling loss, RSRP) derived from activated cell?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Not sure what exact solution is considered here. |
| OPPO | In our view, due to RAN4 requirement existing for MRTD (maximum reception timing difference) for NR CA, the co-located activated cell would not know at least the synchronization condition at the UE side even if it knows the condition at gNB Tx side. So the question is not whether it is beneficial, rather, it is about whether it is feasible -- and our understanding is no. |
| ZTE | It is not clear what the BS assistance information refers to in the question here. Suggest to FFS this issue. |
| Nokia, NSB | FFS |
| vivo | Similar to OPPO’s concern. We might consult with RAN4 before making the decision. |
| Futurewei | We think this is beneficial, and the co-located carrier properties are known by the gNB. Here it can be a gNB decision to signal the BS assistance information or not based on the gNB’s implementation. We do not think it is needed to consult RAN4 as RAN4 deals with the minimum requirement. |
| CATT | We share the similar views with Futurewei. We think it is beneficial. |
| Intel | Prefer to discuss the exact solution first |
| Apple | Better to clarify the use cases and how it can reduce the latency. |
| DOCOMO | We share the similar view as Futurewei. For example, gNB can indicate the combination of cells which have common property. |
| Samsung | Similar comments as above – discussion can be deprioritized. |
|  |  |

## TCSI\_reporting reduction

### Issue-7: Enhancement for CSI reporting

TCSI\_reporting reduction may be beneficial to achieve efficient SCell activation. Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* **Opt 7.1** for acquisition of CSI after activation, reuse the existing R15/R16 framework. [2][9]
* **Opt 7.2** short interval P/SP- CSI-RS report [4]

“*The specific P/SP-CSI-RS/reporting for SCell activation can be received during the required period. This short interval P/SP-CSI-RS/reporting for fast SCell activation is beneficial with little specification impacts.*”[4]

* **Opt 7.3** remove TCSI\_reporting for the case of FR2 unknown cell[4]

“*During the procedure of SCell activation, when gNB receives the beam reporting, i.e. the L1-RSRP report, it implies that UE has completed beam selection and timing synchronization which are necessary conditions for downlink transmission. It means that gNB can start downlink transmission with a conservative or rough MCS on the SCell, and UE can start to monitor PDCCH on the SCell, even the valid CSI report is not yet reported. Thus the gNB and UE can assume the SCell is activated after the Tactivation\_time.*”[4]

* **Opt 7.4** Support aperiodic CSI reporting based on PUCCH for the SCell being activated [12]

*“The group-common DCI can include fields at least for bitmap for SCell activation and CSI request. Since group-common DCI does not include any scheduling information for PUSCH, PUCCH-based CSI reporting should be supported. Using a group-common DCI avoid potential errors for HARQ-ACK codebook determination that would occur if the DCI format activating an SCell was missed and the UE was expected to report both A-CSI and HARQ-ACK in a same PUCCH or PUSCH that does not trigger the A-CSI report.”[12]*

**Question 7: which option above of CSI reporting enhancement should be supported?**

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | At least Opt.7.1. FFS any other enhancements. |
| OPPO | At least Opt 7.1. FFS others. |
| ZTE | At least Opt 7.1. FFS others. |
| Nokia, NSB | Opt 7.1. FFS any other enhancements |
| vivo | Opt 7.1. FFS to others. |
| Futurewei | Opt 7.1 |
| CATT | Opt 7.1. FFS to others. |
| Intel | Opt 7.1. FFS to others. |
| Apple | Opt.7.1 can be always baseline. On the other hand, we would like to note that the CSI reporting may become dominant component if reusing the existing P-CSI-RS based framework and overall SCell Activation latency cannot be meaningfully reduced. |
| DOCOMO | Opt 7.1. FFS to others. |
| Samsung | Consider once the scheme to be used for SCell activation is known. Premature to conclude now. |
|  |  |

## General Issues

* **Question G1:** Whether or not temporary RS should be introduced for unknown cells? [3][16]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | This may depend on the LS reply from RAN4. |
| OPPO | Yes. The WID does not exclude the unknown cell from efficiency enhancement. |
| ZTE | Yes, but it may be better to confirm this with RAN4. |
| Nokia, NSB | Premature, FFS |
| vivo | It may depend on the reply from RAN4. |
| Futurewei | Yes, pending RAN4 confirmation |
| CATT | Same view with Nokia. It should be discussed after the solution on known SCell is mature. |
| Intel | Wait for RAN4 reply |
| Apple | Wait for RAN4 LS reply. |
| DOCOMO | Yes, but we can wait for RAN4 feedback. |
| Samsung | TBD – can start considering after receiving the RAN4 reply LS |
| OPPO | While new comments should go to the FL summary on FTP server, here I would like to share some thinking on using RAN4 concept of known/unknown SCell in RAN1 discussion/decision, which is anyway already the issue for several working assumptions (e.g., Temp RS and its QCL source from SSB are so far only for known SCell).  Below is what 38.133 section 8.3.2 says for known/unknown SCell in FR1 SCell activation:  ------------  *SCell in FR1 is known if it has been meeting the following conditions:*  *- During the period equal to max(5\*measCycleSCell,  5\*DRX cycles) for FR1 before the reception of the SCell activation command:*  *- the UE has sent a valid measurement report for the SCell being activated and* <== [OPPO: let's name this condition as Cond-1]  *- the SSB measured remains detectable according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.2 and 9.3.* <== [OPPO: let's name this condition as Cond-2]  *- the SSB measured during the period equal to max(5\*measCycleSCell, 5\*DRX cycles) also remains detectable during the SCell activation delay according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.2 and 9.3.* <== [OPPO: let's name this condition as Cond-3]  *Otherwise SCell in FR1 is unknown.*  ------------  Two highlighted issues from above RAN4 spec text:  1). Even though the Cond-1 could be known by gNB, it is not clear to us how the Cond-2 (SSB remains detectable in a perid) is ensured [by a protocol] to be known by gNB. Maybe some companies can clarify.  2). The Cond-3 seems to suggest something that is much different from what RAN1 assumed in earlier discussion: a SCell is claimed to be known or unknown based on some conditions (i.e., Cond-1/2/3), one of which (i.e., Cond-3) is tested at the end of the activation procedure, given the Cond-3 requires the SSB remain detectable during "SCell activation delay" which starts upon UE receiving the SCell activation MAC-CE till end of activation. In other words, the UE can know whether the SCell is known/unknown only at the end of activation procedure, not at the beginning. To our understanding, this "known/unknown status of SCell" is a "requirement language" describing something like "If a UE is categorized as known [or unknown] at the end of a procedure, one certain set of timing requirements is applied to that procedure and/or the component sub-procedures of that procedure". It is not appropriate to use this terminology as a "protocol/procedure language" to describe something like "If a UE is in status of known/unknown at time instance t in the same procedure, certain requirement/behavior can be applied for the remaining of the procedure after time t".  For 2), we also notice that the current RAN1/RAN2 specs are kept transparent to this "known/unknown cell" concept. Meanwhile, it seems RAN4 spec has different definitions for "known/unknown cell" for different requirements, e.g., the known cell definition for SCell activation is different from that for handover, which seems to confirm "known/unknown cell" is an RAN4 internal terminology.  Given above thinking, OPPO would like to propose the following for RAN1 to consider:  *Any RAN1 specification for Rel-17 SCell activation/deactivation should be transparent to known/unknown SCell definition given in RAN4 specification*.  We understand this issue might not be of the high priority in companies/FL's issue list, but it seems to us necessary to discuss/decide at an earlier phase rather than being too late to turn-around. It is also helpful to at least reach a common understanding for this RAN4 terminology in RAN1, such as whether the Cond-2 is known to gNB and when Cond-3 is tested. |
| vivo | Regarding Wenfeng’s proposal, I understand Wenfeng’s concern. But on the other hand, RAN1’s conclusions/agreements are made step-by-step per-meeting, so it seems acceptable to start our discussion from a simple one and later to the controversial one. It would finally (and desirably) achieve a unified design for both known and unknown cells, thus naturally can be transparent in RAN1 spec – but we don’t have to restrict the specification work right now. |
| ZTE | We also would like to second Wenfeng's comments regarding the known/unknown SCells. We checked with our RAN4 colleagues, it is possible that network and UE may have different understandings on whether an SCell is known or unknown. From our perspective, it would be preferred to have a unified solution for both known and unknown SCell. Otherwise, it may require the network to configure/activate two different mechanism (one for the known and another for the unknown SCell) in the network for one SCell. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the discussion.  I am a bit confused about the concern here. It is agreeable that “any RAN1 specification for Rel-17 SCell activation/deactivation should be transparent to known/unknown SCell definition given in RAN4 specification”. However, this does not mean that RAN1 should specify a solution that works for any SCell conditions.  Let’s assume we will specify temporary RS that works only for known cell.   * Let’s assume there are some cases where gNB considers the SCell satisfies known cell conditions while from the UE perspective the cell is unknown. * For such case, the temporary RS may not be usable for SCell activation and the UE may need to use multiple SSBs. This may not fasten SCell activation procedure. Until the SCell activation is completed, the UE continues to feedback CQI=0 for the SCell. However, that is it.   + This is unchanged from the legacy procedure. The activation delay just takes longer.   + gNB anyway can know when the SCell activation is completed based on the report of CQI>0   Or, is it suggested to specify a unified solution that works for any SCell conditions (including unknown cell which can be a blindly activated SCell)? |
| Futurewei | We support to further discuss/study this issue, and some of our initial views are as follows.   * This situation should not be new as it existed from R15/16 time. We may follow the same practice as in R15/16. RAN1 can use known versus unknown to describe different cases and define different features, but the RAN1 specifications needs not to explicit reflect the difference while RAN4 can have different timelines for these 2 cases. * There may exist two times x and y, such as if the deactivation is no longer than x ms, then UE/gNB can agree the cell must be known; longer than y ms, then UE/gNB can agree the cell must be unknown; and between x and y, the UE/gNB may or may not have the same understanding. The design may be different for different cases, or always designed for the worst case. |
| OPPO-2 | At present the question is not “whether temp RS solution should work for any SCell condition”, rather the questions are “whether known/unknown status in UE should be taken as that condition” and “whether it is acceptable for the condition being used to lead different understanding between gNB and UE”.  As mentioned before, “known/unknown status in UE SCell activation” has two characteristics (from our understanding for now):   * This known/unknown status can only be claimed for the UE at the end of SCell activation process, not at the beginning. * Some criteria in judging known/unknown condition, such as SSB remaining detectable at UE side for a period of time, is not knowable to gNB.   With above understanding, the “Qualcomm case” saying “where gNB considers the SCell satisfies known cell conditions while from the UE perspective the cell is unknown” does not even seem to exist.   * First of all, gNB has no way to know whether SSB remains datable on UE side. This is not about gNB making an incorrect guess for known/unknown SCell, rather it is about gNB has no ability to even start a “guess process”, unless the gNB does this guess upon a 50-50 coin flipping. * At the time when UE sees an A-TRS coming in, the UE does not even know whether the SCell is known or unknown per RAN4 definition. |
| Ericsson | This should have no RAN1 impact. From RAN1 perspective we provide RS during activation. How the max allowed activation delay requirements are updated based on presence of this RS for various conditions is up to RAN4 discussion. |
| Moderator | Thank OPPO for bringing up the potential off-sync issue. In my understanding, there is no such issue for the following reasons,   * In current TS 38.133, a known SCell is defined with two bullets as two check-points, one is determined based on the cut-off time “*before the reception of the SCell activation command*”, the other one is based on the other effective time “*during the SCell activation delay according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.2 and 9.3.*”. * For the first check-point, i.e. Cond-1 and -2 in OPPO’s previous comment, both gNB and UEs have the same time to check, it should have no off-sync issue. * For the second check-point, i.e. Cond-3 in OPPO’s comment, there is no state transition from known to unknown SCell except for the only condition specified in clause 9.2/9.3 of TS 38.133 which is the received SNR of SSB becomes too low to be detectable. For this exception case, current spec leaves it up to UE to determine whether the SCell activation can be completed in time or not. Such solution can be reused and will not be impacted by the introduction of temporary TRS.   Therefore, there is no off-sync issue with respect to determination of known/unknown SCell between gNB and UEs. For the particular exception case, the current solution in spec can be reused regardless it is called as off-sync or not, which is independent of the introduction of temporary TRS. |
| ZTE | Thank you for the discussion. One question from our side, regarding the following “*the SSB measured remains detectable according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.2 and 9.3*”, how can network know if the SSB remains detectable for one particular UE? Will UE transmit something to the network to indicate that the SSB remains detectable? |
| OPPO | For the known/unknown SCell issue, to simplify the discussion, let's do it step-by-step.  First step: whether it can be common understanding in RAN1 that the known/unknown SCell definition from RAN4 could lead to different understanding of known/unknown status between gNB and UE during the SCell activation procedure.  Second step: If the answer in 1st step is yes, then we can talk whether the misunderstanding between gNB and UE can cause problem or remain trouble-free.  The latest comments from Fred seem not to be against the existence of misunderstanding between gNB and UE, is this the right interpretation? |
| Qualcomm | Wenfeng:  133 specifies conditions of known/unknown cell from UE perspective. There is no way to guarantee gNB and UE have the same understanding even in any extreme case. However, the situations with such misunderstanding can be minimal by appropriate deployments/operations and even if such misunderstanding occurs, the issue should not be critical. |
| Moderator | @ZTE, In my understanding, how a network know if the SSB remains detectable is handled by a procedure other than SCell activation, maybe SCell measurement reporting. But as replied before, if a SSB becomes undetectable after the reception of SCell activation command but the SCell activation is still on-going, the existing solution for SCell activation can be reused.  @OPPO, I feel your questions have been answered by my previous reply. |

* **Question G2:** Whether or not temporary RS should be introduced for both FR1 and FR2 case?[13]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
| OPPO | Yes. WID explicitly says the efficient activation/deactivation applies to both FRs. |
| ZTE | Yes. We can have an agreements to confirm this. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |
| vivo | Yes |
| Futurewei | Yes |
| CATT | Yes |
| Intel | Yes |
| Apple | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Samsung | Yes |

* **Question G3:** Whether or not to additionally support AP CSI-RS, P/SP CSI-RS, SRS, and RS based on SSS/PSS as temporary RS, one or more of which may be used during SCell activation depends on network configuration / UE capability. [1]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | FFS |
| OPPO | New RS is probably needed to work either alone or together with A-TRS if repetition is not agreeable to temporary RS, given the current WA on TRS may have issue with RAN4 MRTD requirements. Please see our response in section 3.2.1.1 for Issue-2. |
| ZTE | FFS. |
| Nokia, NSB | FFS |
| vivo | FFS |
| Futurewei | Yes. These RSs are needed for CSI acquisition during the activation. We should allow the joint trigger to trigger them if they are configured by the network. This gives the network more choices. |
| ZTE | FFS. |
| Intel | Yes, assuming CSI report is needed in the SCell activation |
| Apple | Yes at least for CSI reporting latency reduction. We share Futurewei views. |
| DOCOMO | FFS |
| Samsung | Yes, at least for a CSI report. |

**Question G4:** Whether or not support additional functionality of temporary RS during SCell activation, e.g. CSI measurement/acquisition, cell search. [2][7][18]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | FFS |
| OPPO | FFS |
| ZTE | FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | FFS |
| vivo | FFS |
| Futurewei | Yes, as CSI is part of the activation procedure. |
| vivo | FFS |
| Intel | Yes |
| Apple | FFS |
| DOCOMO | FFS |
| Samsung | Yes. Reducing latency for SCell activation should also include a fast CSI report. |

**Question G5:** Whether RAN1 need to clarify whether to support A-TRS for RRC-based SCell activation. [3][15]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Yes (without optimization). Alt.2.1.2 for Issue 1 enables this. |
| OPPO | Yes. The clarification is needed at least to make RAN2 be aware of. |
| ZTE | Yes. We can first focus on the regular SCell activation procedure. |
| Nokia, NSB | FFS |
| vivo | Yes |
| Futurewei | Yes, a unified design is preferred |
| CATT | FFS |
| Intel | Yes |
| Apple | Yes |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Samsung | OK to clarify |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question G6:** For cases where Rel15/16 TRS structure is re-used for ‘temporary RS’, whether there is need to define a separate ‘temporary RS’ configuration in addition to already existing TRS configuration. [16]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | Depends on the RAN4’s feedback. |
| OPPO | Yes if intra-burst repetition of TRS is agreed to be needed, given the existing TRS configuration does not support repetition. |
| ZTE | Maybe it is better to wait for RAN4’s response first. |
| Nokia, NSB | FFS |
| vivo | FFS |
| Futurewei | FFS pending RAN4 input |
| CATT | FFS |
| Intel | FFS pending RAN4 input |
| Apple | Wait until receiving RAN4 LS reply on TRS structure. |
| DOCOMO | FFS |
| Samsung | Consider after receiving RAN4 reply LS. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question G7:** whether aperiodic TRS is decoupled with periodic TRS related to the time-domain pattern if aperiodic TRS is served as temporary RS. [2]

Companies’ views are very welcome.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
| Qualcomm | This is beneficial and should be available. |
| OPPO | A bit confused by the question itself, which seems to ask whether the introduction of temporary RS would change the coupling relationship that is defined in current spec between aperiodic TRS and periodic TRS. In our view, introduction of new temporary RS should NOT change what is already specified; what RAN1 can discuss is the relation between temporary RS and the periodic TRS, which is a brand-new concept in Rel-17. If nothing is agreed or even discussed, there should be no coupling relationship between the two. Anyhow, this does not seem to be an urgent Q&A and the answer depends on whether the temporary RS is specified as a special case of aperiodic TRS or a new RS that just shares something with aperiodic TRS. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, this is beneficial. |
| Nokia, NSB | A-TRS and P-TRS timings should be decoupled. |
| vivo | Depends on the RAN4’s feedback. |
| Futurewei | More clarification is needed |
| CATT | More clarification is needed |
| Intel | More clarification is needed |
| Apple | The question is unclear for us. Need to understand the function of P-TRS and A-TRS here referring to. |
| DOCOMO | More clarification is needed |
| Samsung | Yes, but this can also wait for determination of the scheme to be used. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other Issues

Issues or comments that do not fit in any of the previous sections of this document can be provided in this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *View* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusions
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# Appendix: Agreements

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:  As working assumption, with respect to efficient SCell activation, reuse existing Rel-15/16 TRS structure for temporary RS   * FFS: how many burst/symbols are required for both AGC settling and Time/Frequency tracking for different cases, e.g. FR1 and FR2, known and unknown SCell   + A burst of temporary RS is notated as in S5.1.6.1.1 of TS 38.214     - “2-slot with four CSI-RSs resources (4 samples)” for FR1     - either “1-slot with two CSI-RSs resources (2 samples)” or “2-slot with four CSI-RSs resources (4 samples)” for FR2 * The working assumption can be confirmed after RAN4 check. (A LS for such request is planned).   Agreements:  For efficient SCell activation, discuss and agree from the following alternatives at RAN1#104-e   * Alt 1: the trigger of temporary RS is integrated into a single triggering signaling with the trigger of SCell activation transmitted on an activated cell.   + FFS detailed design of this integrated triggering signaling.   + Potential examples of single triggering signaling for further discussions   + A PDSCH TB, e.g. containing two respective MAC-CEs for both triggers, one MAC-CE for both triggers   + A DCI for both triggers   + A PDSCH TB and its scheduling DL grant, e.g. MAC-CE for activation and DL grant for temporary RS   + A DL grant and a UL grant received in the same slot/OFDM symbols of PDCCH where the DL grant is scheduling a MAC-CE for SCell activation and the UL grant is triggering the RS.   + Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE and a specific configuration of temporary RS being implicitly triggered as well * Alt2: Triggering of temporary RS separately from SCell activation command is not precluded and both ‘separate’ triggers (examples below) and ‘integrated’ triggers (examples in Alt 1) are considered for SCell activation   + FFS detailed design of separate triggering signaling.   + Potential examples of separate triggering signaling for further discussions   + Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE and Rel 15/16 DCI triggering   + Rel-15/16 SCell activation MAC-CE and new DCI triggering for temporary RS * Note: temporary RS should be triggered by DCI or MAC-CE. * Note: the final mechanism of trigger signaling targets at applicability to one or more SCell activation. * FFS handling of  SCell activation by existing Rel15/16 CA activation command when temporary RS is configured and triggered/not triggered   **Working Assumption**  At least for the case of known cell, temporary RS is supported to expedite the activation process during the SCell activation procedure for efficient SCell activation for both FR1 and FR2:           The temporary RS should provide at least the functionalities of AGC settling and time/frequency tracking during SCell activation procedure.           FFS potential functionalities of CSI measurement/acquisition and cell search  Agreements:  TRS is selected as temporary RS for Scell activation           If more functionalities are confirmed to be supported by temporary RS, other RS candidates, e.g. aperiodic CSI-RS, P/SP-CSI RS, SRS and RS based on SSS/PSS, are not precluded.           The TRS should be triggered by DCI or MAC-CE. FFS which exact triggering command.    Agreements:  UEs measure the triggered temporary RS during Scell activation procedure no earlier than a slot m:           FFS timeline values m which may need coordination with RAN4.           FFS if the triggered temporary RS can be associated with a BWP, then the measurement above is independent of the activation state of the BWP.  Agreements:  Companies are encouraged to provide design details of temporary RS next meeting, at least including:   * TRS structure, e.g. whether to fully reuse existing Rel-15/16 TRS structure and configuration restriction (refer to S5.1.6.1.1 of TS 38.214), or any modification * QCL information, if any * Triggering command: DCI format/fields or MAC-CE fields * Triggering timeline/scheduling offset |