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# Introduction

In RAN Plenary #89-e, the RAN4-led work item of NR support for high speed train (HST) scenario in FR2 has been approved [RP-202118] (which has been further revised to [RP-210800] with editorial revisions and updates on time schedule).

Based on the agreement captured in WF [R4-2120775], the test scope of UE demodulation was under discussion. For this meeting, companies are encouraged to further discuss the test scope for UE demodulation based on the FR2 HST deployment scenarios, and the related test setup for each identified requirements

In this email thread, the following agenda items will be discussed:

* 6.9.2 High speed train deployment scenario in FR2
* 6.9.5.1 General
* 6.9.5.2 UE demodulation requirements
* 6.9.5.2.1 PDSCH requirements under Uni-directional scenario
* 6.9.5.2.2 PDSCH requirements under Bi-directional scenario

It is suggested to have the following target of 1st and 2nd round email discussion

* 1st round: Further discussion the test scope of UE demodulation based on FR2 HST deployment scenarios and the related test setup for each requirements
* 2nd round: Based on the output of 1st round, try to agree the simulation assumption for each demodulation requirements as much as possible for alignment in future meeting.

# Topic #1: FR2 HST Deployment Scenarios

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2201000 | Huawei, HiSilicon | TP to TR 38.854 on Deployment Scenario Analysis for FR2 HST |
| R4-2201524 | Ericsson | TP to TR 38.854: Coverage analysis |

## Open issues summary

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2201000  (TP to TR 38.854) | Nokia:  A few comments/suggestions can be found in the TP, which is uploaded. |
| Company B |
|  |
| R4-2201524  (TP to TR 38.854) | Nokia:  A few comments/suggestions can be found in the TP, which is uploaded. |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #2: General

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2200743 | Samsung | Simulation results summary |
| R4-2200744 | Samsung | CR work split for Rel-17 FR2 HST  Proposal 1: Agree the CR work split table above, interest companies are encouraged for joint contribution. |
| R4-2200745 | Samsung | Proposal 1: Define PDSCH requirement for Bi-directional scenario with 9722Hz.  Proposal 2: No NWA signaling introduce to inform the UE whether a jump is expected (including Deployment type, intra/Inter-RRH TCI state switching type)  Proposal 3: Do not introduce the UE capability to differentiate requirement for Bi/Uni-directional scenario  Proposal 4: Do not consider the following period after receiving MAC CE active TCI switching from the throughput statistics   * Bi-directional scenario DPS scheme1a, THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstSSB + TSSB proc + TfirstTRSafterSSB+ TTRS pro * Uni-directional scenario DPS scheme1b, THARQ +TMAC Proc   Proposal 5: Configure SSB period configuration as 20ms, and 10ms for TRS period configuration  Observation 1: Similar performance can be achieved for Uni-directional scenario with A and B  Observation 2: About 1 dB performance loss for Bi-directional compared with Uni-directional scenario  Proposal 6: MCS 17 with Rank2 is feasible for FR2 HST PDSCH requirement. |
| R4-2200837 | ZTE | Proposal 1: Not to define signaling distinguishing UE capability between uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment.  Proposal 2: To support UE capability signaling differentiating different speed if the need of different speeds is confirmed. |
| R4-2201001 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Do not introduce higher layer signalling to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology (Uni-directional and Bi-directional scenario) for PDSCH demodulation requirement.  Proposal 2: Do not introduce MAC-CE signalling to inform the UE of the TCI switching typology (Intra/Inter -RRH) for PDSCH demodulation requirement.  Proposal 3: Select 10ms for TRS for HST FR2 PDSCH requirements definition. |
| R4-2201002 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR on minimum requirements for PDSCH HST-DPS (38.101-4) |
| R4-2201004 | Huawei,  HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For Uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b, reuse same throughput statistics method as the existing FR1 DPS1b cases that the switching point is the slot#n+THARQ +TMAC Proc and there is no switching interruption during the test, where in slot#n TCI state switching MAC CE command is transmitted. |
| R4-2201005 | Huawei  HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a, only define 350km/h requirements and do not introduce any UE capability to support 250km/h speed.  Proposal 2: For Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a, reuse same throughput statistics method as the existing FR1 DPS1a cases but change the TRS receiving and processing time to the SSB receiving and processing time that the first time that new TCI state applied is the slot#n+THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstSSB + TSSB proc, where in slot#n TCI state switching MAC CE command is transmitted. |
| R4-2201425 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Uni-directional Scenario A as follows:   * Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #k at the location of   Proposal 2: RAN4 demodulation requirements do not consider the following period after receiving MAC CE active TCI switching from the throughput statistics:   * **D**PS Scheme 1a (UE capable of one active TCI state): THARQ + TMAC proc + TfirstRS + TRS proc * DPS Scheme 1b (UE capable of two or more active TCI states): THARQ + TMAC proc   + THARQ: Number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information   + TMAC proc: Number of slots for MAC CE processing   + TfirstRS: Larger number of slots to the first SSB transmission and the first TRS transmission after MAC CE command is decoded by the UE   + TRS proc: Larger number of slots for SSB processing and TRS processing   Proposal 3: No signaling is needed to indicate the deployment topology for FR2 HST UE demodulation requirements.  Proposal 4: RAN4 define UE demodulation requirements with transmission schemes DPS 1a and 1b only with the channel model based on Bi-directional Scenario B.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Test number | Channel model and active TCI switching scheduling | DPS Tx scheme | Channel model parameters | | 1 | HST-DPS-FR2  (derived based on Bi-directional Scenario B) | 1a / 1b according to UE capability of the number of active TCI states. | v: 350km/h  Ds: 700ms  Dmin: 150m |   Proposal 5: Configure SSB with the periodicity of 20ms and TRS with the periodicity of 10ms. |
| R4-2201426 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: For the PDSCH demodulation requirements for the Bi-directional Scenario B deployment in HST FR2, set the maximum Doppler shift to 9722Hz only.  Proposal 2: The PDSCH demodulation requirements defined in Rel-17 WI HST FR2 are only applicable for UE capable of UE power class 6 (High Speed Train Roof-Mounted UE).  Proposal 3: Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Bi-directional Scenario B as follows:   * Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #(k+1) at the location of 2k⋅1/2 D\_s,k=0,1,2,… * Switch from RRH #(k+1) to RRH #k at the location of 2(k+1)⋅1/2 D\_s,k=0,1,2,… |
| R4-2201718 | Qualcomm | Observation 1: If the FR2 HST UE is not informed on the deployment type by the network via higher layer signaling, the UE is expected to guess based on direct observations of the network signal. The details of this observations are up to the UE.  Observation 2: A wrong UE assumption on the Deployment type can have impacts on performance and power consumption.  Observation 3: With the agreed Single Panel UE test setup, it’s unclear how a correct UE autonomous identification of the FR2 HST Deployment type used to derive the channel model can be ensured during PDSCH performance testing for FR2 HST.  Observation 4: We cannot support option 1 (No UE capability for FR2 HST) because a minimum implementation UE is not able to cope with the expected Doppler Jump in FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment with the expected train speed and additional UE processing is required;  Observation 5: Option 3 does not allow for the UE to receive TRS before resuming throughput performance evaluation and as such should not be considered;  Observation 6: Option 1 and 2 seem fundamentally to be the same, but we consider Option 1 to be more immediate and clearer to understand;  Proposal 1: To avoid performance and power impact in a real deployment and to ensure proper setup during testing of the PDSCH demodulation requirements, we recommend RAN4 to agree on the introduction of higher layer signaling (ie. System Information, RRC)) to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology (Uni-directional and Bi-directional scenario).  Proposal 2: If an agreement is reached on the introduction of higher layer signaling to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology, we recommend RAN4 to send an LS to RAN2. A draft is provided in the appendix of this contribution.  Proposal 3: Support introducing a UE capability for FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment, to avoid introducing mandatory requirements which require a dedicated implementation and which cannot be satisfied by a minimum implementation UE. Given that the limitation to 250Km/h does not reflect any expectation on the real world deployment or train speed, do not include a speed limitation in the capability definition.  Proposal 4: If a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced, introduce Test Case 2b: Uni-directional Scenario B with DPS Scheme 1a, and related Applicability Rule that Test 2b can be skipped if UE supports more than 1 Active TCI State.  Proposal 5: If a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced, we are open to compromise on Option 1 (9722Hz) for Maximum Doppler Frequency in Bidirectional Deployment scenario.  Proposal 6: For Bi-Directional Deployment, support the Deployment scenario included in the WF from R4 #101-e.  Proposal 7: On the test procedure issue regarding PDSCH allocation timeline, support Option 4 (which generalizes Option 1 to the Test for UE supporting >1 Active TCI State).  Proposal 8: The PDSCH allocation timeline should also consider the input from RRM regarding FR2 TCI switching timeline before we can reach a definitive conclusion on the test procedure.  Proposal 9: In line with requirements already included in 38.101-4 for HST deployments, we support Option 1 for SSB and TRS period configuration (respectively 20 and 10 ms). |
| R4-2201877 | Intel | Proposal 1: Define HST-FR2 performance requirements for bi-directional deployment only with 9722 Hz Doppler frequency. Do not define network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type (Option 1b).  Proposal #2: PDSCH allocation timeline should include:   * Bi-directional 1a scheme: THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstTRS +TTRS Proc   +  Test setup should ensure that new SSB is received before new TRS. * Uni-directional 1b scheme: THARQ +TMAC Proc   Proposal #3: Consider 20ms and 10ms SSB and TRS periodicity receptively. Consider SSB position in the burst as 29.  Proposal #4: Define UE feature to support HST-FR2 operation according to the following Table:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Index | Feature group | Components | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE | Type  (the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC) | Note | Mandatory/Optional | | x-1 | Support of FR2 HST operation | 1) Support of FR2 UE PC6  2) Support of enhanced RRM requirements for FR2 HST  3) Support of demodulation processing for FR2 HST | Yes | UE is not able to meet the enhanced requirements in HST FR2 | Per Band | FR2 UE power class PC6 signalling is used to indicate support of feature group | Optional with capability signalling | |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreements in the WF R4-2120775

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 2-1 Network Assistance signalling
  + Issue 2-1-1: Network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type
  + Issue 2-1-2: LS to RAN2 for Network Assistance signalling
* Sub-topic 2-2: UE capability and Doppler Frequency
  + Issue 2-2-1: UE capability
  + Issue 2-2-2: Doppler Frequency for PDSCH requirement in Bi-directional scenario
* Sub-topic 2-3: UE feature list for FR2 HST
  + Issue 2-3-1: whether additional signalling to indicate UE supporting of demodulation processing for FR2 HST excepting for FR2 UE power class PC6 signalling is needed

### Sub-topic 2-1: Network Assistance signaling

**Issue 2-1-1: Network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type**

* Observations
  + Observation 1(Qualcomm):
    - If the FR2 HST UE is not informed on the deployment type by the network via higher layer signaling, the UE is expected to guess based on direct observations of the network signal. The details of this observations are up to the UE
    - A wrong UE assumption on the Deployment type can have impacts on performance and power consumption.
    - With the agreed Single Panel UE test setup, it’s unclear how a correct UE autonomous identification of the FR2 HST Deployment type used to derive the channel model can be ensured during PDSCH performance testing for FR2 HST
  + Observation 2(Intel):
    - Conventional UE implementation assumes implementation of SSB based frequency estimation.
    - Network assistance signaling on TCI state switching type or deployment type does not provide reasonable performance or implementation benefits.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Intel, Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson): Do not define network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type
  + Option 2 (Qualcomm): To avoid performance and power impact in a real deployment and to ensure proper setup during testing of the PDSCH demodulation requirements, we recommend RAN4 to agree on the introduction of higher layer signaling (ie. System Information, RRC)) to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology (Uni-directional and Bi-directional scenario).
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-1-2: LS to RAN2 for Network Assistance signalling**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm): If an agreement is reached on the introduction of higher layer signaling to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology, we recommend RAN4 to send an LS to RAN2. A draft is provided in the appendix of this contribution.
* Recommended WF
  + Pending on issue 2-1-1

### Sub-topic 2-2: UE capability and Doppler Frequency

**Issue 2-2-1: UE capability**

* Observation
  + Observation 1(Qualcomm):
    - We cannot support option 1 (No UE capability for FR2 HST) because a minimum implementation UE is not able to cope with the expected Doppler Jump in FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment with the expected train speed and additional UE processing is required;
* Proposals
  + Option 1(ZTE, Intel, Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson): Not to define signaling distinguishing UE capability between uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment.
  + Option 2(ZTE): To support UE capability signalling differentiating different speed if the need of different speeds is confirmed.
  + Option 3(Qualcomm): Support introducing a UE capability for FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment, to avoid introducing mandatory requirements which require a dedicated implementation and which cannot be satisfied by a minimum implementation UE. Given that the limitation to 250Km/h does not reflect any expectation on the real world deployment or train speed, do not include a speed limitation in the capability definition.
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-2-2: Doppler Frequency for PDSCH requirement in Bi-directional scenario**

* Observations
  + Observation 1(Intel)
    - Option 3 contradicts with previous agreement to not take into account any extra UE frequency error margins to derive max supported Doppler frequency.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Intel, CMCC, Huawei, Ericsson): 9722Hz
  + Option 2 (Qualcomm): Compromise 9722Hz if a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any. Pending on Issue 2-2-1

### Sub-topic 2-3: UE feature list for FR2 HST

**Issue 2-3-1: whether additional signalling to indicate UE supporting of demodulation processing for FR2 HST excepting for FR2 UE power class PC6 signalling is needed**

* Proposals
  + Option 1( Intel, Ericsson): No
    - The PDSCH demodulation requirements defined in Rel-17 WI HST FR2 are only applicable for UE capable of UE power class 6 (High Speed Train Roof-Mounted UE).
    - Define UE feature to support HST-FR2 operation according to the following Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature group | Components | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE | Type  (the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC) | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| Support of FR2 HST operation | 1) Support of FR2 UE PC6  2) Support of enhanced RRM requirements for FR2 HST  3) Support of demodulation processing for FR2 HST | Yes | UE is not able to meet the enhanced requirements in HST FR2 | Per Band | FR2 UE power class PC6 signalling is used to indicate support of feature group | Optional with capability signalling |

* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

Sub topic 2-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-1-1  Issue 2-1-2 |
| Intel | Issue 2-1-1  We still do not see benefits to provide information on deployment type or TCI state switching type from demodulation perspective. According to our assessments TCI state switching due to Tx beam change happens not so frequently to have impact on UE power consumption due to SSB+TRS tracking. Also, HST FR2 UE is a dedicated product that should be able to operate in different deployments. Therefore, there is no need to signal deployment type. |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-1-1: Network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type**  We don’t see it necessity to define any NWA signaling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type. |
| Nokia | **Issue 2-1-1**  We support Option 1.  In general, we do not consider HST FR2 CPE is power limited kind of device, and therefore power consumption is not of a primary concern. Additionally, it was accepted to considered 2 panels per CPE each for both for TX and RX. Each panel points in opposite directions following, e.g., the agreed HST FR2 deployment scenario assumptions (WF at RAN4#98-bis-e, R4-2106100).  Regarding the indication of TCI state switching type, we suggest that the discussion should only continue in relation to the UL Timing Adjustment issue in RRM-2 email discussion thread.  **Issue 2-1-2**  Unless it is decided to define demodulation-specific signaling the LS to RAN on network signalling being prepared in RRM-1 email discussion thread can be used. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue: 2-1-1**  We have not seen comments that address the concern that we have raised regarding the testing setup, and that we further clarify here:  With the testing conditions that have been agreed up until this point we see a situation in which 2 performance demodulation tests based on different channel conditions will be run, but the UE cannot rely on different panel observations to infer the deployment which directly impacts the UE performances.  In fact, as other companies commented in the past, in normal operation a UE sensing signal only on one panel can and will assume that it is located in a uni-directional deployment setting and so it could safely decide to skip SSB measurements for FO tracking, but this exposes it to performance impact when the bidirectional channel model is instead used for the performance testing.  It is our view that a performance test that does not consider this cannot be properly defined and that providing the UE with deployment type information is the only solution that can ensure that the UE is being tested with proper knowledge of the testing condition.  @Ericsson’s (addressing the question posed in the next table): As we have expressed our proposals in the past, the Deployment Type flag that is shared for the UE is valid until updated RRC configuration or system information is provided to the UE, so if the deployment type changes along the tracks so can the information shared with the UE.  On the possible ‘middle deployment’, while it is clear that the deployment parameters we are discussing cannot exactly match the real world, whether the RX Beams from the RRH panels are illuminating the tracks from both directions or a single one does not seem to us to leave much gray zone in the middle. Are there any example of potential ‘middle deployments’ that cannot be classified either way? |
| ZTE | Issue 2-1-1  Option 1  We do not consider it necessary for network assistance signaling to indicate deployment type as CPE can determine the deployment type through measurement.  With regard to TCI state switching, we think that CPE can judge the TCI switching type. For example, if the TCI state switching indicates the beam switching from beam of one panel to the beam of another panel, CPE will be able to realize the Doppler hopping.  Issue 2-1-2  The necessity of the higher layer signaling to inform the UE FR2 HST deployment typology should be discussed first. |
| Ericsson | 20220119: comments moved from the sub-topic 2-2  Issue 2-1-1  Option 1.  From UE demodulation test point of view, one transmitter transmits signal by changing the Doppler shift according to the channel model regardless of uni- or bi-directional model. This means UE does not need to tune Rx panel. We should also point out it is for special UE dedicated for HST FR2, i.e., PC6. I think such a UE should be optimized for such an environment.  We are not sure how the operators choose the deployment mode if 3GPP introduce the higher layer signaling to indicate the deployment topology information. These two deployment scenarios (bi-directional and uni-directional) are two extreme deployment models in our understanding. In the real deployment, it is not possible to deploy RRH exactly same as like Bi-directional scenario B. Some deployment may be middle of uni-directional like and bi-directional like deployments. In this case which mode operators should signal? |
| Ericsson2 | Issue 2-1-1  If we understand correctly, the purpose of deployment information signaling is to help UE to indicate whether the Rx beams comes from two directions or a single direction. We are wondering if it is discussed in UE demodulation performance part.  The purpose of FR2 HST-DPS test cases is to verify UE receives the signals from the active TCI state, and tracks the Doppler shift from the active TCI state. We have also agreed OTA test setup uses the single transmitter. We don’t think such an indication is needed from UE demodulation test point of view. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-1-1  As agreed, RS for FO tracking is up to UE implementation, from demod perspective, considering there is no PDSCH scheduling during TCI state switching, UE only apply SSB/TRS for timing/frequency adjustment, we do think there is benefit to inform UE whether a jump is expected (including Deployment type, intra/Inter-RRH TCI state switching type), from UE demodulation perspective  Issue 2-1-2  Pending on issue 2-1-1 |

Sub topic 2-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Issue 2-2-1:  Option 1. We do not see the necessity to define signaling distinguishing UE capability between uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment. In our view, whether uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment is deployed is up to operator deployment, our preference is that both are supported by the high-speed CPEs  Issue 2-2-2:  Option 1. |
| Ericsson2 | **Issue 2-2-1**  Option 1  **Issue 2-2-2**  Option 1 |
| Intel | Issue 2-2-1  According to the HST FR2 WID, performance in HST-FR2 deployment should be optimized to support 350km/h at 30GHz carrier frequency. A dedicated UE PC 6 was agreed to be introduced for such operation. It means that this UE should have a dedicated implementation to be able to meet corresponding requirements. We do not assume that conventional UEs will be used in HST-FR2 hence there is no need to define requirements based on conventional implementations. Support Option 1.  Issue 2-2-2  Support Option 1 that is aligned with a target speed from HST-FR2 WID. |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-2-1: UE capability**  We prefer Option 1 since the type of deployment is decided by operator and UE should support both type of deployment.  **Issue 2-2-2: Doppler Frequency for PDSCH requirement in Bi-directional scenario**  We prefer Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue: 2-2-1**  If support of demodulation processing for FR2 HST is based on FR2 UE power class 6 as proposed in Issue 2-3-1, we can compromise to introducing no separate UE capability for uni- and bi- directional for the sake of making progress on this issue.  **Issue 2-2-2: Doppler Frequency for PDSCH requirement in Bi-directional scenario**  We can compromise to option 1 for the sake of making progress on this issue. |
| ZTE | Issue 2-2-1  From deployment type point of view option 1 is preferred and from the need of different speed option 2 can be supported.  With regard to UE capability of different deployment, we think the capability is not necessary for the network deployment is relatively fixed and the network can not adapt the deployment type reported by CPE. On the other hand, the network deployment may be different from one place to another. So it’s recommended the CPE can support uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment to adapt to the network deployment.  Issue 2-2-2  Option 1 is preferred  As pointed under issue 2-2-1, it is recommended for CPE to support both uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment. From the perspective of unified requirements, we prefer to define only 9722 Hz for both uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-2-1:  Option 1  The difference between Bi-directional and Uni-directional is that large frequency jump happens for Bi-directional scenario, while delay jump for Uni-directional scenario. The Doppler/Delay jump is due to the inter-RRH TCI state switching, during TCI state switching, UE will apply SSB/TRS for FO/TO adjustment. From FO/TO tracking processing perspective, we don't see any different for Bi/Uni-directional.  Issue 2-2-2  It is feasible with 9722Hz Doppler frequency for both Uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment |

Sub topic 2-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-3-1 |
| Ericsson | Issus 2-3-1  We support to define single UE capability to support the PDSCH demodulation requirements for Rel-17 HST FR2, and which should be connected to FR2 UE power class PC6. |
| Huawei | We are OK with Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1 and to define demodulation support according to the Table proposed; |
| ZTE | We are fine with option 1. |
| Samsung | We are ok with option 1  As comments, there is no additional UE capability needed, so we think FR2 UE power class PC6 can also apply for demodulation, for other part, such RRM, whether additional capability is needed should be discussed in the RRM email thread. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

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

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #3: PDSCH requirement

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

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2200743 | Samsung | Simulation results summary |
| R4-2200744 | Samsung | CR work split for Rel-17 FR2 HST  Proposal 1: Agree the CR work split table above, interest companies are encouraged for joint contribution. |
| R4-2200745 | Samsung | Proposal 1: Define PDSCH requirement for Bi-directional scenario with 9722Hz.  Proposal 2: No NWA signaling introduce to inform the UE whether a jump is expected (including Deployment type, intra/Inter-RRH TCI state switching type)  Proposal 3: Do not introduce the UE capability to differentiate requirement for Bi/Uni-directional scenario  Proposal 4: Do not consider the following period after receiving MAC CE active TCI switching from the throughput statistics   * Bi-directional scenario DPS scheme1a, THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstSSB + TSSB proc + TfirstTRSafterSSB+ TTRS pro * Uni-directional scenario DPS scheme1b, THARQ +TMAC Proc   Proposal 5: Configure SSB period configuration as 20ms, and 10ms for TRS period configuration  Observation 1: Similar performance can be achieved for Uni-directional scenario with A and B  Observation 2: About 1 dB performance loss for Bi-directional compared with Uni-directional scenario  Proposal 6: MCS 17 with Rank2 is feasible for FR2 HST PDSCH requirement. |
| R4-2200837 | ZTE | Proposal 1: Not to define signaling distinguishing UE capability between uni-directional deployment and bi-directional deployment.  Proposal 2: To support UE capability signaling differentiating different speed if the need of different speeds is confirmed. |
| R4-2201001 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Do not introduce higher layer signalling to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology (Uni-directional and Bi-directional scenario) for PDSCH demodulation requirement.  Proposal 2: Do not introduce MAC-CE signalling to inform the UE of the TCI switching typology (Intra/Inter -RRH) for PDSCH demodulation requirement.  Proposal 3: Select 10ms for TRS for HST FR2 PDSCH requirements definition. |
| R4-2201002 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Draft CR on minimum requirements for PDSCH HST-DPS (38.101-4) |
| R4-2201004 | Huawei,  HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For Uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b, reuse same throughput statistics method as the existing FR1 DPS1b cases that the switching point is the slot#n+THARQ +TMAC Proc and there is no switching interruption during the test, where in slot#n TCI state switching MAC CE command is transmitted. |
| R4-2201005 | Huawei  HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a, only define 350km/h requirements and do not introduce any UE capability to support 250km/h speed.  Proposal 2: For Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a, reuse same throughput statistics method as the existing FR1 DPS1a cases but change the TRS receiving and processing time to the SSB receiving and processing time that the first time that new TCI state applied is the slot#n+THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstSSB + TSSB proc, where in slot#n TCI state switching MAC CE command is transmitted. |
| R4-2201425 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Uni-directional Scenario A as follows:   * Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #k at the location of   Proposal 2: RAN4 demodulation requirements do not consider the following period after receiving MAC CE active TCI switching from the throughput statistics:   * **D**PS Scheme 1a (UE capable of one active TCI state): THARQ + TMAC proc + TfirstRS + TRS proc * DPS Scheme 1b (UE capable of two or more active TCI states): THARQ + TMAC proc   + THARQ: Number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information   + TMAC proc: Number of slots for MAC CE processing   + TfirstTRS: Larger number of slots to the first SSB transmission and the first TRS transmission after MAC CE command is decoded by the UE   + TRS proc: Larger number of slots for SSB processing and TRS processing   Proposal 3: No signaling is needed to indicate the deployment topology for FR2 HST UE demodulation requirements.  Proposal 4: RAN4 define UE demodulation requirements with transmission schemes DPS 1a and 1b only with the channel model based on Bi-directional Scenario B.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Test number | Channel model and active TCI switching scheduling | DPS Tx scheme | Channel model parameters | | 1 | HST-DPS-FR2  (derived based on Bi-directional Scenario B) | 1a / 1b according to UE capability of the number of active TCI states. | V: 350km/h  Ds: 700ms  Dmin: 150m |   Proposal 5: Configure SSB with the periodicity of 20ms and TRS with the periodicity of 10ms. |
| R4-2201426 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: For the PDSCH demodulation requirements for the Bi-directional Scenario B deployment in HST FR2, set the maximum Doppler shift to 9722Hz only.  Proposal 2: The PDSCH demodulation requirements defined in Rel-17 WI HST FR2 are only applicable for UE capable of UE power class 6 (High Speed Train Roof-Mounted UE).  Proposal 3: Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Bi-directional Scenario B as follows:   * Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #(k+1) at the location of 2k⋅1/2 D\_s,k=0,1,2,… * Switch from RRH #(k+1) to RRH #k at the location of 2(k+1)⋅1/2 D\_s,k=0,1,2,… |
| R4-2201718 | Qualcomm | Observation 1: If the FR2 HST UE is not informed on the deployment type by the network via higher layer signaling, the UE is expected to guess based on direct observations of the network signal. The details of this observations are up to the UE.  Observation 2: A wrong UE assumption on the Deployment type can have impacts on performance and power consumption.  Observation 3: With the agreed Single Panel UE test setup, it’s unclear how a correct UE autonomous identification of the FR2 HST Deployment type used to derive the channel model can be ensured during PDSCH performance testing for FR2 HST.  Observation 4: We cannot support option 1 (No UE capability for FR2 HST) because a minimum implementation UE is not able to cope with the expected Doppler Jump in FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment with the expected train speed and additional UE processing is required;  Observation 5: Option 3 does not allow for the UE to receive TRS before resuming throughput performance evaluation and as such should not be considered;  Observation 6: Option 1 and 2 seem fundamentally to be the same, but we consider Option 1 to be more immediate and clearer to understand;  Proposal 1: To avoid performance and power impact in a real deployment and to ensure proper setup during testing of the PDSCH demodulation requirements, we recommend RAN4 to agree on the introduction of higher layer signaling (ie. System Information, RRC)) to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology (Uni-directional and Bi-directional scenario).  Proposal 2: If an agreement is reached on the introduction of higher layer signaling to inform the UE of the FR2 HST deployment typology, we recommend RAN4 to send an LS to RAN2. A draft is provided in the appendix of this contribution.  Proposal 3: Support introducing a UE capability for FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment, to avoid introducing mandatory requirements which require a dedicated implementation and which cannot be satisfied by a minimum implementation UE. Given that the limitation to 250Km/h does not reflect any expectation on the real world deployment or train speed, do not include a speed limitation in the capability definition.  Proposal 4: If a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced, introduce Test Case 2b: Uni-directional Scenario B with DPS Scheme 1a, and related Applicability Rule that Test 2b can be skipped if UE supports more than 1 Active TCI State.  Proposal 5: If a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced, we are open to compromise on Option 1 (9722Hz) for Maximum Doppler Frequency in Bidirectional Deployment scenario.  Proposal 6: For Bi-Directional Deployment, support the Deployment scenario included in the WF from R4 #101-e.  Proposal 7: On the test procedure issue regarding PDSCH allocation timeline, support Option 4 (which generalizes Option 1 to the Test for UE supporting >1 Active TCI State).  Proposal 8: The PDSCH allocation timeline should also consider the input from RRM regarding FR2 TCI switching timeline before we can reach a definitive conclusion on the test procedure.  Proposal 9: In line with requirements already included in 38.101-4 for HST deployments, we support Option 1 for SSB and TRS period configuration (respectively 20 and 10 ms). |
| R4-2201877 | Intel | Proposal 1: Define HST-FR2 performance requirements for bi-directional deployment only with 9722 Hz Doppler frequency. Do not define network assistance signalling to indicate TCI state switching type or deployment type (Option 1b).  Proposal #2: PDSCH allocation timeline should include:   * Bi-directional 1a scheme: THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstTRS +TTRS Proc   +  Test setup should ensure that new SSB is received before new TRS. * Uni-directional 1b scheme: THARQ +TMAC Proc   Proposal #3: Consider 20ms and 10ms SSB and TRS periodicity receptively. Consider SSB position in the burst as 29.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Index | Feature group | Components | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE | Type  (the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC) | Note | Mandatory/Optional | | x-1 | Support of FR2 HST operation | 1) Support of FR2 UE PC6  2) Support of enhanced RRM requirements for FR2 HST  3) Support of demodulation processing for FR2 HST | Yes | UE is not able to meet the enhanced requirements in HST FR2 | Per Band | FR2 UE power class PC6 signalling is used to indicate support of feature group | Optional with capability signalling |   Proposal #4: Define UE feature to support HST-FR2 operation according to the following Table: |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreements in the WF R4-2120775

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 3-1 Common setup
  + Issue 3-1-1: Test cases definition and test applicability rule
  + Issue 3-1-2: TRS/SSB configuration
* Sub-topic 3-2: PDSCH requirement for Uni-directional scenario
  + Issue 3-2-1: TCI switching scheduling
  + Issue 3-2-2: PDSCH allocation time for Uni-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1b
* Sub-topic 3-3: PDSCH requirement for Bi-directional scenario
  + Issue 3-3-1: TCI switching scheduling
  + Issue 3-3-2: PDSCH allocation time for Bi-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1a

### Sub-topic 3-1: Common setup

**Issue 3-1-1: Test cases definition and test applicability rule**

* Observation
  + Observation 1(CMCC):
    - With current applicability agreed in last meeting, even if both case 1 (Uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b) and case 2 (Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a) are tested, the performance of bi-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b and the performance of uni-directional scenario B with DPS 1a are not guaranteed.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Ericsson): RAN4 define UE demodulation requirements with transmission schemes DPS 1a and 1b only with the channel model based on Bi-directional Scenario B.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test number | Channel model and active TCI switching scheduling | DPS Tx scheme | Channel model parameters |
| 1 | HST-DPS-FR2  (derived based on Bi-directional Scenario B) | 1a / 1b according to UE capability of the number of active TCI states. | V: 350km/h  Ds: 700ms  Dmin: 150m |

* + Option 2 (CMCC): Update applicability rule for defined two cases
    - If UE is capable of more than 1 activated TCI state, UE should pass test both case 1 and case 2, otherwise, UE should only pass test of case 2
    - If UE passes case 1 (uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b), the performance of uni-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1b are also guaranteed
  + Option 3 (Qualcomm) : If a UE capability to support FR2 HST Bidirectional deployment is introduced, introduce additional Test Case 2b with test applicability rule
    - Uni-directional Scenario B with DPS Scheme 1a,
    - Test 2b can be skipped if UE supports more than 1 Active TCI State
  + Option 4: Keep agreement in the last meeting
    - If UE is capable of more than 1 activated TCI state, UE should pass test both case 1 and case 2, otherwise, UE should only pass test of case 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test number | Channel model and active TCI switching scheduling | DPS Tx scheme | Channel model parameters |
| 1 | HST-DPS-FR2-B  (Bi-directional Scenario B) | 1a | v: 350km/h  Ds: 700ms  Dmin: 150m |
| 2 | HST-DPS-FR2-A  (Uni-directional Scenario A) | 1b | v: 350km/h  Ds: 700m  Dmin: 10m  Ds\_offset: 10m |

* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 3-1-2: TRS/SSB configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Intel, Qualcomm, Huawei, Ericsson, Samsung): 20ms for SSB, and 10ms for TRS
    - Option 1a (Intel): SSB position in the burst as 29
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

### Sub-topic 3-2: PDSCH requirement for Uni-directional scenario

**Issue 3-2-1: TCI switching scheduling**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Ericsson): Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Bi-directional Scenario A as follows
    - **Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #k at the location of**



* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 3-2-2: PDSCH allocation time for Uni-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1b**

* Observations
  + Observation 1 (Qualcomm):
    - Option 3 does not allow for the UE to receive TRS before resuming throughput performance evaluation and as such should not be considered;
    - Option 1 and 2 seem fundamentally to be the same, but we consider Option 1 to be more immediate and clearer to understand;
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Intel, Qualcomm, Huawei, Ericsson): THARQ+TMAC Proc
    - THARQ: Number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information
    - TMAC proc: Number of slots for MAC CE processing
  + Option 2 (Qualcomm): The PDSCH allocation timeline should also consider the input from RRM regarding FR2 TCI switching timeline before we can reach a definitive conclusion on the test procedure
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

### Sub-topic 3-3: PDSCH requirement for Bi-directional scenario

**Issue 3-3-1: TCI switching scheduling**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Ericsson, Qualcomm): Schedule the active TCI switching for PDSCH demodulation test with the channel model assuming the Bi-directional Scenario B as follows
    - Switch from RRH #(k-1) to RRH #(k+1) at the location of
    - Switch from RRH #(k+1) to RRH #k at the location of



* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 3-3-2: PDSCH allocation time for Bi-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1a**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Huawei): *T*HARQ+*T*MAC Proc+TfirstSSB+TSSB proc
  + Option 2(Qualcomm, Samsung): THARQ+TMAC Proc+TfirstSSB + TSSB proc +TfirstTRSafterSSB+ TTRS pro
    - Option 2a (Qualcomm): The PDSCH allocation timeline should also consider the input from RRM regarding FR2 TCI switching timeline before we can reach a definitive conclusion on the test procedure
  + Option 3 (Intel): THARQ +TMAC Proc +TfirstTRS +TTRS Proc
    - Test setup should ensure that new SSB is received before new TRS
  + Option 4(Ericsson): *T*HARQ+*T*MAC Proc+TfirstRS+TRS proc := *T*HARQ+*T*MAC Proc+ max(TfirstSSB, TfirstTRS), +TRS proc
    - THARQ: Number of slots between PDSCH and corresponding HARQ-ACK information
    - TMAC proc: Number of slots for MAC CE processing
    - TfirstRS: Larger number of slots to the first SSB transmission and the first TRS transmission after MAC CE command is decoded by the UE, that is, max(TfirstSSB, TfirstTRS)
    - TRS proc: Larger number of slots for SSB processing and TRS processing
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

Sub topic 3-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Issue 3-1-1: Test cases definition and test applicability rule  Option 2 (after further check, we update option 2 as following). We would like to provide detailed consideration on this issue.  In last meeting, we have following agreements:   |  | | --- | | Agreements in last meeting (R4-2120755)   * Number of test cases   + Case 1: Uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b   + Case 2: Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a   + Test applicability rule     - If UE is capable of more than 1 activated TCI state, UE should pass test both case 1 and case 2, otherwise, UE should only pass test of case 2 |   With current applicability agreed in last meeting, even if both case 1 (Uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b) and case 2 (Bi-directional scenario B with DPS scheme 1a) are tested, the performance of uni-directional scenario B with DPS 1b is not guaranteed.  Based on above consideration, it is proposed to update the applicability rules as following (the addition parts are highlighted in yellow)   |  | | --- | | Updated option 2:  Update applicability rule for defined two cases   * If UE is capable of more than 1 activated TCI state, UE should pass test both case 1 and case 2, otherwise, UE should only pass test of case 2 * If UE passes case 1 (uni-directional scenario A with DPS scheme 1b), the performance of uni-directional **scenario B** with DPS scheme 1b are also guaranteed |   We would like to hear companies’ views on this issue.  Issue 3-1-2- |
| Ericsson | Issue 3-1-1  Our simulation results show any significant performance difference between Bi-directional Scenario B and Uni-directional Scenario A. So we prefer to define the single test to avoid redundant test cases, that is, Option 1  If companies want to define two cases, we are also fine with the last agreement Option 4.  Regarding the proposal by CMCC, we want to keep the agreements on the scenarios: Uni-directional Scenario A and Bi-directional Scenario B.  Issue 3-1-2  Option 1 is fine with us. |
| Intel | Issue 3-1-2  Support at least Option 1. We have proposed Option 1a as an alternative how to ensure that SSB is received before TRS after TCI state switching. |
| Huawei | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases definition and test applicability rule**  For Option 1, from our understanding, Bi-directional Scenario B for DPS 1b is not feasible in Rel-17 and should be considered for future releases. In addition, we are also OK with the updated applicability rule proposed by CMCC.  **Issue 3-1-2: TRS/SSB configuration**  We prefer to reuse the existing SSB configuration and no need to change the SSB offset. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases definition and test applicability rule**  Regarding Option 1, Bi-directional for DPS 1b has been discussed and excluded for this release.  Regarding Option 2, our view is that this is only a choice to reduce the number of test cases introduced, and it should not be along applicability rules  We are fine with Option 4, but for clarity the Channel Model names should include the deployment type they are designed based on and we propose to use:  HST-DPS-FR2-**BI**-B  HST-DPS-FR2-**UNI**-A  **Issue 3-1-2: TRS/SSB configuration**  We support option 1;  @Intel: We support a proper test setup configuration, but we would rather keep the SSB slot offset to 0 and select the slot in which the TCI state switch command is transmitted. |
| ZTE | Issue 3-1-1  Option 4 is preferred  The agreement reached last meeting covers different scenarios, deployment and transmission scheme. The 2 TCI scheme can be tested in one of the test cases. And we think option 2 and option 4 are consistent. Therefore, we prefer option 4 if option 4 itself has no ambiguity |
| Samsung | Issue 3-1-2  With short period, it can benefit the Doppler tracking accuracy, we are fine to configure 20ms for SSB period configuration, and 10ms for TRS period configuration |

Sub topic 3-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 3-2-1  Issue 3-2-2- |
| Ericsson | Issue 3-2-1  RAN4 should capture such a scheduling in TS38.101-4.  Issue 3-2-2  We support Option 1. Regarding the TCI switching timeline, we can follow the same approach as FR1 HST-DPS agreed in Rel-16 HST WI. We need to configure CSI-RS for CSI acquisition so that UE should know the next TCI states. |
| Intel | Issue 3-2-1  We support Option 1. Similar to HST FR1 test cases the scheduling approach should be captured in table with test case parameters.  Issue 3-2-2  Support Option 1 that is aligned with TCI state switching delay requirement for MAC-CE based switching with known target TCI state. |
| Huawei | **Issue 3-2-1: TCI switching scheduling**  For TCI switching, we have agreements for previous meeting that RRHs under the same cell use the different sets of SSB indexes, e.g., RRH-1 uses SSB-0, RRH-2 uses SSB-1 and etc. However, the number of RRH is infinite in the same cell for FR1 HST test, so the number of SSB within one cell should be limited to a specific value. In addition, same issue exists for TRS and we have never discussed about it. We prefer to configure the maximum number 4 of SSB and TRS index so that RRH#i and RRH#i+4 have the same SSB and TRS index.  **Issue 3-2-2: PDSCH allocation time for Uni-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1b**  We are OK with Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 3-2-1: TCI switching scheduling**  Support Option 1 and capturing the scheduling in the test case parameters.  Regarding SSB and TRS indexing, for unidirectional we can reuse the FR1 HST approach from 38.101-4 and we are ok to considering 4 SSB Indexes and corresponding RRHs per Cell, which will reserve one slot at SCS=120kHz;  @Ericsson: can you please clarify how the CSI-RS for CSI acquisition configuration procedure applies to the next TCI State? In our understanding TE will have to schedule measurements to ensure that the target TCI state is known, but we would like to further understand this issue  **Issue 3-2-2: PDSCH allocation time for Uni-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1b**  For 2 active TCI states, we support Option 1 (Our observation for Option 2 was for Single Active TCI state test); |
| ZTE | Issue 3-2-1  Option 1 can be supported and there is a typo, “Bi-directional Scenario” in option 1 should be “Uni-directional Scenario”  Issue 3-2-2  Option 1 is preferred  For scheme 1b the CPE can track 2 beams simultaneously, so the new beam can be switched without SSB process. |
| Samsung | Issue 3-2-1  We are fine with option1, similar as FR1 HST to capture the related scheduling in the test case parameters, we are open to further discuss the number of SSB index configured for corresponding RRHs per Cell  Issue 3-2-2  Regarding DPS scheme 1b in Unidirectional A, since the signal is transmitted with same TX beam by two neighbor RRH, therefore, there is no need to include SSB processing. Same test procedure of PDSCH allocation timeline as HST FR1 should be applied. Meanwhile, the TCI state switching delay requirement is under discussion in RRM session, we should follow and consider the related conclusion. |

Sub topic 3-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 3-2-1  Issue 3-3-1 |
| Ericsson | Issue 3-2-1  RAN4 should capture such a scheduling in TS38.101-4.  Issue 3-3-1  Option 4 is a compromised proposal of Option 1 and Option 3, which covers both cases UE receive either SSB or TRS just after the active TCI switching. It looks the Option 2 requires the longest DTX period which requires to receive SSB first, followed by TRS. Considering the SSB periodicity of 20ms and TRS periodicity of 10ms. The different among the options may not be so significant.  Since we agreed it is up to UE implementation for time/frequency tracking, RAN4 may choose Option 2 considering the worst case? |
| Intel | Issue 3-2-1  We support Option 1. Similar to HST FR1 test cases the scheduling approach should be captured in table with test case parameters.  Issue 3-3-1  Test setup will determine when each TRS and SSB will be received during the test. In this case we prefer to clearly capture exact interruption time in test description. In order to make correct TCI state switching UE needs both SSB and TRS. SSB will be used for course time/frequency synchronization. Then, TRS is also needed since fine synchronization is required for demodulation of high order modulation. Therefore, we support Option 3 or Option 4. Option 3 looks preferable because there is no need to test engineers to calculate which RS is received first/last. |
| Huawei | **Issue 3-3-1: TCI switching scheduling**  For TCI switching, we have agreements for previous meeting that RRHs under the same cell use the different sets of SSB indexes, e.g., RRH-1 uses SSB-0 to SSB-1, RRH-2 uses SSB-2 to SSB-3. However, the number of RRH is infinite in the same cell for FR1 HST test, so the number of SSB within one cell should be limited to a specific value. In addition, same issue exists for TRS and we have never discussed about it. We prefer to configure the maximum number 8 of SSB and TRS index so that RRH#i and RRH#i+4 have the same SSB and TRS index.  **Issue 3-3-2: PDSCH allocation time for Bi-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1a**  We prefer Option 1. We are also OK with Option 2 consider different implementation. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 3-3-1: TCI switching scheduling**  Support Option 1 and capturing the scheduling in the test case parameters.  We are ok with considering 4 RRHs per Cell, and so maximum 8 SSB Indexes, which will reserve 2 slots at SCS=120kHz;  **Issue 3-3-2: PDSCH allocation time for Bi-directional scenario with DPS scheme 1a**  We see a problem with Option 4 if the outcome of the max operation equals TfirstSSB, because it will not guarantee that the UE has been able to process correctly TRS before resuming operations, and PDSCH performances based on SSB-based measurement should not be computed toward the requirement.  For a test setup that ensures SSB is received before TRS, Option 3 and Option 1 result in the same DTX duration but since there would be no difference in the resulting values we prefer the wording of Option 2 which states more clearly the conditions of the DTX period. |
| ZTE | Issue 3-3-1  We are fine with option 1 as the channel model is captured in the WF last meeting.  Issue 3-3-2  Option 1 can be supported as the processing time of SSB needs to be considered |
| Samsung | Issue 3-3-1  We are fine with option 1, similar as FR1 HST to capture the related scheduling in the test case parameters, we are open to further discuss the number of SSB index configured for corresponding RRHs per Cell  Issue 3-3-2  Option 2 can allow different UE implementation, it is clearer to indicate the procedure, which requires to receive SSB first, followed by TRS, although it may result in long DTX period. Option 3 and option 4 can reduce the DTC period, while it may suffer the effort for specifying the specific pattern and calculation effort to the first SSB transmission and the first TRS transmission after MAC CE command. Since there is no PDSCH scheduling during TCI state switching delay, from demod aspects, there should be no impact.  Meanwhile, the TCI state switching delay requirement is under discussion in RRM session, we should follow and consider the related conclusion. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2201002  (Draft CR on minimum requirements for PDSCH HST-DPS (38.101-4)) | Moderator: Based on guidance of meeting arrangement, the draft CR will be postponed to future RAN4 meeting. |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #4: CR work split for FR2 HST demod

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2200744 | Samsung | CR work split for Rel-17 FR2 HST  Proposal 1: Agree the CR work split table above, interest companies are encouraged for joint contribution. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreements in the WF R4-2120775

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 4-1: CR work split

### Sub-topic 4-1: CR work split

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Agree the CR work split table above, interest companies are encouraged for joint contribution.
    - BS demodulation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section number** | **Section title** | **Responsible company** |
| **TS 38.104** | | |
|  | *Big CR* | Samsung |
| 11 | Radiated performance requirements | |
| 11.2 | Performance requirements for PUSCH | |
| 11.2.2 | Requirements for BS type 2-O | |
| *11.2.2.x* | *Requirements for PUSCH for high speed train* | *Intel* |
| *11.2.2.y* | *Requirements for UL timing adjustment* | *CATT* |
| 11.4 | Performance requirements for PRACH | |
| 11.4.2 | Requirements for BS type 2-O | |
| 11.4.2.2 | PRACH detection requirements | |
| *11.4.2.2.x* | *Minimum requirements for high speed train* | *Huawei* |
| *Annex A* | *Reference measurement channels* | *Intel* |
| *Annex G.3* | *High speed train condition* | *Nokia* |
| *Annex G.4* | *Moving propagation conditions* | *CATT* |
| **TS 38.141-2** | | |
|  | *Big CR* | *Nokia* |
| *4.6* | *Manufacturer's declarations* | *Samsung, Nokia* |
| 8 | Radiated performance requirements | |
| 8.1.2 | Applicability rule | |
| *8.1.2.4* | *Applicability of PUSCH for high speed train performance requirements* | *Huawei* |
| 8.2 | OTA performance requirements for PUSCH | |
| *8.2.4* | *Performance requirements for PUSCH for high speed train* | *Ericsson, Samsung* |
| *8.2.5* | *Performance requirements for UL timing adjustment* | *CATT* |
| 8.4 | OTA performance requirements for PRACH | |
| 8.4.1 | PRACH false alarm probability and missed detection | |
| *8.4.1.6* | *Test requirement for high speed train* | *Huawei* |
| *Annex A* | *Reference measurement channels* | *Intel* |
| *Annex E* | *OTA measurement system set-up* | *Ericsson* |
| *Annex J.3* | *High speed train condition* | *Nokia* |
| *Annex J.4* | *Moving propagation conditions* | *CATT* |

* + - UE demodulation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section number** | **Section title** | **Responsible company** |
| **TS 38.101-4** | | |
|  | *Big CR* | Samsung |
| 7.11 | *Applicability of requirements* | Intel |
| 7.2.2.2.x | *Minimum requirements for PDSCH HST-DPS* | Huawei |
| A.3.2 | *Reference measurement channels for PDSCH performance requirement* | Ericsson |
| *B.3* | *High speed Train Scenarios* | Qualcomm |

* Recommended WF

In the last meeting, the draft CR work split for FR2 HST demod was discussed. Based on current progress for FR2 HST performance part, around 22 CRs work split was expected for both UE and BS side. Based on the guidance about CR handling as

|  |
| --- |
| * + SI/WI RAN4 RF/RRM/demodulation Work Plans, if needed   + Rapporteurs are encouraged to provide updated SI/WI RRM work plans to decide on     - CR/TP work split among contributing companies to avoid duplicate efforts and to encourage sharing the workload and cross-checking CRs       * CR work split should at least include Big CR split. It is also allowed if companies want to further split the work under each Big CR. |

Regarding the CR work split, it is encouraged to companies considering the work load. 2 or 3 CRs per each companies is suggested, if other companies show the same interest with same topic and want to contribute it, joint contribution is appreciated.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

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

Sub topic 3-1

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

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

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

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Moderator (Samsung) | Yunchuan Yang | yc0301.yang@samsung.com |
| Ericsson | Kazuyoshi Uesaka | kazuyoshi.uesaka@ericsson.com |
| Intel Corporation | Artyom Putilin | artyom.putilin@intel.com |

Note:

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