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# Introduction

In RAN#86, the Rel-17 WID of further enhancements on MIMO for NR is approved [1]. In the approved WID, a particular point is about SRS enhancements in terms of flexibility, coverage and capacity, targeting both FR1 and FR2. The detailed scope of the SRS enhancement is given as follows.

*3. Enhancement on SRS, targeting both FR1 and FR2:*

* 1. *Identify and specify enhancements on aperiodic SRS triggering to facilitate more flexible triggering and/or DCI overhead/usage reduction*
	2. *Specify SRS switching for up to 8 antennas (e.g., xTyR, x = {1, 2, 4} and y = {6, 8})*
	3. *Evaluate and, if needed, specify the following mechanism(s) to enhance SRS capacity and/or coverage: SRS time bundling, increased SRS repetition, partial sounding across frequency*

Previous RAN1 agreements on these SRS enhancements are given in Section 6.1.

In this contribution, we summarize companies’ views on the above SRS enhancements submitted to RAN1#103e [2]-[25].

# Flexibility enhancements

## SRS triggering offset

### 2.1.1. Reference slot definition

Two options are given in last meeting’s agreement on the definition of reference slot. The following table summarizes companies’ views on three alternatives for SRS triggering offset enhancement.

Table 2-1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Companies |
| Opt. 1 (Reference slot is the slot with the triggering DCI) | 10 | Nokia, NSB, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Futurewei, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, LG |
| Opt. 2 (Reference slot is the slot indicated by the legacy triggering offset) | 14 | NEC, CMCC, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, InterDigital, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, MotM |

***FL Proposal 2-1:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | Option 2 is an add on to existing functionality instead of a replacement and gives more flexibility. |
| Samsung | We slightly support Option 2, since Option 2 can be implemented on top of the Rel-15/16 implementation with more flexibility. |
| CATT | Prefer option 2, which offers more flexibility. Option 1 can be seen as a special case of option 2 with legacy RRC configured slot offset set to 0. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support option 1. By defining the offset as number of slots counting ‘available slots’ only, RAN1 already agreed that flexible indication to make the offset longer than before. If we set the ‘original/pre-configured value’ of offset as the reference, then gNB may found too large latency between triggering and transmission of A-SRS in some TDD configuration. |
| Futurewei | We think Opt. 1 works well and Opt. 2 lacks flexibility.* Note that Opt. 1 is still subject to the minimum timing requirement between the trigger and the SRS resource(s), so it is well within the UE capability.
* For Opt. 2, if the RRC slotoffset is, say, 10 slots, and the gNB identifies an available slot after 5 slots, that available slot cannot be utilized with Opt. 2 (unless a negative offset by DCI is allowed) but can be utilized with Opt. 1. Can this be taken into consideration when making a decision?
 |
| InterDigital | We prefer Option 2 as it has more flexibility, and also if needed, it can be configured to act as Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Support Option 2. The additional offset based on the legacy triggering offset would also save more DCI overhead. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Opt. 1.For Opt.2 it can’t trigger SRS transmission before reference slot unless a negative “t” is used, which is not flexible enough. Then, if negative “t” is defined, it require more DCI overhead than Opt.1.**Further reply:**For the comment from QC, we do not think Option-1 is more complex than Option-2 for Rel-17 UEs. For Rel-17 UE, need to determine SRS transmission on the slot based on Rel-15/16, or based on Rel-17. Obviously, the exact slot counting for SRS transmission will be determined by two different ways in Rel-15 and Rel-17 for Option-2, respectively. One is with only *slotoffset*, and the other is with “t” after *slotoffset*. Then, for the comment Option-1 is the special case of Option-2, and Option-2 is more flexible, we also have different view. As mentioned by ZTE, there is no additional flexibility provided by Option-2 compared with Option-1. On the contrary, if *“slotoffset”* is not configured as 0 in the Option-2, then the flexibility will be reduced if negative slots cannot be used.  |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support option 2 which can provide more flexibility. Option 1 is a special case under option 2.  |
| MediaTek | Support option 2 as an additional feature on top of R15/R16. |
| vivo | We support Option 2 as Option 2 provides more flexibility and potential lower UE processing complexity. And, Option 1 is a special case of Option 2 with zero slot offset configuration. |
| OPPO | We support Opt1.Share the same view as some companies that Option 1 is more flexible than Option 2 as Option 2 can only trigger SRS after an RRC-configured reference slot. On the other hand, as DCI-based indication can dynamically trigger SRS transmission in different slots, reuse of legacy RRC configured slot offset in Option 2 will not offer additional benefit.Moreover, we do not see the necessary to configure two kinds of slot offset as in Option 2, since it will increase the complexity of UE to determine two slot offsets. |
| ZTE | We support Option 1. For Option 2, if there is no negative t values, for legacy offset larger than 0, there is large restriction on the slots to send the triggering DCI. So in the end, even with Option 2, gNB will configure legacy offset as 0. Then it is option 1 eventually. Hence the so-called “more flexibility” in Option 2 does not exist in practical. So Option 2 cannot provide more benefit compared with Option 1, which is the simpler one.Further, for companies who can accept Option 2, they should be able to accept gNB to configure legacy offset as 0 in option 2. Hence it’s puzzled why option2 proponents cannot accept Option 1. |
| NEC | We support option 2, which has good balance between flexibility and overhead. RRC configured slot offset can work in Rel-15/16, while the issue is lack of flexibility. The main target is to find an available slot if the RRC configured slot offset is not available, based on this, adjusting the SRS transmission slot based on combination of t and RRC configured slot offset is natural.  |
| DOCOMO | Support option 1. As per our view, option 2 does not bring any additional gains over option 1. In fact, option 2 reduces A-SRS triggering flexibility since it involves two steps (first UE has to align with the *reference slot* based on the configured legacy triggering offset and afterwards, UE has to wait additional (*t+1*) slots from the *reference slot* for an *available slot*) while requiring additional signaling overheads, i.e., for configuring legacy triggering offset, compared to option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Support option 2.* Rel.17 UE needs to support two different implementations for SRS triggering; a legacy SRS triggering based on SlotOffset if NW doesn’t support Rel-17 enhanced triggering (i.e.. Rel.15/16 gNB) and enhanced triggering based on available slot. Option 2 is enables a UE-friendly implementation as it builds on existing UE architecture. The UE will either transmit A-SRS at the slotOffset (legacy) or at later slot based on indicated ‘t’. However, option 1 requires dramatic change of UE implementation to support reference slot as triggering DCI slot.
* Option 2 can accommodate option 1 if NW configures slotOffset is zero or not configured.

Option 2 gives more flexibility as it enables different reference slots for the triggered SRS resource sets while for option-1 all SRS resource sets have same reference slot. |
| LGE | Support Option 1. Option 1 is more flexible solution to enable zero slot offset triggering always. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Option 2 which offers more flexibility.For Option 1, we are not sure how Option 1 can ensure that UE capability on offset between aperiodic SRS triggering and transmission is always met. |
| Futurewei2 | Regarding the comment that Option 1 is a special case of Option 2 if slotoffset is set to be 0, we’d like to point out that slotoffset is RRC configured and cannot be changed dynamically enough. The goal here is to have more flexibility, but a reference slot based on RRC configuration lacks flexibility. If it turns out that slotoffset always have to be configured as 0, then we should just go with Option 1.To Intel: the offset between the trigger and the SRS is ensured in the definition of available slot. |
| Sharp  | We prefer option 2.Option 1 is a special case of option 2. |

### 2.1.2. Available slot definition

One FFS point from last meeting is the detailed definition of available slot. One example is given in last meeting’s agreement, which is a good start point from most of companies’ view. Companies’ detailed views are given in the table below.

Table 2-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Supporting companies | Other comments |
| **Definition:**“Available slot” are slots satisfying there are UL or flexible symbol(s) for the time-domain location(s) for all the SRS resources in the resource set and it satisfies the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and all the SRS resources in the resource set. | NEC, Samsung, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, ZTE, Futurewei, , OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo , Lenovo/MotM (12) | CMCC: Not to count flexible symbols due to DL channel/signals can be dynamically scheduled on flexible symbols.(FL: This can be addressed in the next row of this table.)Intel: Need to clarify whether to allow shift of SRS symbols in a slot.(FL: The definition says there should be UL or flexible symbols for the time-domain locations for the SRS resources, i.e., not just sufficient number of OFDM symbols. It is clear shift is not allowed.) |
| **Impact of dynamic event:**“Available slot” is determined only based on RRC configuration, i.e., * SFI or dynamic scheduling of DL channel/signals on flexible symbols does not impact the determination of available slots.
* Collision handling between the triggered SRS and any UL channels/signals does not impact determination of available slot.
 | NEC, CMCC, Samsung, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, ZTE, OPPO, vivo ,Xiaomi (11) |  |

Based on the majority of companies have a common understanding of available slot definition, and UE vendors have strong concern on dynamic signals impacting the determination of available slots, the following FL proposal is given.

***FL Proposal 2-2:*** *An “available slot” is a slot satisfying there are UL or flexible symbol(s) for the time-domain location(s) for all the SRS resources in the resource set and it satisfies the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and all the SRS resources in the resource set.*

* *From the first symbol carrying the SRS request DCI and the last symbol of the triggered SRS resource set, UE does not expect to receive SFI indication, UL cancellation indication or dynamic scheduling of DL channel/signal(s) on flexible symbol(s) that may change the determination of “available slot”.*
* *Note: Collision handling between the triggered SRS and any other UL channel/signal is performed after the determination of available slot.*
* *FFS: Rules to handle the case of multiple SRS resource sets with overlapping symbols and/or triggered by a same DCI*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | Support FL proposal. We also need to discuss collisions between two sets triggered by the same SRS trigger codepoint as they may have different “available slot” interpretations (see 2.1.4).  |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. |
| CATT | We are OK with the FL proposal, except the 1st sub-bullet. The NW can refrain from sending SFI if so desired. Otherwise if SFI transmission makes the slot no longer available, Rel.16 dropping can apply. This is already in the current spec and doesn’t add to extra implementation. Also would suggest to add the clarification (“impact of dynamic event”) in table 2-2 in the proposal, otherwise we have several concerns and it becomes unacceptable to us.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal |
| Futurewei | * Can we clarify the use of “available slots” for one resource set? There might be different interpretations on why multiple slots may be used for one resource set. We should prevent the available slots from being interpreted too broadly; we understand this is also related to the reference slot design and offset indication.
* For the wording “… and it satisfies …”, should we change to “… and they satisfy …”?
* Regarding the first bullet, we think it is a bit too restrictive. An available slot may be, say, 10 slots after the reference slot. The first bullet does not allow any SFI indication between the DCI and 10 slots after the reference slot. However, the determination of the 10th slot after the reference slot seems to be irrelevant of whether the slots before them are changed by the SFI or not. We think it may be sufficient to require

“*For the slots determined by the DCI on which the SRS resource set may be transmitted, UE does not expect to receive SFI indication or dynamic scheduling of DL channel/signal(s) on flexible symbol(s).*” That is, if the gNB instructs the UE to sound on one or more slots, the gNB should not change those slots’ UL/flexible formats, but the gNB may change other slot’s format before the SRS slots. |
| InterDigital | Do not support. We understand the concern related to impact of dynamic SFI and DL scheduling on flexible symbols, however we don’t see the necessity of imposing restriction on gNB scheduler in selection of slot formats. ***Proposal:*** *“Available slots” are UL or flexible slots that satisfy the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and the earliest SRS resources in the resource set.** *UE can receive an SFI between the triggering DCI and AP SRS transmission, but SFI or dynamic scheduling of DL channel/signals on flexible symbols does not impact the determination of available slots.*

In other words, triggering the AP SRS on the indicated slot, overrides slot format as needed, i.e., according to the number of SRS resources triggered for transmission. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support in principle. Just some comments on the adding wording:1. Cancellation indication, who can clarify it?2. The added FFS for “*available slot” determination rules*”, since the dropping rule will happen after available slot determination following the note, so we only need to discuss the dropping rule, not necessary for the determination rules. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support FL proposal. |
| MediaTek | Okay in principle, but bullet 1 looks too much restriction. Dropping rule can be considered instead.  |
| vivo | Support FL proposal. Similar with Ericsson, we think collision between two sets triggered by one DCI in same CC or triggered by different DCI in different CCs should be discussed. |
| OPPO | Support FL proposal. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal. The main bullet is to guarantee the flexibility of gNB can send triggering DCI in any slot for the triggered SRS resources, and the sub-bullets are to make sure it is implementable for UE. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL proposal.* Cancellation indication refers to DCI format 2\_4 which notifies the UE to cancel UL transmission on some indicated time/frequency resources. Considering only RRC configuration for determination of available slot, these ‘emptied’ resources shouldn’t be consider as available resources for UE behavior of determination of available slot.
* Further discussion is needed for the scenario where single DCI triggers multiple SRS resource sets with one or more SRS resource overlapping at same symbol(s).
 |
| LGE | Generally fine with FL proposal. |
| Intel | Generally, we are fine with the main bullet of FL proposal.The collision between aperiodic SRS and other UL channel/signal may happen often. We suggest considering collision handling when determining slot availability. If not, then the UE may need to drop the SRS and the gNB needs to send the triggering again.In addition, we think the comment from Ericsson makes good point and it should be discussed. And the ‘overlapping symbols’ in the third sub-bullet should be changed to ‘the same trigger state’.The following change is suggested:* *~~Note: Collision handling between the triggered SRS and any other UL channel/signal is performed after the determination of available slot.~~*
* *FFS: whether or not the determination of available slot should include aperiodic SRS dropping due to collision handling.*
* *FFS: Rules to handle the case of multiple SRS resource sets with ~~overlapping symbols~~ the same trigger state.*
 |
| CMCC | We do not support the part of flexible symbols in the main bullet. As we proposed in the contribution, the flexible symbols determined through RRC configurations should not be counted as the available time domain resources for SRS.For the first sub-bullet, there is no need to restrain the scheduling of gNB, more focus on the collision handling is preferred.  |
| Futurewei2 | Thanks to the FL for considering our question on “slots” vs “slot”. There are cases that the SRS resources in one SRS resource set are on multiple slots. Do we intend to exclude those cases in this proposal? We are fine either way but it will be good to clarify.We still think the first bullet is unnecessarily limiting. Only the slot for the SRS transmission should not experience the dynamic events to alter its slot format; the slots before it can be modified without affecting the SRS slot. |
| Intel2 | We still have some concern on performing collision handling after available slot determination. As explained previously, if collision handling is performed after available slot determination and SRS should be dropped, the gNB will need to send triggering DCI again. The following modification is suggested:* *~~Note: Collision handling between the triggered SRS and any other UL channel/signal is performed after the determination of available slot.~~*

*FFS: whether or not the determination of available slot should include aperiodic SRS dropping due to collision handling.* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Support for the proposal. For the notation, we prefer to keep it. The collision handling should be after identifying which case will be collision. So, we prefer to handle the collision after available slot determination. |
| Ericsson2 | Support the proposal |
| CMCC2 | As proposed in the last round, the limitation of behavior of gNB such as scheduling and other indications is not preferred. The 2nd bullet is proposed updated as follows * *From the first symbol carrying the SRS request DCI and the last symbol of the triggered SRS resource set, UE does not expect that receiving SFI indication, UL cancellation indication or dynamic scheduling of DL channel/signal(s) on flexible symbol(s) will change the determination of “available slot”.*
 |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital 2 | Further clarification regarding our earlier comment,Basically, we believe that the current proposed definition is a bit too restrictive. The strict requirement of *“”Available slots” are slots satisfying … for all the SRS resources in the resource set”* leads to ignoring F slots that do not have a sufficient number of UL or F symbols. Therefore, it reduces opportunities for AP SRS triggering which is not desired. Therefore, what we are proposing is that if the indicated slot for AP SRS is an F slot with not enough F/UL symbols, then it should be automatically assumed (by both gNB and UE) as another F slot that has sufficient number of F/UL symbols. This will improve AP SRS opportunities, as according to the current proposal, these F slots will be dropped and will not be considered for AP SRS transmission. Therefore, all UL and F slots that meet the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and all the SRS resources in the resource set, can be considered as available slots.***Proposal:*** *“Available slots” are UL or flexible slots that satisfy the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and the earliest SRS resources in the resource set.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Case 1 – The indicated F slot is ignored as it only has one symbol for SRS transmission |  |
| Case 2 – The indicated F slot is automatically assumed as another default F slot with sufficient number of symbols for SRS transmission |

 |

### 2.1.3 Determination on the value of t

Based on last meeting’s agreement, candidate values of t are configured by RRC and indicated further in DCI. Detailed mechanism is still to be decided. Companies’ views are summarized in the following table.

Table 2-3

|  |
| --- |
| **DCI** |
| Cases | Alternatives | Number | Companies |
| Non-scheduling DCI (DCI 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request) | Alt 1-1: Add a new configurable DCI field to indicate t | 4 | Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT |
| Alt 1-2: Re-purpose unused DCI field to indicate t | 8 | CMCC (TDRA), Qualcomm, ZTE (TDRA), Futurewei (TDRA), vivo, LG, Ericsson, DOCOMO |
| Scheduling DCI (DCI that schedules a PDSCH or PUSCH) | Alt 2-1: Add a new configurable DCI field to indicate t | 8 | Nokia, NSB, Apple, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT |
| Alt 2-2: t is indicated without adding DCI payload | 10 | CMCC, Qualcomm, ZTE, OPPO, Intel, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Lenovo, MotM, DOCOMO |

It can be observed in the case of non-scheduling DCI, the majority of companies support to repurpose unused fields. The benefit is clear as there is no need to add DCI overhead for such DCI. For scheduling DCI, slightly more companies prefer adding a configurable DCI format.

* Adding a new configurable field seems to be a simple solution.
* Some companies have concern on increasing DCI payload. If DCI payload is an issue, it’s better to keep the possibility to allow gNB not to configure the new DCI field, and re-purpose the unused fields in non-scheduling DCI.

Based on such observation, FL proposes the following to move forward.

***FL Proposal 2-3:*** *A list of t values is configured in RRC for each SRS resource set*

* *For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request, support to re-purpose an unused field for the indication of t*
* *In DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1-1/1-2 that schedules a PDSCH or PUSCH, indication of t is performed with one of the two following alternatives*
	+ *Alt 2-1: Add a new configurable DCI field to indicate t*
	+ *Alt 2-2: t is indicated without adding DCI payload*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | We support Alt.1-2 and 2-2.  |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. |
| CATT | We support the FL proposal in the main bullet and the 1st sub-bullet. For the 2nd sub-bullet, whether unused field in the DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request is re-purposed for the indication of *t* depends on the solution of the indication of *t* for normal DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2, it can be discussed later. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are not O.K. with the 1st subbullet, but O.K. to continue the discussion. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal.We also suggest to support TDRA field for the t value indication and capture this in the proposal. A TDRA field is simple, versatile, and already supported, with reasonable overhead of typically 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits (up to 6 bits if multiple PUSCH are transmitted). Almost no new design is needed if we reuse a TDRA field in a non-scheduling DCI and reuse the TDRA field design in a scheduling DCI. Therefore, we suggest: *A list of t values is configured in RRC for each SRS resource set** *In DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2, add a new configurable field reusing PUSCH/PDSCH TDRA field design to indicate the values of t*
* *For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request, support to re-purpose ~~an~~ the unused TDRA field for the indication of t*
 |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal |
| Xiaomi | We slightly prefer implicit indication as alt.2-2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support the proposal. With or without data, the DCI field/bits will change dynamically in the merged solution, which will increase the complexity of blind detection. A unified solution for the cases with and without data is required, adding a new DCI field is a simple way.  |
| Lenovo/MotM | We do not support the proposal. Firstly, the UE blind detection complexity will be increased by adding additional bit in the existed DCI.Furthermore, *t* can be implicitly determined. For example, multiple slot offset values can be configured by RRC, while not all of them are available. The UE can only transmit the SRS in the 1st available slot. |
| vivo | There are enough unused bits which can be repurposed to indicate slot offset directly rather than available slot offset concept in non-scheduled DCI. It provides lower UE processing complexity with similar flexibility as available slot offset mechanism if direct slot offset indication agreed in non-scheduled DCI.For non-scheduling DCI refer to comments in section 2.2Alt 1-1: Add a new configurable DCI field to indicate slot offset or available slot offsetAlt 1-2: Re-purpose unused DCI field to indicate slot offset or available slot offset |
| OPPO | No support the proposal. We prefer a common solution for different DCI formats. For the current proposal, it may lead to different DCI sizes and more complexity of blind decoding. Moreover, two different designs will require more standardization efforts.DCI payload is a critical criterion when we design any PHY scheme. Thus, the additional DCI payload introduced by the proposal is not desirable.  |
| ZTE | We think it is important not to increase DCI payload. Increasing DCI payload causes lower PDCCH reliability and higher UE BD complexity. Hence we support to Alt 1-2 and Alt 2-2. In Rel-16 and Rel-17, there have been a lot of features requiring larger DCI payload. If SRS triggering enhancement needs to work jointly with these features, it’s hard to guarantee the PDCCH reliability performance if DCI payload is increased as well for SRS triggering. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support Alt1-2 and Alt2-2. As per our view also, we should try to refrain as much as possible from increasing the DCI payload size.  |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1-2 and 2-2 as preferred solution that does not increase DCI overhead.  |
| LGE | Support Alt. 1-2 for DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request. Prefer to further discuss regarding DCI with data. Alt 2-1 and alt 2-2 are in trade-off relationship, e.g., alt 2-1 is more flexible to indicate slot offset but needs DCI payload overhead, alt 2-2 don’t need additional DCI payload but isn’t flexible enough to indicate a number of slot offset.And we think DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 without data can also be used to trigger aperiodic SRS. Unused fields related with PDSCH scheduling can be used for slot offset indication. |
| Intel | We think the FL proposal is a mix of indication of ‘t’ and DCI extension. It’s better to discuss separately.We prefer to indicate ‘t’ implicitly. DCI overhead increasing should be avoided. |
| CMCC | The main part of the FL’s proposal needs more discussion, i.e. “*A list of t values is configured in RRC for each SRS resource set”*, which is related to the flexibility of SRS and the background consideration of section 2.1.1.Alt 1-2 and alt 2-2 are supported. Adding new bits to the scheduling DCI will increase the BD complexity and lower the PDCCH reliability. The necessary of increasing DCI payload should be justified.  |
| Futurewei2 | We think adding a new configurable DCI field would not cause 2 different payload sizes for the same UE at the same time. The payload size is based on RRC configuration and only one size is configured. |
| Nokia/NSB | Modified FL proposal: We want to delete FFS part in the first bullet. It is not fair to indicate some specific solution. We are O.K. with FL proposal if that part is deleted.  |
| LGE2 | Agree with Nokia, we also prefer to delete FFS part in the first bullet. Or, we can enumerate all of unused fields related with data scheduling, e.g., TDRA, FDRA, MCS, NDI, RV, HARQ process number, antenna port(s).. |
| Intel2 | We think the first bullet should be discussed in Section 2.2 since it is related with repurposing DCI field for DCI without data and CSI request. |
| OPPO2 | We prefer a common design for DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1-1/1-2 that schedules a PDSCH or PUSCH and DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request. As the design for DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1-1/1-2 that schedules a PDSCH or PUSCH will have impact on that of and DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request, we suggest to determine the solution for DCI format scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH as a first step. And then, we can further discuss whether re-purpose of an unused field has any additional benefit. We also support Intel’s proposal that the first bullet should be in Section 2.2 (proposal 2.6). |
| Ericsson2  | Support the new FL proposal with Nokias edit. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Remove the first bullet.As we raised the concerns to design different solutions (explicit and implicit) on with and without data scheduling, the bitwidth will be changed dynamically due to the data scheduling or not, which will required additional complexity on BD obviously. To address the complexity issue, we should discuss the case with data scheduling first, where no unused bits can be used, and design a unified solution.  |
| Ericsson3 | Support the proposal |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |

Another FFS point in last meeting’s agreement is whether to support MAC CE as an inter-mediate step to update candidate values of t. Companies’ views are summarized as follows.

Table 2-4

|  |
| --- |
| **Whether to support MAC CE as an inter-mediate step** |
| Alternatives | Number | Companies |
| Support using MAC CE to update the candidate values of t | 10 | Nokia, NSB, Samsung, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, MotM, Lenovo, MediaTek, InterDigital, Xiaomi |
| Deprioritize or do NOT support | 9 | CMCC, Futurewei, OPPO, Ericsson, CATT, vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel |

***FL Proposal 2-4:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | We prefer to deprioritize this |
| Samsung | To have more flexibility, we prefer to have MAC-CE based update. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support MAC CE based update |
| Futurewei | We still feel using MAC CE is not strongly motivated. The flexibility and DCI overhead from the design based on RRC + DCI is already reasonable and sufficient, e.g., typically at most a 4-bit TDRA field in DCI to indicate a wide range of slot offsets and symbol lengths, there seems to be no obvious additional benefit to utilize MAC CE. However, we are willing to hear other companies’ technical views. |
| InterDigital | Support MAC CE based update of *t* values |
| Xiaomi | MAC-CE has the merit on the flexibility and efficiency. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not necessary. In the previous agreement, only support RRC+DCI. In our understanding, RRC and DCI are sufficient, since 3 states for SRS indication in the general case for TDD slot configuration (DL:UL=8:2).  |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support MAC CE based update. |
| MediaTek | Support MAC CE update t values |
| vivo | No necessity for MAC CE, DCI or DCI + RRC is sufficient. |
| OPPO | Not support MAC CE update available slot offset t. DCI based indication of available slot has offer sufficient flexible. |
| NEC | We think MAC CE is not necessary. |
| DOCOMO | Support MAC CE based updating |
| Qualcomm | Support MAC CE update for t values and also ‘SlotOffset’ for updating the reference slot (i.e. option 2).  |
| Intel | It’s not necessary to introduce MAC-CE to update the value of ‘t’. Similar view as other companies, the current design is flexible enough. |
| CMCC | Not support the MAC CE updated slot offset, since DCI and RRC based indication provides sufficient flexibility. |

### 2.1.4 Collision handling among the triggered SRS resource sets

Two companies discuss the issue of supporting a mechanism to handle potential collision among the triggered SRS resource sets in the available slot, if multiple resource sets are triggered by one DCI. Their views are summarized as follows.

Table 2-5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Companies |
| Support a mechanism to handle potential collision among triggered SRS resources in the same or different CCs in an available slot | vivo (an ordering principle of increased or decreased SRS resource set ID), Ericsson (details FFS) |

***FL Proposal 2-5:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | This may need to be resolved, suggest to try to agree on the basic functionality first (2.1.1,2.1.2 and 2.1.3) |
| Nokia/NSB | Open to discuss |
| Futurewei | This may not be an issue if we reuse the TDRA field design for multiple PUSCH. I.e., the DCI may use up to 6 bits to indicate multiple SRS resource set transmissions similar to multiple PUSCH transmissions scheduled by the same DCI; if there is no collision for multiple PUSCH, likely there would be no collision for SRS resource sets, either. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not necessary. gNB can avoid such collision by indicating different “t”. |
| vivo | Agree with Ericsson’s view. It can be resolved after basic functionality agreed. |
| OPPO | We don’t think this is a problem. gNB should take care of that.  |
| ZTE | We are open to further study this issue. Either collision handling or some other approach can work to solve the overlapping issue between triggered SRS resources or between the triggered SRS resource and periodic SRS resource. Further considerations on UE capability of simultaneous SRS transmission among multiple CCs need to be taken into account. |
| Qualcomm | This should be discussed and is captured as FFS of 2.1.2 FL proposal. |
| LGE | OK to discuss. |
| Intel | Agree with Ericsson and vivo to discuss this issue. It should be clarified whether it is allowed to transmit a subset of the triggered SRS resource sets. |
| CMCC | Not necessary. gNB should avoid such a collision.  |

## Flexible DCI format

Last meeting we have agreed to support DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to trigger SRS without data and without CSI request. One remaining issue is whether to repurpose the unused fields. Companies’ views are summarized as follows.

Table 2-6

|  |
| --- |
| **Whether to repurpose unused fields in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI** |
| Alternatives | Detailed functionality | Companies |
| Yes | Indication of available slot position (cf. Section 2.1.3) | CMCC, Qualcomm, ZTE, Futurewei, ~~vivo~~, LG |
| Indication of slot offset (cf. Section 2.1.3) | vivo |
| Indication of a group of CCs for SRS transmission | Qualcomm, ZTE |
| TPC command for each CC | Qualcomm |
| Indication of resource blocks for SRS transmission | Ericsson, Futurewei |
| Indication of SRS port and beamforming | Futurewei |
| No | - | Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon |

***FL Proposal 2-6:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | In our tdoc, we provide some motivation for indication of RBs for SRS |
| Futurewei | We suggest to repurpose the unused fields for more flexibility of SRS transmissions, for example, partial frequency sounding, repetition / hopping behavior, etc.We support Ericsson’s view above. And we think this can also be combined with the partial frequency sounding design. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. The benefits of repurpose unused field for above use cases is not clear. The same discussion of 2.1.3. |
| vivo | We prefer to indicate slot offset directly rather than available slot offset concept in non-scheduled DCI as enough unused bits which can provide similar flexibility but with lower UE processing complexity. We also support SRS bandwidth indication with non-scheduling DCI  |
| OPPO  | We think repurpose unused fields in DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI is a lower priority issue. The main part of SRS design in 2.1 will have impact on this issue. Thus, we suggest to postpone the discussion until the design in Section 2.1 is clear.  |
| DOCOMO | We support to repurpose the unused fields for enhancing SRS flexibility  |
| Qualcomm | Other than explicit indication of the available slot ‘t’ per each SRS resource slot, there are multiple benefits to repurpose bit-fields:* DCI overhead reduction, which is part of WID: The non-scheduling DCI (format 0\_1,0\_2 without data) can trigger A-SRS across multiple CCs (e.g. a group of CCs) which reduce PDDCH overhead.
* Indication of the partial frequency resources of SRS (if PFS is agreed)
 |
| LGE | We propose SRS band can be reused by PDSCH/PUSCH FDRA field *in DCI with data*. It is considerable to align SRS band with PUSCH and/or PDSCH band for dynamic SRS bandwidth indication. This approach has a clear benefit to reuse former sounded/scheduled bandwidth with good channel quality and to avoid multi-UE SRS collision based on the multi-UE PUSCH/PDSCH multiplexing. |
| Intel | We don’t see a strong need to repurpose the existing DCI field. |
| CMCC | We are open to the indication of frequency domain resources of SRS by repurpose the unused field. |
| Futurewei2 | Support the RB / partial bandwidth indication as described by Ericsson, vivo, Qualcomm, LGE, and CMCC. For scheduling DCI, the FDRA field can apply to both the data and SRS. For non-scheduling DCI, the unused FDRA field can indicate SRS BW and frequency location. |

Another remaining issue is whether to enhance group-common DCI in addition. Companies’ views are summarized as follows.

Table 2-7

|  |
| --- |
| **Whether group-common DCI enhancement is supported additionally** |
| Alternatives | Number | Companies |
| Yes | 7 | Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, Sharp, Futurewei, vivo, Intel |
| No | 8 | Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Lenovo, MotM, LG |

***FL Proposal 2-7:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | Ok if benefits in performance can be shown and solutions is a simple modification to existing specification |
| Samsung | Group-common DCI is already used for the purpose of SRS carrier switching purpose. Hence we do not see why the other purposes are precluded. |
| Nokia/NSB | We may need to see a reasons or details whether group common DCI can provide reasonable benefits with simple modifications |
| Futurewei | GC DCI is useful to trigger multiple SRS by different UEs, by the same UE on same / different carriers. We suggest to enhance GC DCI.We think at least flexible timing should be supported in the GC DCI, with the same (or even stronger) motivation for the enhancement to UE-specific DCIs. |
| InterDigital | Support Group-common DCI. GC DCI is needed to support CSI estimation and UE pairing in MU-MIMO  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Samsung.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. Aperiodic SRS triggering is normally UE specific, it is not the use case for Group-common DCI.  |
| Vivo | Support. DCI format 2-3 can be enhanced with minimum specification impact on current SRS carrier switching mechanism to achieve more flexible aperiodic SRS triggering and reduce probability of PDCCH congestion.  |
| OPPO | Open to discuss it |
| Qualcomm | Support discussion to enhance GC-DCI 2\_3. |
| LGE | Agree with Samsung. |
| Intel | Open to further discuss it. |

## Usage/overhead reduction

One remaining issue is whether to support configuring one SRS resource set with multiple usages explicitly in specification. Table 2-8 summarize companies’ views.

Table 2-8

|  |
| --- |
| **Whether to support configuring one SRS resource set with multiple usages explicitly** |
|  | Number | Companies |
| Support specification change | 6 | Nokia, NSB, Apple, Ericsson, vivo, DOCOMOEricsson: Further support antenna selection for PUSCH with ceil(n/m)-bit SRI field. |
| Implementation can solve the issue | 8 | Xiaomi, Futurewei, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Lenovo, MotM |

***FL proposal 2-8:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | Implementation cannot solve this as there will be ambiguity in power control parameters to use. Also, as discussed in our contribution, it is time to introduce closed loop antenna selection for PUSCH to catch up on LTE functionality which is yet another use case for multiple usages for SRS set |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree on Ericsson’s comment. We do not see how it can be solved by implementation. |
| Futurewei | We suggest to treat this discussion as lower priority. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Implementation solution is enough. |
| Lenovo/MotM | It can be reached by implementation. |
| Vivo | For consistent UE behavior a simple clarification in spec can be considered as well as flexibility in using SRS with different usage with time domain behavior  |
| OPPO | Implementation based solution is sufficient |
| DOCOMO | We support for specification change. Further, agree with Ericsson regarding the closed loop antenna selection possibility for PUSCH with this enhancement |
| Intel | Open to further discuss it. |

## Flexible antenna switching

Multiple companies discuss the issue of indicating the number of antennas to support more flexible antenna switching in dynamic signaling. Their views are summarized in the following table.

Table 2-9

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number | Companies |
| Support indicating the number of Tx/Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching via MAC CE or DCI | 6 |  Qualcomm, Ericsson, ZTE, MotM, Lenovo, Intel |
| UE Report the preferred Tx or Rx antenna number together with other CSI contents to the gNB to trigger the change or degradation of the SRS antenna switching configurations. | 1 | Xiaomi |

***FL proposal 2-9:*** *Support L1 or L2 based adaptation of the number of Tx and/or Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching*

* *This indication is applicable for at least one of the following*
	+ *Case 1: Aperiodic SRS*
	+ *Case 2: Periodic and semi-persistent SRS*
* *FFS via MAC CE or DCI*
* *FFS the considerations on dynamic DL MIMO layer adaptation*
* *FFS UE reporting of the preferred Tx/Rx antenna number*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | It seems no company oppose, or? 😉 |
| Samsung | Support the FL proposal in principle. Besides, a related issue, dynamic DL MIMO layer adaptation, is being treated in UE power saving agenda. We prefer to discuss all those issues together. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view with Samsung |
| Futurewei | Question: As described in our contribution, there may be some CSI issues with dynamic antenna number changes. If a UE changes its Rx antennas from 8 to 2, the existing CSI is no longer valid. The CSI issues need to be resolved before further consideration of this discussion. Any thoughts about the CSI issue? |
| Xiaomi | We think it is beneficial both for the UE and the network to allow the UE to trigger the change or fall back of antenna switching configuration from UE perspective. In cases like Power saving mode, a subset of antennas is used for other RAT,etc.Also, as another option to the flexible indication discussion , we would still like to suggest the extension of the current indication method, by allowing multiple configurations of preferred antenna switching by RRC with different identifiers for the BWP, and SRS request field in DCI can be further enhanced … |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The use case is not clear, may need more clarification. Is this for AP-SRS, SP-SRS or P-SRS?**Further comments:**Not support the feature for aperiodic SRS. In our understanding, the benefits claimed by proponents, such as power saving, are for SP-SRS and P-SRS, not for A-SRS since only once transmission for A-SRS. So, the use case should be P-SRS and Semi-persistent SRS. By the way, the proposal include MAC-CE and DCI. In our understanding, only MAC-CE is needed. |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support FL proposal. |
| Vivo | Before discussing the proposal, few things such as impact to UE implementation, potential benefit, etc. should be clarified. In normal UE implementation, the RF circuitry, switching modules are very much related to hardware design, and a dynamic indication may have unseen impact on UE implementation. For DL MIMO layer adaptation, dynamic BWP switching can efficiently support power saving purpose. We don’t see strong motivation of dynamic indication of Tx/Rx antennas for SRS.  |
| OPPO | The use cases and benefit are not justified. More discussions are needed |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal. We think it should be applicable to aperiodic SRS only.Regarding the CSI issue, gNB can configure CSI reports with different rank restrictions, and dynamically trigger one to coordinate with the CQI change. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL proposal. * We do not think that maxMIMO layer adaptation should be considered and believe that Rel-16 mechanics of per-BWP maxMIMO layer is sufficient.
 |
| LGE | We have similar view as vivo.The motivation and benefit is not clear, since the number of Tx/Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching can be configured for a UE based on UE capability reporting. If the UE want to sound for subset of antennas for power saving, UE can report corresponding capability to gNB. On the other hand, from gNB perspective, measuring not subset of SRS ports but all SRS ports of the UE for DL scheduling has no harm. We think RRC based solution should be a baseline. |
| Intel | We think the easiest way is to allow the gNB to trigger one SRS resource set from multiple configured SRS resource sets. For example, 2 aperiodic SS resource sets are configured for 1T4R, and only 1 SRS resource set is triggered for 1T2R operation.The following modification is suggested:*Support ~~indicating~~ dynamic adaptation of the number of Tx/Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching ~~via MAC-CE or DCI,~~ at least for aperiodic SRS.** *FFS the considerations on dynamic DL MIMO layer adaptation*
* *FFS via MAC-CE or DCI*
 |
| Futurewei2 | Thanks for ZTE’s reply on our CSI question. We are still unsure about the suggested solution. The reply seems to suggest multiple / parallel CSI processes for different antenna configurations. However it is unclear to us how the CSI measurement resources are configured and measured by the UE --- to maintain the CSIs with different antenna configurations, the UE may have to switch back and forth among different antenna configurations. Please further clarify. Maybe a CSI measurement reset is needed every time the antenna configuration changes. |
| Nokia/NSB | Modified FL proposal:We suggest separated discussion for ‘T’ and ‘R’, since it is obvious that the complexity and usecases should be totally different for the adaption of ‘T’ or ‘R’. For exmpale, adaption of ‘R’ can be simply done by triggering some of configured SRS resource set, wich is not supported option in Rel-15/16. So we suggest following modification (also including some editorial changes): ***FL proposal 2-9:*** *Support dynamic adaptation of the number of Tx and/or Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching** *This indication is applicable for at least one of the following*
	+ *Case 1: Aperiodic SRS*
	+ *Case 2: Periodic and semi-persistent SRS*
* *FFS via MAC CE or DCI*
* *FFS the considerations on dynamic DL MIMO layer adaptation*
* *FFS UE reporting of the preferred Tx/Rx antenna number*
 |
| Ericsson2 | Support FL proposal / Nokias modificaiton  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | We are not positive on the proposals since the use case and benefits are still not clear. But if majority companies want the feature, the proposal need to be revised:1. For “*dynamic adaptation of the number*”, we cannot say “dynamic adaptation”, since there is MAC-CE based solutions. 2. Only support MAC-CE based, if the case is for power saving, we do not see additional benefits with DCI changing, which consuming DCI payload. 3. As we clarified, we only see there may be benefits on periodic and semi-persistent cases. The feature should be based on periodic and semi-persistent first, and further discuss the aperiodic one.*Support MAC-CE based adaptation of the number of Tx and/or Rx antennas for SRS antenna switching** + *This indication is applicable for at least Periodic and semi-persistent SRS*
* + *FFS: Aperiodic SRS*
* *FFS the considerations on dynamic DL MIMO layer adaptation*
* *FFS UE reporting of the preferred Tx/Rx antenna number*
 |
| Ericsson3 | Do not support the new proposal where aperiodic SRS is FFS ince the aperiodic SRS is in Ericsson view more important than P or SP. This SRS is mainly used for DL CSI, and triggering SRS depends on whether there is DL traffic for a UE. Hence, aperiodic SRS is more useful for this use case.Also, the feature is primarily for overhead reduction, as whether there is power saving benefits is a bit questionable.Hence, we are not ok to set the AP-SRS as FFS while agreeing on the (somewhat less interesting) SP-SRS and P-SRS cases.  |

## Others

The following are proposed by one company.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support CC-specific SRS triggering in carrier aggregation | Intel |
| Support flexible trigger state configuration for multiple SRS resource sets with different usages in multi-TRP | Intel |
| Support one usage of SRS with multiple time-domain types | CMCC |
| Support to trigger aperiodic SRS by non-scheduled DCI format 1-1 and 1-2 | vivo, LG |
| Support update the association between aperiodic SRS resource set(s) and aperiodic SRS triggering states by MAC CE | Lenovo, MotM |

# Antenna switching up to 8Rx

## Resource set configurations

On the agreed set of antenna switching configurations {1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R, 4T8R}, companies’ input on the supported SRS resource set configurations is summarized as the following table. Note that 4T6R is not included as the decision is pending.

Table 3-1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | xTyR | Details/Companies |
| Define set distribution patterns | 1T6R | * 1 set, 6 resources: CMCC (periodic/semi-persistent), Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Spreadtum, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, DOCOMO
* 2 sets, 3+3: Nokia, NSB, CMCC (aperiodic), Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, CATT, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MotM, vivo
* 3 sets, 1+2+3: CMCC (aperiodic), CATT
* 3 sets, 2+2+2: CMCC (aperiodic), Xiaomi, Samsung, CATT, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MotM
* 3 sets, 1+1+4: Samsung, CATT
* 2 sets, 1+5: Samsung, CATT
* 2 sets, 2+4: Samsung, CATT
* 4 sets, 1+1+2+2: Samsung
 |
| 1T8R | * 1 set, 8 resources: CMCC (periodic/semi-persistent), Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm (periodic/semi-persistent), Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, DOCOMO
* 2 sets, 4+4: Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, Qualcomm, vivo, Spreadtrum, Sony, Lenovo/MotM
* 2 sets, 3+5: CATT, Lenovo/MotM
* 2 sets, 2+6: CATT, Lenovo/MotM
* 3 sets, 2+3+3: CMCC (aperiodic), CATT
* 4 sets, 1+1+3+3: CMCC (aperiodic), CATT
* 4 sets, 1+2+2+3: CMCC (aperiodic), CATT
* 4 sets, 2+2+2+2: CMCC (aperiodic), Xiaomi, CATT, Lenovo/MotM
 |
| 2T6R | * 1 set, 3 resources: Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, DOCOMO
* 2 sets, 1+2: CMCC (aperiodic), Xiaomi, Samsung, CATT, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MotM
* 3 sets, 1+1+1: Xiaomi, Samsung
 |
| 2T8R | * 1 set, 4 resources: CMCC (periodic, semi-persistent), Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, Huawei, HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, Sony, CATT, Lenovo/MotM, DOCOMO
* 2 sets, 2+2: Nokia, NSB, CMCC (aperiodic), Xiaomi, Samsung, CATT, vivo, Lenovo/MotM
* 2 sets, 1+3: CMCC (aperiodic), CATT, Lenovo/MotM, vivo
* 3 sets, 1+1+2: Samsung
* 4 sets, 1+1+1+1: Xiaomi, Samsung
 |
| 4T8R | * 1 set, 2 resources: Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Spreadtrum, Sony, Lenovo/MotM, vivo, DOCOMO
* 2 sets, 1+1: Xiaomi, Samsung
 |
| Flexible configuration | Support RRC to flexibly configure the number of resource sets and distribute the SRS resources in the resource sets | Ericsson, ZTE, OPPO (for 1T6R (<=2 sets), 1T8R (<=4 sets) and 2T8R (<=2 sets)), Huawei, HiSilicon (for 1T8R), Intel (<=2 sets) |

It can be observed in the above table that companies have very divergent requests on the supported resource distribution patterns and number of resource sets, while flexible configuration can address most of (if not all) the requests. Further,

* For legacy 1T4R case, flexible distribution of 4 resources (1+3 or 2+2) in two sets has already been supported in the current specification.
* Along the direction of flexible configuration, a lot of discussion time can be saved. The only discussion point is the maximum number of sets for each xTyR.

Based on the above observation and principle, FL propose the following to progress.

***FL proposal 3-1:***

* *For aperiodic antenna switching SRS, support to configure N <=N\_max resource sets, where totally K resources are distributed in the N resource sets flexibly based on RRC configuration.*
* *For 1T6R, K=6, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 1T8R, K=8, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 2T6R, K=3, N\_max = [3], and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 2T8R, K=4, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 4T8R, K=2, N\_max = [2], and each resource has 4 ports.*
* *For 1T4R, K=4, N\_max = 4, and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 2T4R, K=2, N\_max = 2, and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 1T2R, K=2, N\_max = 2, and each resource has 1 port.*
* *FFS other configurations considering UE coherence capability*
* *FFS the number of resources and resource sets for semi-persistent and periodic antenna switching SRS*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Ericsson | We would like to ask RAN1 companies for support to extend this FL proposal based on our feedback from real life deployments of NR. As discussed in our contribution, 1T4R and 2T4R, 1T2R antenna switching for some operators using special slots with 2 UL symbols is not possible by current spec. By enabling using special slot with only 2 UL symbols for SRS antenna switching transmissions would increase TDD efficiency and throughput significantly in their networks as UL slots can then fully be used for PUSCH/PUCCH. Hence, we think this FL proposal can be straightforwardly be extended to also include 1T4R, 2T4R and 1T2R cases, i.e.* *For 1T4R, K=4, N\_max = 4, and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 2T4R, K=2, N\_max = 2, and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 1T2R, K=2, N\_max = 2, and each resource has 1 port.*
 |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. |
| CATT | Support FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think gNB can select proper configuration for SRS antenna switching. So we do not want to define ‘T and R specific’ value of N\_max.  |
| InterDigital | Don’t support, Need to consider UE coherence capability, especially for 4T8R |
| Xiaomi | Support E///’s suggestion to include other configurations as a whole solution, more discussion is needed… |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think both the resources number and sets number should be extended to increase the flexibility of SRS configurations, including periodic, semi-persistent and aperiodic SRS resources. However, the proposal here seems only for aperiodic case, the number of SRS resources and resource sets are also should be discussed for periodic and semi-persistent SRS.The number of SRS resource sets in current antenna switching is also limited. However, in practical cases, more than one set is required for periodic or semi-persistent SRS resources. So, such extending on SRS resources sets should also be applicable for 1T4R, 2T4R, 1T2R, T=R.One more comment is for the added FFS part “coherence capability”, what’s the intention here, or what’s the impact on antenna switching?*For antenna switching SRS with 1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R or 4T8R, support to configure N <=N\_max resource sets for aperiodic SRS, where totally K<=K\_max resources are distributed in the N resource sets flexibly based on RRC configuration.** *For 1T6R, K\_max=12, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 1T8R, K\_max=16, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 2T6R, K\_max=6, N\_max = [3], and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 2T8R, K\_max=8, N\_max = [4], and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 4T8R, K\_max=4, N\_max = [2], and each resource has 4 ports.*

*FFS: Number of SRS resources and SRS resource sets for periodic and semi-persistent cases;**FFS: Extending number of SRS resource sets for 1T4R, 1T2R, 2T4R, T=R.* **Further comments:**For the periodic and semi-persistent SRS, **at least two sets** are required to guarantee the flexibility in configuration. Some example use cases are shown as follows:Two sets semi-persistent SRS resources are configured with different periodicity/frequency-time resources, MAC-CE can active or de-active one of them according to traffic to avoid the collision.One set periodic SRS resource and one set semi-persistent SRS resource are configured with different periodicity. The semi-persistent SRS can be MAC-CE based active or de-active based on traffic.So, we prefer the following revisions on the proposal:* *For semi-persistent and periodic antenna switching SRS with 1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R or 4T8R, support at least 2 SRS resource sets and each resource set with K resources for each xTyR*
* *For 1T6R, K=6, and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 1T8R, K=8, and each resource has 1 port.*
* *For 2T6R, K=3, and each resource has 2 ports.*
* *For 2T8R, K=4, and each resource has 2 ports.*
	+ *For 4T8R, K=2, and each resource has 4 ports.*
 |
| Lenovo/MotM | Support FL proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| vivo | Corrected our position on number of sets above. And, we don’t see necessity of flexible configuration of number of sets for one combination of nTmR, network can already configure SRS symbols on any symbols within a slot. Using same principle as in Rel-16, extend as necessary to support certain combination.  |
| OPPO | Support the FL proposal with the assumption that some *N\_max* may be smaller than the temporary value |
| ZTE | Support the FL proposal for aperiodic SRS. It should be noted that Rel-15 has already support such flexible configuration for aperiodic 1T4R.The FL proposal needs to be further clarified it is for aperiodic SRS only. For periodic and semi-persistent SRS, as the periodicity and slot offset is configured per resource, there is no issue to support only one SRS resource set for each xTyR. |
| NEC | We share similar view with Huawei to increase the flexibility. And we are fine with the proposal updated by Huawei. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL proposal. * The first FFS on UE phase coherency is not clear why it is needed.
 |
| LGE | Generally fine with FL proposal. |
| Intel | We think the FL proposal is mainly for aperiodic SRS.We agree with Ericsson on the extended configuration of 1T4R, 1T2R and 2T4R.In addition, we suggest adding the following FFS to FL proposal since the maximum number of SRS resource sets is a bit large.* *FFS: whether the gNB can flexibly trigger one SRS resource set from multiple configured aperiodic SRS resource sets*

Also, it’s not clear why we need to consider UE coherence capability |
| LGE2 | We are somewhat confused regarding the last sub-bullet “*FFS: whether the gNB can flexibly trigger one SRS resource set from multiple configured aperiodic SRS resource sets*”. Is it the same thing with proposal 2-9 or not? I think it is the subset of proposal 2-9. So, we can jointly discuss about this FFS part in proposal 2-9 and it is not needed for this section. |
| OPPO2 | Regarding to “*FFS: whether the gNB can flexibly trigger one SRS resource set from multiple configured aperiodic SRS resource sets*”, we share the same view as LGE that it should be in Proposal 2-9 rather than in this proposal.For periodic and semi-persistent SRS, as the periodicity and slot offset is configured per resource, only one SRS resource set is sufficient for each xTyR. As for the example illustrated by Huawei to show the flexibility, it should be discussed in Proposal 2-9. |
| Ericsson2 | It seems our proposal to also include 4R and 2R switching cases in this enhancement to resolve operators headache for the special slot with 2UL symbols, was supported by multiple companies. No company were against. Not sure why it is listed as FFS in the FL proposal?  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | 1. Not sure why to remove the periodic and semi-persistent cases. How many SRS resources and SRS resource sets are still not clear for periodic and semi-persistent cases. We prefer to capture the following proposals:* ***For semi-persistent and periodic antenna switching SRS with 1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R or 4T8R, support at least 2 SRS resource sets and each resource set with K resources for each xTyR***
* ***For 1T6R, K=6, and each resource has 1 port.***
* ***For 1T8R, K=8, and each resource has 1 port.***
* ***For 2T6R, K=3, and each resource has 2 ports.***
* ***For 2T8R, K=4, and each resource has 2 ports.***
* ***For 4T8R, K=2, and each resource has 4 ports.***

To ZTE, totally only one resource set for periodic and semi-persistent is not sufficient, we have clarified the cases in my previous reply:Two sets semi-persistent SRS resources are configured with different periodicity/frequency-time resources, MAC-CE can active or de-active one of them according to traffic to avoid the collision.One set periodic SRS resource and one set semi-persistent SRS resource are configured with different periodicity. The semi-persistent SRS can be MAC-CE based active or de-active based on traffic.2. Then, for the discussion on legacy antenna switching issues, the following proposal should be super bullet (same level with main bullet) since periodic and semi-persistent should be included as well. And the cases with T=R cases also need to be included to be discussed.***FFS extension to increase N\_max for 1T4R, 2T4R, T=R and 1T2R cases*** |
| Ericsson3 | Support the new proposal. One comment on the 1T6R case, although still in brackets, it would make more sense if Kmax=[3] |
| InterDigital 2  | Further clarifications related to considering UE coherence capability,Here, the problem is that for DL CSI estimation through SRS transmission, we consider reciprocity of wireless channel. Therefore, we could assume that the transposed of the measured UL channel represents a good estimate of the DL channel, and hence it can be used for determination of DL CSI. However in a partially/non-coherent UE, the phase/amplitude characteristics of receive paths is not the same as of TX RF paths. Therefore, any phase/amplitude imbalances imposed by the TX RF chain affect SRS transmission, and so it will be reflected in the measured UL channel that is different than the actual UL wireless channel. In other words, let’s say that we have $H\_{DL}=H\_{UL}^{T}$, and so, the estimated UL channel $\tilde{H}\_{UL}=H\_{UL}T\_{UE}$ where $T\_{UE}$ is the distortion imposed by TX RF chain of partially/non-coherent UE, then the DL channel is estimated as transpose of $\tilde{H}\_{UL}$ that is $T\_{UE}^{T}H\_{UL}^{T}$**=**$T\_{UE}^{T}H\_{DL}$that is different from the actual $H\_{DL}$. Therefore in our view, UE coherence capability should be considered for configuration of SRS resources. So our modified proposal for 4T8R that could also be considered to support 4T6R is the following,* For 4T8R,
	+ For fullAndPartialAndNonCoherent UEs, K=[2], N\_max = 2, and each resource has 4 ports.
	+ FFS for partialAndNonCoherent and nonCoherent UEs

We are currently working on some simulations, and plan to share our evaluation results in the next meeting. |

## Whether 4T6R is supported

One remaining issue from last meeting is whether 4T6R is supported. Companies’ views are summarized as follows.

Table 3-2

|  |
| --- |
| **Whether to support 4T6R SRS antenna switching** |
|  | Number | Companies |
| Yes | 13 | NEC, Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, InterDigital, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, MotM, MediaTek |
| No or deprioritize | 5 | Ericsson, Futurewei, Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo |

***FL Proposal 3-2:*** *Further discuss in RAN1#104e*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Samsung | Since some products can have larger form factor such as CPE-type future product than a normal smart phone, we think that 4T6R can be also a case to consider. Also, if 4T8R is supported, we think that 4T6R should support the same. |
| Nokia/NSB | Sharing similar view with Samsung. We may need to allow flexibility supporting some specific implementation of UE antenna. |
| Xiaomi | Support 4T6R configuration since it is beneficial to allow the diversity for UE implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support. From companies’ Tdoc, we are still confused on how to mapping antennas and ports, how to address the issues on insertion loss for 4T6R, andwhat’s the benefits with such switching in a practical scenarios. As we discussed in our Tdocs, following problems should be addressed before we supporting the case: practical physical antenna mappings, impact of unbalanced insertion loss and potential power and coverage imbalance. |
| Vivo | We prefer to deprioritize 4T6R |
| OPPO | Although we don’t 4R6R is a typical implementation, we can keep open to it |
| NEC | We support 4T6R. |
| DOCOMO | Support 4T6R |
| Qualcomm | Support 4T6R as 3GPP spec should forward looking and doesn’t not preclude specific UE implementation of antenna switching for 6Rx devices.* In our tdoc, we extensively discussed all concerns that raised up by other companies including physical antenna mapping, insertion loss, SRS configuration and performance motivation for 4T6R.
 |
| Intel | We are open to discuss the supporting of 4T6R. |

## Others

The following is proposed by one company.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Enhance SRS resource set configuration for 1T2R, 1T4R and 2T4R | Ericsson |
| Need to consider UE coherence capability, especially for 4T8R | InterDigital |

# Coverage and capacity enhancements

Companies’ views on SRS coverage and capacity enhancements are summarized in the following table.

Table 4-1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Schemes | Number | Companies |
| Class 2 | Scheme 2-0: Increase the number of repetition symbols in one slot | 21 | NEC, Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple, Qualcomm, Sharp, ZTE, Futurewei, MotM, Lenovo, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, LG, Intel, Spreadtrum, Sony, OPPO |
| Scheme 2-1: Inter-slot repetition | 6 | Nokia, NSB, Futurewei, vivo, MediaTek, Intel |
| Scheme 2-2: Repetition with TD-OCC | 4 | NEC, ZTE, MediaTek, Intel |
| Scheme 2-3: Repetition with CS hopping | 3 | Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek |
| Class 3 | Scheme 3-1: RB-level partial frequency sounding | 18 | NEC (Reducing subband size for frequency hopping), CMCC, Xiaomi, Qualcomm (with only contiguous RBs), Ericsson (frequency hopping enhancements that allow contiguous portions of the band to be sounded in each slot), NTT DOCOMO, Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI, ZTE (contiguous RBs in a hop), Futurewei (a unified design of partial frequency sounding with granularity of N PRBs), Huawei, HiSilicon (for SRS hopping BW > 4 RBs), MotM, Lenovo, vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Spreadtrum |
| Scheme 3-2: Subcarrier-level partial frequency sounding | 13 | NEC, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Qualcomm, OPPO, MotM, Lenovo, CATT, vivo, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, Sony |
| Scheme 3-3: Subband-level partial frequency sounding | 9 | NEC (Reducing the number of hoppings), Sharp, Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI, MotM, Lenovo, vivo, MediaTek, Futurewei (unified design that can also support 3-1, 3-4, 3-5) |
| Scheme 3-4: Partial-frequency sounding schemes assisted with CSI-RS | 3 | CMCC, Qualcomm, DOCOMO |
| Scheme 3-5: Dynamic change of SRS bandwidth with RB-level subband size scaling | 2 | vivo, LG |

Relevant simulation observations submitted to RAN1#104e are summarized in Table 6-2 in Appendix.

It can be observed that the majority of companies support Scheme 2-0, Scheme 3-1 and Scheme 3-2. Further, based on companies’ evaluation results,

* Scheme 2-0 can provide link-level gain, but it has negative impact on SRS capacity;
* Scheme 3-1 can provide either similar or better link-level performance compared with Rel-15 baseline, and it can provide SRS capacity gain;
	+ Non-contiguous RBs in one OFDM symbol has negative impact on PAPR;
* Scheme 3-2 can provide similar link-level performance compared with Rel-15 baseline, and it can provide SRS capacity gain.

Considering the majority views and simulation observations, FL proposes the following (support all three schemes: Scheme 2-0, Scheme 3-1 and Scheme 3-2) to progress.

***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *For Rel-17 SRS capacity and coverage enhancement, support the following*

* *Increase the maximum number of repetition symbols in one slot and one SRS resource to S*
	+ *Support at least one S value from {8, 10, 12, 14}*
		- *FFS other candidate values*
* *When frequency hopping is enabled, support to transmit SRS only in* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *contiguous RBs in one frequency hop, where* $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *indicates the number of RBs in a frequency hop as configured by BSRS and CSRS*
	+ *Support at least one PF value from {2, [3], 4, 8}*
		- *FFS other candidate values, e.g., non-integer values for PF*
	+ *Note: SRS sequence shorter than the minimum length supported in the current specification is not pursued.*
	+ *FFS detailed signaling mechanism to determine PF and the location of the* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}} $*RBs*
* *Support Comb 8*
	+ *Note: SRS sequence shorter than the minimum length supported in the current specification is not pursued.*
* *FFS whether and if needed, how to use harmonized approach to define the three supported schemes*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. We support increasing the maximum number of repetition symbols based on scheme 2-0 which is an intuitive way to enhance coverage without minimal impact on implementation. We also support Comb 8 which can be based on scheme 3-2. For the case of scheme 3-1, we are not okay with non-contiguous case since subcarriers with unequal spacing would request a complex channel estimation and would not be good for PAPR as FL mentioned, but we can support the contiguous case as mentioned in the second bullet of FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support 1st bullet and 3rd bullet. We need further clarification whether 2nd bullet would request some new operations possibly causing gNB complexity or works to confirm the feasibility, e.g., support of SRS transmission bandwidth which is not supported in Rel-15/16, etc.  |
| Futurewei | As discussed in our contribution, Schemes 3-1, 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5 can be supported with one unified design, i.e., partial frequency sounding with granularity of N PRBs, where N = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc. Therefore, we suggest to combine the schemes (which should lead to more supporting companies) and include the combined scheme in the FL proposal:*For Rel-17 SRS capacity and coverage enhancement, support the following** *Increase the maximum number of repetition symbols in one slot and one SRS resource to S*
	+ *Support at least one S value from {8, 12, 14}*
* *When frequency hopping is enabled, support to transmit SRS only in* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *contiguous RBs in one frequency hop, where* $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *indicates the number of RBs in a frequency hop as configured by BSRS and CSRS*
	+ *Support at least one PF value from {2, 3, 4}*
* *Support Comb 8*
* *Support sounding on one or more segments of N PRBs, where N = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc., and FFS non-contiguous segments.*
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **We are fine for the second bullet on the FL’s proposal, but not support increasing repetition number and Comb-8. We also not fine to add Scheme 3-4 in the FFS part.**For the first bullet, as we shown in our Tdoc, increasing the repetition number is the same performance with frequency hopping, but loss the multiplexing capacity and also increasing the collision possibility for inter-cell, i.e., inter-cell interference. So, we do not support.In our understanding, inter-cell interference is a main challenge in the practical scenarios, which is interference limited. Especially, with the larger repetition number, inter-cell interference will be increased. As we analyzed in our Tdoc, current sequence hopping and group hopping can’t randomize inter-cell interference well due to the limited number of sequences in sequence hopping (only two) and potential sequence group collision. CS hopping is a better way to solve the problem. It won’t cause sequence group collision and have enough CS value for hopping. So, CS hopping also should be supported. By the way, supporting repetition increasing, the inter-cell interference also should be handled by CS hopping.Then, for Comb 8, we don’t see any benefit compare to comb 2 and comb 4. Although number of comb is increased, but it will reduce the number of available cyclic shift per comb, i.e., the SRS capacity don’t change. **Further comments:****Not support the proposal.** In the proposal, it seems more than 3 solutions (other solutions are also included with FFS) may be supported. We are not fine with so many solutions in the proposals, which requires complexity on UE and gNB to implementation and big standards efforts. Prefer to down-select one scheme in each Class.  |
| Lenovo/MotM | We support the 1st bullet and 3rd bullet and share the similar view on the 2nd bullet. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with 1st /2nd bullets.For comb8, we prefer a larger comb can also work together with repetition. For example, Comb8 with 2 repetition is equivalent to comb4. Furthermore, hopping different comb offset can be enabled (and will have similar pattern as R16 position SRS).  |
| Vivo | For repetition, both of intra-slot and inter-slot repetition provide visible gain with R increasing. And we believe inter-slot repetition is a supplementary method if there are no sufficient symbols for SRS repetition in one slot.Scheme 2-0 and scheme 2-1 are not mutually exclusive as well as relative schemes in Class 3. For partial frequency sounding, scheme 3-3 and scheme 3-5 support SRS capacity enhancement without performance degradation and without impact on PAPR.  |
| OPPO | We support scheme 2-0 rather than Scheme 2-1. We have revised the table accordingly to reflect our position. We support the 1st bullet and 3rd bullet. The 2nd bullet achieve similar functionality as 3rd bullet. We don’t need to design duplicated features for the same purpose. Moreover, the scheme of 2nd bullet needs more standardization efforts. |
| ZTE | We support the first and second sub-bullet.The scheme in the third sub-bullet has performance loss compared with the second one based on our simulation. The loss comes from the reduction of detection window reduction in time-domain algorithms. Further, we agree with Huawei that the actually number of Cses which can be multiplexed in one symbol is lower in considering the smaller time domain window, esp. in the case of high delay spread. This reduces the potential gain of SRS capacity for the 3-rd sub-bullet. |
| MediaTek | For the 1st bullet, we prefer to add following as multiple companies think it worth* *FFS: inter-slot repetition*

For the 3rd bullet, in addition to just saying “support comb 8”, we prefer a larger comb can also work together with repetition and can achieve similar performance as lower comb without (or less) repetitions. For example, Comb8 with 2 repetition can be manipulated to form an equivalent comb4 by hopping to different comb offset (which result in a similar pattern as R16 position SRS). A tradeoff between capacity and coverage can be made by adjusting comb size and repetition number.Also, for 2nd and 3rd bullet (both under the scope of partial frequency sounding), they share many similar functionalities and should work with repetition symbols to accommodate both capacity and coverage. A systematic way to define the scheme is highly desired. In our tdoc, a hierarchical resource allocation based on tree-structured is discussed and can apply to multiple schemes. We believe it can be a good starting point to merge/harmonize multiple schemes.  |
| NEC | We support the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets of the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support FL proposal.* Partial frequency sounding should be supported on contiguous RBs only to avoid increase of PAPR and the implications on emission requirements.
* Support comb8 as our LLS/SLS analysis shows performance gain.
* *PF* value of 3 may results into fractional RBs.

*Support at least one PF value from {2, [3], 4, 8}*Support association with CSI-RS as it enables a pre-whitened SRS which implicitly provides gNB interference statistics at the UE and improves DL TPUT.  |
| LGE | Support at least first bullet(scheme 2-0) and second bullet(scheme 3-1). |
| Intel | For Class-2, we support Scheme 2-0, 2-1 and 2-2.For increased repetitions, we think the consecutive repetition across slots have the same performance as the intra-slot repetition, since the slot is just a logical concept. With cross slot repetition, more flexibility could be achieved.Regarding the FL proposal, we can support the first bullet with the following change:* *Increase the maximum number of repetition symbols in one or multiple slots and one SRS resource to S*
	+ *Support at least one S value from {8, 12, 14}*

In addition, we could be supportive on the third bullet (*Support Comb 8*) in FL proposal. We think one solution for SRS partial sounding is enough, which is Comb 8, since Comb 8 is already supported in spec. |
| CMCC | Support the 1st and 2nd sub-bullet. Support further study and discussion for the 4th sub-bullet.Scheme 3-1,3-2,3-3 has similar performance in shorten the cycling period of sounding the full bandwidth part. The main benefit of 3-3 is to shorten the cycling period. 3-1 and 3-2 has similar performance in power boosting and increase the capacity. Capacity gain provided by 3-2 may degrade in the high delay spread scenario, which is very typical in the Urban Macro scenarios.  |
| Futurewei2 | Support the proposal in principle.Regarding the 2nd main bullet, we wonder if “*When frequency hopping is enabled*” and “*in one frequency hop*” are needed. We think the intention here is just to say on one OFDM symbol, the SRS BW can be smaller. Thus we suggest to remove frequency hopping here.We suggest to also discuss the frequency location of the $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$contiguous RBs.We think non-integer values for *PF* are needed to make the partial frequency sounding more useful. With the set of {2,[3],4,8}, the actual SRS BW can only be ½, [1/3], ¼, 1/8 of the configured BW. If we wish to have the actual SRS BW of ¾ of the configured BW, then integer *PF* values are incapable of supporting so. If, however, fractional *PF* are allowed, such as 4/3, then sounding on ¾ of the configured BW becomes possible. Regarding Qualcomm’s comment on fractional RBs, this can be resolved easily with rounding operations (whether it is rounding up or down can be discussed later). Note that *PF* of 8 can also lead to fractional RBs if no rounding is performed. Regarding Schemes 3-1 and 3-3, it may be considered jointly with DCI enhancement to indicate RBs for SRS as discussed in Sec. 2.2, which is supported by Ericsson, Qualcomm, LGE, and CMCC (in addition to Scheme 3-3 proponents). Therefore, we suggest to consider the DCI indication of RBs (or subbands) in this proposal. It may or may not be done with non-contiguous SRS. Some PAPR concern on potentially non-contiguous segments of SRS, as shown by evaluations in our contribution, with 2~3 segments the PAPR increase is within 0.5~1.5 dB, which can be used for cell-center Ues. Splitting non-contiguous segments on multiple OFDM symbols is also a possibility.Regarding Scheme 3-4, based on our understanding of the scheme, it requires to link SRS to CSI-RS and CSI-IM resources for interference acquisition, and the CSI-IM needs to be captured in the bullet. Also as we show in our contribution, there are different ways to use SRS to convey DL interference information. Therefore, the solution may not be based on pre-whitening and we can further discuss. Regarding the 1st bullet, as discussed in our contribution, the increased time-domain repetition should be accompanied with reduced frequency-domain resources, to offset the negative impact on SRS capacity and to focus the power for cell-edge Ues. In this sense, the 1st bullet may not be standalone.So our suggestion modifications are:* *Support to transmit SRS only in* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *contiguous RBs in one OFDM symbol, where* $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *indicates the number of RBs as configured by BSRS and CSRS*
	+ *Support at least one PF value from {2, [3], 4, 8}*
		- *FFS other candidate values, e.g., non-integer values for PF*
	+ *Note: SRS sequence shorter than the minimum length supported in the current specification is not pursued.*
	+ *FFS detailed signaling mechanism to determine PF*
	+ *FFS the frequency location of the* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *contiguous RBs, rounding of* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *to obtain an integer number of RBs*

…* *FFS considerations on the association between the partial sounded SRS resources and CSI-RS/CSI-IM resources to improve DL CSI acquisition*
* *Support DCI indication of RBs / subbands / partial bandwidth for SRS*
 |
| Intel2 | Regarding FL Proposal 3-1 (antenna switching up to 8Rx) and FL Proposal 4-1 (coverage and capacity enhancement), we think one thing should be firstly clarified is how many OFDM symbols could be configured for one SRS resource and which OFDM symbols within one slot could be used for SRS. For Rel-17 SRS design, should we follow the legacy Rel-15 configuration or Rel-16 positioning SRS configuration as starting point?We think this issue should be firstly clarified and it should be straightforward. |
| OPPO2 | Without “in each hop”, the current version of the 2nd bullet seems to only introduce different BW for SRS if hopping is not configured. Is that correct understanding? If so, why the current SRS BW is not enough? For example, if *in* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$= 6, what’s the big different of 6 and 4, or 6 and 8? Regarding the comment on the reduction of available cyclic shift per comb for Comb-8 base solution, we think the solution in the 2nd bullet suffer the similar issue as the reduction of SRS bandwidth will reduce the multiplexing capacity as well. There is no much difference.We have made good progress that three solutions are selected among so many candidates. However, there are still duplicated solution for the same purpose, which will lead to unnecessary complexity at UE and gNB. Thus, we propose to further down-select some solution(s) out of there three bullet, and the proposal can be revised as below*For Rel-17 SRS capacity and coverage enhancement, further down-select some solution(s) out of ~~support~~ the following**….*  |
| Ericsson2 | Support the view by Intel2, we need to clarify the number of symbols per resource in Rel-17 SRS. Also support the modification by Futurewei2.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | **Support the second bullet for partial sounding with RB level.**Firstly, **we do not think some FFS parts should be there**, such as FFS on inter-slot repetition, it is Option 2-1. And the FFS on SRS and CSI-RS association, it is Option 3-4. If they should not be merged here. For us, we concerns how many options we need to support. By the way, as we claimed before, we are negative on the first and third bullet, i.e., increasing repetition number and Comb=8, since with increasing repetition number, we do not see the benefits compared with frequency hopping and also concern for reducing multiplexing capacity. For Comb=8, increasing the Combs, but the available CS will be reduced. |
| vivo2 | For scheme 3-3, SRS capacity enhancement without performance degradation and without impact on PAPR can be achieved for supporting SRS transmission on non-continuous subbands. Subband-level partial sounding can be jointly configured with scheme 3-1 and scheme 3-2 with minimal specification impact and RB level partial sounding is special case of subband level partial sounding. And, one more note, dynamic bandwidth indication is still under discussion under flexible DCI format (non-scheduling DCI), hence a note on this regard is added.Support omitting SRS transmission on a the whole $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ RBs in a frequency hop in FL proposal:* *When frequency hopping is enabled, support to transmit SRS only in* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *contiguous RBs in one frequency hop, where* $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *indicates the number of RBs in a frequency hop as configured by BSRS and CSRS*
	+ *Support at least one PF value from {2, [3], 4, 8}*
		- *FFS other candidate values, e.g., non-integer values for PF*
	+ *Note: SRS sequence shorter than the minimum length supported in the current specification is not pursued.*
	+ *FFS detailed signaling mechanism to determine PF and the location of the* $\frac{1}{P\_{F}}m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}} $*RBs*
* *Support Comb 8*
	+ *Note: SRS sequence shorter than the minimum length supported in the current specification is not pursued.*
* *Support omitting SRS transmission on the whole* $m\_{SRS, B\_{SRS}}$ *RBs in a frequency hop*
* *FFS considerations on the association between the partial sounded SRS resources and CSI-RS/CSI-IM to improve DL CSI acquisition*

*FFS whether and if needed, how to use harmonized approach to define the three supported schemes**Note: Dynamic change of SRS bandwidth with RB-level subband size scaling is still under discussion when SRS is triggered with non-scheduling DCI, which can also be considered at partial sounding.* |
| Ericsson3 | Support the FL proposal |

# Conclusion

# Appendix

## Previous agreements

Table 6-1

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#102e****Agreement**Enhance the determination of aperiodic SRS triggering offset, with at least one of the following alternatives* + Alt 1: Delay the SRS transmission to an available slot later than the triggering offset defined in current specification, including possible re-definition of the triggering offset
	+ Alt 2: Indicate triggering offset in DCI explicitly or implicitly
	+ Alt 3: Update triggering offset in MAC CE
	+ Further consideration aspects may include the cost v.s. the total combinations PDCCH and SRS locations for gNB to choose, DCI overhead, multi-UE SRS multiplexing, CA aspect, whether to have multiple opportunities to transmit SRS, etc.

**Agreement**Study the following two alternatives in the scope to enhance at least one DCI format for aperiodic SRS triggering * + Alt 1: Use UE-specific DCI, e.g., extending DCI 0\_1 without uplink data and without CSI
	+ Alt 2: Use group-common DCI, e.g., extending DCI 2\_3 for cases other than carrier switching
	+ Further consideration aspects may include simultaneous or CC-specific SRS triggering for multiple CCs, dynamic indication of SRS frequency resources, etc..

**Agreement**For SRS overhead reduction, study reusing same resources among multiple usages, at least for “codebook” and “antenna switching”. Study aspects include* + Whether implementation approach based on legacy SRS configuration is sufficient
		- If not, and if there are benefits other than RRC overhead reduction, study further on the case that antenna switching and PUSCH have different number of Tx antennas, whether UL BWP for different SRS usages is the same or different, whether and how to ensure UE to use same virtualization, the set of applicable usages, UE implementation complexity and overhead, etc..

**Agreement**For SRS antenna switching up to 8Rx, study the configuration of {1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R, 4T6R, 4T8R}.* + Study points may include CSI latency, performance considering aspects like insertion loss, use cases, antenna structure, UE power saving, SRS resource configuration, etc..

**Agreement**For SRS coverage/capacity enhancements, evaluate and, if needed, specify one or more from three categories based on the following definition. * + Class 1 (Time bundling): Utilize relationship among two or more occasions of one or more SRS resources in one or more slots to enable joint processing within time domain.
		- Study aspects include the issue of phase discontinuity, interruption of SRS transmission by other UL signals, etc..
	+ Class 2 (Increase repetition): Change the legacy SRS pattern in one resource and one occasion from time domain by increasing SRS symbols for repetition.
		- Study aspects include to use TD-OCC to compensate the negative impact on SRS capacity, inter-cell interference randomization, whether these SRS symbols are in one slot or consecutive slots, etc..
	+ Class 3 (Partial frequency sounding): Support more flexibility on SRS frequency resources to allow SRS transmission on partial frequency resources within the legacy SRS frequency resources.
		- Study aspects include the partial frequency resources are with RB level or subcarrier level (e.g., larger comb, partial bandwidth), PAPR issue, etc..

**RAN1#103e****Agreement**A given aperiodic SRS resource set is transmitted in the (t+1)-th available slot counting from a reference slot, where t is indicated from DCI, or RRC (if only one value of t is configured in RRC), and the candidate values of t at least include 0. Adopt at least one of the following options for the reference slot.* Opt. 1: Reference slot is the slot with the triggering DCI.
* Opt. 2: Reference slot is the slot indicated by the legacy triggering offset.
* FFS the detailed definition of “available slot” considering UE processing complexity and timeline to determine available slot, potential co-existence with collision handling, etc., e.g.,
	+ Based on only RRC configuration, “available slot” is the slot satisfying: there are UL or flexible symbol(s) for the time-domain location(s) for all the SRS resources in the resource set and it satisfies the minimum timing requirement between triggering PDCCH and all the SRS resources in the resource set
* FFS explicit or implicit indication of t
* FFS whether updating candidate triggering offsets in MAC CE may be beneficial

**Agreement**Support at least DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2 to trigger aperiodic SRS without data and without CSI.* FFS whether/how to re-purpose the unused fields, e.g., the triggering offset(s) and the frequency resources for triggering A-SRS on one or more component carriers, SFI-index, etc.
* FFS UL/DL DCI with data for aperiodic SRS
* FFS group common DCI

**Agreement**In Rel-17 SRS coverage and capacity enhancement, support at least one scheme from Class 2 and Class 3, and deprioritize Class 1.* Note: Extensions of Rel-15/16 frequency hopping are included in Classes 2 and 3, e.g. where UE hops once per symbol within a Rel-17 SRS resource.

**Agreement**Candidate schemes for Class 2:* Scheme 2-0: Increase the number of repetition symbols in one slot
* Scheme 2-1: Inter-slot repetition on consecutive symbols or non-consecutive symbols across slots
* Scheme 2-2: Repetition with TD-OCC
* Scheme 2-3: Repetition with CS hopping

Candidate schemes for Class 3:* Scheme 3-1: RB-level partial frequency sounding
* Scheme 3-2: Subcarrier-level partial frequency sounding
* Scheme 3-3: Subband-level partial frequency sounding
* Scheme 3-4: Partial-frequency sounding schemes assisted with CSI-RS, where SRS is transmitted in a subset of RBs of the original SRS frequency resource
* Scheme 3-5: Dynamic change of SRS bandwidth with RB-level subband size scaling
* Note: Consider issues like gNB receiver complexity, PAPR, etc., with above schemes
* Note: Joint operation between Class 2 and Class 3 schemes can be considered

**Agreement**For antenna switching up to 8Rx, support SRS resource configurations for {1T6R, 1T8R, 2T6R, 2T8R, [4T6R], 4T8R}. |

## Simulation observations on coverage and capacity enhancement

Table 6-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Observations |
| Lenovo, MotM | * It can be seen that the performance difference of UL throughput is marginal with different comb values in the lower speed scenario and with increased SNR the performance gap becomes smaller between different comb values. In a lower SINR range, the performance of comb 16, has performance degradation of up to 0.4dB compared with comb 2, while increasing the SRS capacity a factor of 8.
* The performance loss of all three partial frequency band sounding schemes are not obvious in the given channel condition.
 |
| Intel | * From the link level simulation results, it could be observed that SRS with repetition factor of 4 shows obvious gain over repetition factor of 1. SRS with repetition factor of 8 shows some gain over repetition factor of 4 for low MCS, but for high MCS the gain of SRS with repetition factor of 8 is not obvious. Regarding SRS with repetition factor of 12 over repetition factor of 8, it can be seen that the gain is very limited.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | * Even though higher speeds do not bother much for intra-slot time bundling performance, this can be an issue for inter-slot time bundling. In particular, channel estimation performance degrades compared to slow mobility situations, for larger SRS bundle sizes, i.e., bundle size = 4. This is because, at higher speeds, channel gets outdated much faster as a result of higher Doppler.
 |
| Ericsson | * The gains seen with increased SRS repetition factor depend largely on the reference case.
* Only minor gains are found with increased SRS repetition for wideband reciprocity-based precoding.
* The throughput gain with SRS repetition quickly diminishes with increased UE speed.
* Increased SRS repetition shows only marginal gains in system-level simulations where SRS interference is taken into account.
* Increasing the number of frequency hops per slot is a more effective way of increasing DL throughput than increasing the repetition factor, especially in interference-limited scenarios.
 |
| Qualcomm | * SRS repetition more than 4 symbols improves the quality of the channel estimates which reflect to better DL throughput.
* SRS repetition with TD-CC can recover some of capacity loss as compared to SRS repetition, however, it comes at the cost of losing some of SRS coverage gain.
* Frequency hopping within SRS repetition improves the quality of the channel estimates which reflect to better DL throughput while preserving the same capacity without hopping
* SRS Frequency hopping similar or higher DL throughput as compared to SRS Repetition.
* TD-OCC performance is inferior as compared to SRS repetition or SRS frequency hopping.
* For a given capacity assumption, partial frequency sounding shows better throughput performance compared with full-band sounding scheme due to the faster sounding periodicity and power boosting effect.
* The association between SRS and CSI-RS helps improve the link adaptation based on the pre-whitened channel estimation, which reflect to better DL throughput for SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.
* Partial frequency hopping achieves higher multiplexing capacity compared to full-band sounding or full frequency hopping. Comparing with full-sounding, partial frequency hopping slightly improves the DL throughput due to the power boost.
* For partial frequency hopping, the association between SRS and CSI-RS also helps improve the link adaptation, which reflect to better DL throughput for SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.
* For a given capacity assumption, comb 8 shows better DL throughput performance compared to comb 4 and comb 2 due to the faster sounding periodicity and power boosting effect.
* For different comb size configurations, the association between SRS and CSI-RS also helps improve the link adaptation, which reflect to better DL throughput for SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.
* Larger comb increases the channel capacity while preserving a similar performance to comb 2.
* For a given capacity assumption, RB level partial frequency schemes show better DL throughput performance compared to full-band sounding scheme due to the faster sounding periodicity and power boosting effect. Meanwhile RB level partial frequency sounding with pattern 0101 shows similar throughput performance compared with the one of pattern 0110.
* For RB level partial frequency schemes, the association between SRS and CSI-RS also helps improve the link adaptation, which reflect to better DL throughput for SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.
* RB level partial frequency sounding increases the channel capacity while preserving a similar performance to full band sounding.
* Both of the RB level partial frequency schemes (including continuous sounding bandwidth and non-continuous sounding bandwidth) and subcarrier level partial frequency sounding (larger comb size) can bring system-level performance gain compared with the baseline scheme due to the faster sounding periodicity and power boosting effect.
* Considering the same capacity improvement, RB level partial frequency sounding and subcarrier level partial frequency sounding show similar throughput performance, and the sounding pattern of the RB level partial frequency sounding has small influence on the throughput.
* The association between SRS and CSI-RS also helps improve the link adaptation, which reflect to better DL throughput for SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * Increasing SRS repetitions has the similar performance with reducing hopping bandwidth, but SRS multiplexing capacity will decrease by increasing SRS repetitions.
* Larger comb means shorter sampling duration, which reduce the number of available cyclic shift per comb. Subcarrier-level partial frequency sounding can’t improve SRS capacity.
* Partial sounding can provide better performance than legacy SRS hopping for the case with 24 RBs SRS hopping bandwidth.
* For small hopping bandwidth (such as 4 RBs), performance of partial sounding can be obtained with reducing SRS cyclic shift, but the multiplexing capacity will be reduced.
 |
| vivo | * The performance of comb 2 with 1100 is slightly worse than that of comb 4 with 1100.
* Large comb value as well as comb 4 with pattern-based mechanism with SRS hopping achieves some performance gain compared with others in both of UL BLER and UL throughput.
* The DL performance of comb 4 achieves visible gain compared with comb 2 with pattern-based scheme, while DL performance of comb 8 is almost same with that of comb 4 with 1100 pattern, if no repetition SRS enabled.
* Although an extra 1 dB gain is achieved in comparison with non-repetition case, the DL performance of comb 8 with half SRS resource costs is better than comb 2 with 1100 with enabling SRS repetition.
* The DL performance of comb 8 with repetition is worse than comb 4 with 1100 and repetition, while almost same performance between the two schemes are achieved without repetition.
* Along with the increasing of intra-slot repetition factor, DL BLER performance is also increased for both case of repetition without SRS hopping and with SRS hopping.
* Significant repetition gain is achieved from each R=x to R=2x with per about 1dB gain increasing in metric of DL BLER for repetition scheme with SRS hopping.
* DL BLER performance of R = 8 increases over 2.5 dB gain compared with that of R = 1 under SRS hopping condition.
* For inter-slot repetition, almost same DL BLER performance is obtained from R = 8 with intra-slot repetition and R = 8 with two different inter-slot repetition schemes.
* For the performance metric of DL throughput, similar performance tendency is achieved compared with performance results in DL BLER.
 |
| ZTE | * The following is observed from LLS results for coverage enhancement
* The gain of partial frequency sounding is about 0.5-1dB over baseline.
* The gain of 8 repetitions is about 1-2dB over 4 repetitions.
* Comb8 does not have gain compared with baseline, due to reduced detection window in time domain.
* The following is observed from SLS results for coverage and capacity enhancement
* Partial frequency sounding can bring significant system-level performance gain compared with baseline schemes.
* Performance loss of increasing repetition is significant if there is no way to compensate the loss of SRS capacity.
* Compared with the number of UEs multiplexed in one slot, the SRS channel estimation performance has much smaller impact on the final UPT performance.
* Based on the above LLS and SLS results, we can conclude the following.
* Scheme 3-1 has gain on both single-link performance and system-level throughput.
* Scheme 2-0 have gain on single-link performance.
* From system level, it is crucial to use Scheme 2-2 (TD-OCC) or Scheme 3-1 to compensate the loss of SRS capacity if Scheme 2-0 is supported.
 |
| OPPO | * Considering the influence of capacity and BLER performance, RE-level method is the optimal option in DL BLER comparison.
 |
| Futurewei | * BiT based on flexible A-SRS triggering with dynamically indicated partial frequency sounding can provide substantial SE performance gains over baseline ZF in a TDD system.
* TDD ZF performance can be significantly improved by flexible A-SRS triggering with dynamically indicated partial frequency sounding.
 |
| CATT | * The PAPR of SRS transmission on uneven frequency resource by using RB-level partial frequency sounding is increased compared to the SRS transmission on uniform frequency resource as do as SRS transmission in Rel-15.
* For the same SRS transmission bandwidth, the PAPR of larger comb size, e.g., 8 or 12 is smaller than that of comb 4 with pattern‘0101’which belongs to RB-level partial frequency sounding.
 |
| Nokia, NSB | * Scheme 2-0 with repetition factor of R=8,12 outperform existing Rel-15 solutions (R= up to 4)
* For Scheme 2-0 the impact of antenna port coherence impairments are marginal.
* Scheme 3-1 w/ TX power boosting can achieve nearly same PDSCH throughput as the Scheme 2-0 with three times smaller resource overhead.
* Scheme 3-1 provides robust PDSCH throughput performance in the presence of antenna port incoherence impairments.
* Existing Rel-15 (Scheme 3-1) with TX power boosting can provide nearly same PDSCH throughput performance as the Scheme 2-1 w/ and w/o antenna port phase incoherence impairments.
 |
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