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# Technical issues

## Issue 3.1: Support more antenna switching configurations

***FL Proposal 3-1:*** *Support N = 1 for aperiodic SRS configuration for 1T4R*

* *This new configuration is UE optional.*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Status of the first round:  Supported by CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, vivo, Qualcomm, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi  Concern: Ericsson  The only company who showed concern in the first round is Ericsson. I’d like to check with Ericsson whether proposal 3-1 is acceptable given it seems the majority can support this new configuration. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Lenovo | Support FL proposal. |
| CATT | Support |
| *FL* | It seems all companies are okay with proposal 3-1. We can close the discussion for this issue. |

## Issue 3.3: Handling of the case where the interval between SRS resource sets is larger than Y

Table 3-3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue 3.3: How to handle the case where the interval between SRS resource sets is larger than Y** | | |
| Alternatives | | Companies |
| Alt 1: UL/DL signals are allowed to be transmitted in the interval between SRS resource sets for antenna switching when the interval is larger than Y symbols, i.e., no scheduling restriction | | CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo/MotM, Xiaomi |
| Alt 2: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, Y consecutive symbols in the interval is reserved for scheduling restriction.   * Supported by Nokia/NSB, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, NEC, Intel, OPPO, LGE, CMCC, InterDigital | Alt 2-1: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, the position of guard period for scheduling restriction is the last Y symbols of the interval. | Nokia/NSB, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, OPPO, NEC, Intel, InterDigital |
| Alt 2-2: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, the position of guard period for scheduling restriction is the first Y symbols of the interval | Nokia/NSB, CATT, OPPO, NEC, Intel, Interdigital, NTT DOCOMO |
| Alt 2-3: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, the position of guard period for scheduling restriction is configured by signaling | Vivo, LGE |
| Alt 3: Any DL/UL signal is not expected to be transmitted in the interval between two SRS resource sets | | Qualcomm, InterDigital, Apple |
| Alt 4: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than 2Y symbols, the first Y symbols and the last Y symbols of the interval are reserved for scheduling restriction. | | Samsung |

***FL Proposal 3-3:*** *Support one of the Alts for handling the case where the interval between SRS resource sets is larger than Y.*

* *Alt 1: UL/DL signals are allowed to be transmitted in the interval between SRS resource sets for antenna switching when the interval is larger than Y symbols, i.e., no scheduling restriction*
* *Alt 2: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, Y consecutive symbols in the interval is reserved for scheduling restriction.*
  + *Alt 2-1: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, the position of guard period for scheduling restriction is the last Y symbols of the interval.*
  + *Alt 2-2: If the interval between two SRS resource sets for antenna switching is larger than Y symbols, the position of guard period for scheduling restriction is the first Y symbols of the interval*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Looks like Alt 2-1, Alt 2-2 and Alt 1 attracts most companies. Based on this merit, FL would like to ask companies to indicate which one(s) from these three alternatives is acceptable to you. |
| DOCOMO | Our best preference is Alt 1 from RAN1 perspective, while we think it may contradict to the information given by RAN4. Therefore, we are ok with either Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t support FL proposal 3-3. We have strong opinion on keeping the guard period as is.  In addition, out of the listed alternatives, only Alt 4 address UE timeline requirements for switching antenna ports and changing power in between SRSs and other UL signal/channel. As mentioned in RAN4 LS, there is at least 15us requirement to allow for such switching before and after other UL signal. |
| NEC | We prefer Alt 2, and fine with either Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2 |
| OPPO | We are fine with either Alt.2-1 or Alt.2-2. However, we don’t support Alt.1 since it will lead to more complexity of UE implementation |
| CATT | Fine with either Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2. |
| Samsung | According to RAN4 LS, we still think that Alt.4 is the only option which RAN1 can take. For interval between SRS resource sets, the first and last Y symbols (i.e., 2Y symbols) to obtain 15us each should be reserved for port/power switching. |
| vivo | Fine with either Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2. |
| Intel | Something to clarify.  1. Why the proposal is just for inter-set case? In Rel-16 and Rel-17, the SRS resource could be configured over any symbols within one slot. For Rel-17 antenna switching, the SRS configuration is very flexible. It’s also possible that the interval between two SRS resources in the same slot is larger than required Y symbols.  We suggest changing “interval between SRS resource sets” to “interval between SRS resources”.  2. The gap symbols are also used for collision handling. When we say ‘no scheduling restriction’ or ‘reserved for scheduling restriction’, how does it impact the collision handling operation? |
| CMCC | Although our initial preference is Alt 1 which depends on gNB’s scheduling. We also support to provide a clear guidance to UE and improve the operation efficiency.  Alt 2 is slightly preferred. Either Alt.2-1 or Alt.2-2 is fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt 1.  @DCM: We think Alt 1 will not contradict to the information given by RAN4. Your concern may be aroused by *RAN4 clarifies that the transient period between SRS resources is 15us* in LS from RAN4 (R4-2202413), however, as we discussed before, **this 15us transient period doesn’t mean gNB should always reserve 1 or 2 symbol (depend on SCS) containing this 15us without scheduling**, which can be further proved by agreement in RAN4 100-e meeting, *Do not define the scheduling restriction on symbols before and after SRS transmission for the cell with SRS antenna port switching and on SRS transmit symbols in Rel-17* and *Performance degradation on these symbols can be expected*. What RAN4 really cares is whether the interval between SRS resources can match the transient period demand, i.e., **whether the interval between SRS resources is larger than or equal to 15us transient period**, which is satisfied intrinsically when the interval is larger than Y symbols. Thus, extra scheduling restriction is unnecessary.  @QC, Samsung: Hope further clarification above can also solve your concern.  @OPPO: On the contrary, forcing GP to be located at either the first Y symbols of the interval (Alt 2-1) or the last Y symbols of the interval (Alt 2-2) will no doubt limit the flexibility of UE implementation.  It seems that companies’ view is still divergent when the interval between SRS resource sets is larger than Y, here at least we can firstly reach a conclusion that **UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols**, which makes the current spec clearer. |
| LGE | Support Alt 2-1 or Alt 2-2. |
| *FL* | Based on the discussion so far, it seems companies still have strong view and do not have the willing to compromise. Let’s see whether we can have a baby step first by agreeing on the proposal from Huawei for the case when the interval is Y symbols.  ***FL Proposal 3-3A:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*  Companies are encouraged to share your views about the proposal above.  Some response to Intel’s question for clarification based on FL’s understanding:   1. My understanding is the issue of inter-resource GP is already clear that for Rel-15/16, the gap between resources should be at least Y symbols and reserved for scheduling restriction, i.e., no signal can be transmitted on the gap symbols. It’s gNB scheduling’s responsibility to efficiently use the gap symbols. As this is already clear, I don’t see a strong reason to change this for Rel-17, but inter-set gap is newly introduced in Rel-17. That is why my suggestion is to focus on inter-set gap here. 2. I don’t quite understand why resource collision is an issue here. My understanding is that spec is clear on the legacy behavior, which has been implemented in NR for years. I guess you may think the current specification is not clear enough based on Intel’s tDoc and previous comments? But I’m not sure whether other companies have same confusion. As I said, this has already been implemented in products.   This is just the understanding from my side. Companies are also encouraged to share your thoughts about the two questions from Intel. |
| vivo | Proposal 3-3A is not necessary as current spec captures it well |
| MTK | We don’t support Proposal 3-3 or 3-3A.  Alt-3 is preferred. If it wants to max the resource usage, it should consider Alt-4 as additional interval is required between SRS and other channels. |
| Lenovo | It seems proposal 3-3A has been captured in the current spec.  As we commented in the 1st round.  Y guard symbols for antenna switching can be ensured by gNB implementation. For example, if the first Y symbols are not used for other signals, they can be used for antenna switching. If there is any other UL signal in the first Y symbols, the UE can perform antenna switching in the last Y symbols. So we prefer Alt. 1. |
| CATT | Don’t support proposal 3-3A. Scheduling other UL signals should be allowed in the interval between two SRS resource sets of antenna switching. |
| Intel | Same view as vivo. Proposal 3-3A is not necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Support Alt 1, and we are also fine with FL Proposal 3-3A at this stage. In the discussion, there are following two cases for multiple SRS sets in different slots:  **Interval > Y case**：There are Alt.1, Alt.2-1/2, Alt.3 and Alt.4 till now, it seems more discussion is required to align the view.  **Interval = Y case**：There should be no data scheduling in the GP for the case, is there any other understanding for this?  For Interval > Y case, we still think Alt.1 should be adopted which is aligned with RAN4 LS and agreement as we mentioned above. For Interval = Y case, we do not see any company allow scheduling on the Y symbols, so it could be agreed as proposal 3-3A at this stage. This is why we agree the proposal 3-3A now, and let the discussion for Interval > Y continue.  **@** vivo，Lenovo, Intel: The proposal 3-3A seems not captured in current spec. In the description of current spec, the restriction that no any other signals can be transmitted in the guard period **is for GP in a SRS resource set**. **But there is no definition of UE behavior for multi-SRS resource sets case.**  ‘*The UE is configured with a guard period of Y symbols, in which* ***the UE does not transmit any other signal*** *... The guard period is* ***in-between the SRS resources of the set****.* *For two SRS resource sets of an antenna switching located in two consecutive slots … a guard period of Y symbols exists between …*’ |
| Samsung | We would like to elaborate a bit more about Alt.4. In Figure 6.3.3.7-1 and 6.3.3.7-2 in RAN4 specification TS38.101-1 as below, the required locations of a transient time (15us) is defined before and after SRS transmission. it means that the transient time should be required between SRS transmission and PUSCH/PUCCH transmission, and also between PUSCH/PUCCH transmission and SRS transmission. We think that this is the same case which PUSCH/PUCCH transmission is located in the interval between two SRS resource sets. Hence, we support Alt.4 that guard period (for transient period) should be the first and the last Y symbols of the interval between SRS resource sets. |
| Qualcomm2 | For the case, when the guard period between the two SRS sets is exactly equal to Y, the current endorsed specification doesn’t have the scheduling restriction similar to the UL restriction for guard period in-between SRSresources.  We agree with FL and Huawei that this could be clarified, so we support FL proposal 3-3A.   |  | | --- | | **Text in clause 6.2.1, TS 38.214 v17.0.0**  The UE is configured with a guard period of *Y* symbols, in which the UE does not transmit any other signal, in the case the SRS resources of a set are transmitted in the same slot. The guard period is in-between the SRS resources of the set. For two SRS resource sets of an antenna switching located in two consecutive slots, if UE is capable of transmitting SRS in all symbols in one slot, a guard period of *Y* symbols exists between the last OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the first slot and the first OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the second slot. | |
| DOCOMO | Thanks HW/QC for your elaboration. With that, we understand that even FL Proposal 3-3A has not been reflected in the latest spec yet. We support Proposal 3-3A. |
| Xiaomi | For the inter-set GAP, we agree to support Proposal 3-3A first. |
| vivo | Ok, since current spec mentions guard period is between SRS resources. The current proposal seems incomplete because this only applies for “*if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.”* Following revision is applicable forAlt1, 2-1, 2-2.  ***updated Proposal 3-3A:*** *for SRS resource sets for antenna switching, the UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the guard period Y symbols.* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon3 | Support FL Proposal 3-3A for **Interval = Y case** and further discussion is needed for **Interval > Y case**.  **Interval = Y case**：It seems most companies share same view under this case. Thanks QC, DOCOMO and vivo for understanding.  **Interval > Y case:**  In Rel-15 no GP is defined for aperiodic 1T4R to ensure that PUSCH could be scheduled in the interval between two SRS resource sets (which is large, since SRS is only allowed in the last 6 symbols in each slot in R15) and in Rel-17 similar logic should be adopted to counter the resource waste. Thus we prefer to define no scheduling restriction when the interval is larger than Y symbols.  In terms of the transient period mentioned by RAN4 as well as concerned by some companies, it doesn’t mean gNB should reserve Y symbols for it without scheduling, which can be further proved by agreement in RAN4 100-e meeting as shown below. After all GP is never defined between PUSCH and SRS in R15 and R16, isn’t it?  ‘*Do not define the scheduling restriction on symbols before and after SRS transmission for the cell with SRS antenna port switching.*  *Performance degradation on these symbols can be expected*.’  @vivo: The current FL Proposal 3-3A aims at reaching a consensus about the behavior of gNB and UE when the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols. In terms of the Interval > Y case, further discussion is needed. |
| *FL* | Looks like more time is needed on the case interval>Y. Let’s focus on FL proposal 3-3A first. The status so far is:  ***FL Proposal 3-3A:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*  Supported by Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung, vivo?  From FL perspective, this proposal is rather straight-forward and helpful to clarify the current specification as the current spec is not clear on the inter-set GP. If you have concern or questions on 3-3A, please raise them a.s.a.p.. Let’s see whether we can achieve consensus on this one first. |
| Intel | More clarification is needed.  The following sentence is included in Rel-17 spec of 38.214.  *When the UE is configured with the higher layer parameter usage in SRS-ResourceSet set to 'antennaSwitching', and a guard period of Y symbols is configured according to Clause 6.2.1.2, the UE shall use the same priority rules as defined above during the guard period as if SRS was configured.*  In FL Proposal 3-3A, when it says “UE doesn’t transmit any other signal on any symbol of the interval”, does it mean “the gap symbols are not used for collision handling”? Or does it mean “the gap symbols are used for collision handling, but the gap symbols are highest priority”? Do we have common understanding among companies?  We think the spec should be clear and accurate. |
| *FL* | @Intel, my understanding is the proposal itself is clear enough. It is same as Rel-15/16 inter-resource GP in this case. It means as it says, i.e., no other signal is transmitted, no PUCCH, PUSCH, etc. I don’t quite understand how it related with collision handling, but my understanding is other signals like PUSCH/PUCCH cannot be transmitted in the Y symbols when the interval size is Y. |
| vivo | Thanks Intel citing the spec, I was originally thinking about this text when I said current spec captures it. Maybe another way to address the issue is to remove the phrase as below.  The UE is configured with a guard period of *Y* symbols, ~~in which the UE does not transmit any other signal~~, in the case the SRS resources of a set are transmitted in the same slot. The guard period is in-between the SRS resources of the set. For two SRS resource sets of an antenna switching located in two consecutive slots, if UE is capable of transmitting SRS in all symbols in one slot, a guard period of *Y* symbols exists between the last OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the first slot and the first OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the second slot. |
| Intel | Thanks FL for the response. The proposal will be captured into spec of 38.214. However, after capturing this proposal the spec itself will be contradictory since the current spec specifies that the gap symbols are also used for collision handling, as indicated in our previous comments.  Thanks vivo for the suggestion. We think it is a good way to align the spec. We support vivo’s suggestion. |
| *FL* | My understanding on vivo and Intel’s proposal is to remove the scheduling restriction in the inter-resource GP symbols, which has been in the spec since Rel-15.  Now we have two alternative proposals which leads to completely different directions.  ***FL proposals 3-3A:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*  Supported by Huawei/HiSilicon, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung  ***FL proposal 3-3B:****Adopt the following TP for section 6.2.1.2 of TS 38.214*   |  | | --- | | The UE is configured with a guard period of *Y* symbols, ~~in which the UE does not transmit any other signal~~, in the case the SRS resources of a set are transmitted in the same slot. The guard period is in-between the SRS resources of the set. For two SRS resource sets of an antenna switching located in two consecutive slots, if UE is capable of transmitting SRS in all symbols in one slot, a guard period of *Y* symbols exists between the last OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the first slot and the first OFDM symbol occupied by the SRS resource set in the second slot. |   Supported by vivo, Intel  Companies are encouraged to share your comments on these two proposals. Again, let’s focus on the case that interval = Y symbols for inter-set GP now. If we even cannot achieve consensus on this basic thing first, we cannot move forward to the more entertaining case. :) |
| LGE | Regarding Intel’s comment, we agree with FL’s assessment. The spec says that UE does not transmit any other signal in the Y symbols “in between” SRS resources. It is different story with collision handling.  Regarding proposal 3-3B, don’t support and we don’t need to touch the legacy spec.  Generally, we are fine with proposal 3.3A since it is technically correct. Additionally, UE shall use the same priority rules for the Y symbols in between SRS resource sets as defined for SRS resource set(s). |
| Intel | @LGE, the issue is the spec also specifies that the gap symbols are used for collision handling, which means the gap symbols could be dropped to transmit other uplink signals. Even in your suggestion to go with proposal 3.3A and the gap symbols using the same priority, the same issue exists, i.e., the gap symbols are dropped according to the collision handling but meanwhile proposal 3.3A says UE doesn’t transmit any other signal over the gap symbols.  For progress, we are fine to focus on the inter-set case. In such case, it’s a proper way that if the SRS resource prior to the gap and the SRS resource after the gap are transmitted, then the UE doesn’t transmit any other uplink signal over the gap symbols. If either the SRS resource prior to the gap or the SRS resource after the gap is dropped according to the collision handling rule, then the gap symbols should also be dropped. The reason is that if both SRS resources are transmitted, then the gap symbols are required for antenna switching operation; but if either SRS resource is dropped, then there is no need to perform switching any more.  Please see below for the proposal:  ***Proposal****: UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*  *- When either the SRS resource prior to the gap or the SRS resource after the gap is dropped due to collision handling, the gap symbols are also dropped.*  BTW, our first preference is still FL Proposal 3-3B. |
| CATT | We have similar view as Intel that current spec is not clear enough on whether UL signal(s) can be transmitted in guard period.  According to the collision handling rule that “*the UE shall use the same priority rules as defined above during the guard period as if SRS was configured*”, if the guard period overlaps with an UL signal, and the UL signal has higher priority than the guard period, the UE shall transmit the UL signal in the overlapped symbol(s), isn’t it? It seems it collides with “the UE does not transmit any other signal during the guard period”.  We’d like to know if UE does not transmit any other signal during guard period, which one of the followings is UE’s correct behavior:  - Alt 1: UE does not transmit any other signals during guard period, regardless of the priority of the guard period;  - Alt 2: UE does not transmit any other signals during guard period, when the guard period does not overlap with UL signals, or when the guard period overlaps with UL signal(s) and has higher priority than any of the UL signal(s). If the guard period overlaps with an UL signal, and the UL signal has higher priority than the guard period, UE transmits the UL signal. |
| *FL* | Thanks Intel for the proposed resolution. Let’s focus on this direction, i.e., to revise proposal 3-1A by reflecting the unclear part of collision handling. The proposal from Intel can be a good clarification. Hopefully this can also answer the question from CATT.  ***FL Proposal 3-3C:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*   * *When either the SRS resource prior to the gap or the SRS resource after the gap is dropped due to collision handling, the gap symbols are also dropped with same priority.*   My understanding is the sub-bullet has the same principle as the current spec on the collision handling part, i.e., if the SRS is dropped due to collision handling, GP symbols do not exist either. It would be good to add “with same priority” as shown in the red text for better clarity, which is also aligned with the current spec.  To make the discussion more focused, I encourage companies to further share your suggestion on proposal 3-3C. |
| OPPO | In the two following cases illustrated by the figure, the guard period is still needed. Thus, we suggest the modify FL Proposal 3-3C as below:  ***FL Proposal 3-3C:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*   * *When ~~either~~ both the SRS resource on all of the corresponding symbols prior to the gap ~~or~~ and the SRS resource on all of the corresponding symbols after the gap ~~is~~ are dropped due to collision handling, the gap symbols are also dropped with same priority.*   It is also preferable to align the different wording of “interval” and “gap” in the proposal. We can use the same language of the spec, i.e., interval -> guard period, gap -> guard period, gap symbol -> guard period. |
| Lenovo | Thanks Intel and CATT to explain the issues behind this proposal. The guard symbols only existed when both SRS resource prior and SRS resource after the gap are actually transmitted. If either of them is dropped, the guard symbols can be used for other UL signals. And the same principle also applies to SRS resources within a same SRS resource set.  On proposal 3-3C, it better to clarify that the “dropped gap symbols can be used for UL transmissions”.  ***Updated FL Proposal 3-3C:*** *UE does not transmit any other signal on any symbols of the interval if the interval between SRS resource sets is Y symbols.*   * *When either the SRS resource prior to the gap or the SRS resource after the gap is dropped due to collision handling, the gap symbols are also dropped with same priority and can be used for UL transmission.* |

## Issue 4.1: Applicable case of RPFS

Table 4-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue 4.1: Whether RPFS is applicable to non-FH case** | |
| Views | Companies |
| RPFS is applicable for frequency hopping case only | Intel, Qualcomm, OPPO, vivo, Xiaomi |
| RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases | Ericsson, Huawei/HiSilicon, Futurewei, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, NEC, Samsung |
| Support of RPFS for non-FH case is an optional UE feature for UEs supporting RPFS | ZTE |

***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases, where support of RPFS for non-FH case is an optional UE feature for UEs supporting RPFS.*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | This is about an editor’s note in TS 38.211, which has to be addressed. Majority of companies support to apply RPFS on both FH and non-FH. Considering the concern from 4 companies holding negative view, FL recommends proposal 4-1 as a compromise. Please indicate whether it is acceptable to you or you have better suggestions. |
| Futurewei | Support the FL proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We would like to echo Huawei’s 1st round input that the benefit of RPFS is common between FH case and non-FH case. Thus, our best preference is to support both cases with a single UE feature.  We are not sure if separate FG can alleviate concerns raised by the companies opposing to support non-FH case since it seems they doubt the benefit of RPFS itself for non-FH case. But we are fine with FL proposal 4-1 if that is the only way forward to support RPFS for non-FH case. |
| Qualcomm | RPFS doesn’t provide any additional coverage/capacity gain to non-frequency hopping scenario as compared to current specification. It may enable some new RBs configuration (e.g., 1RB, 2RBs), however coverage gain will be lost by MPR/A-MPR requirements.  Regarding the argument that some RBs configurations (e.g., 38RBs) can’t be achieved by legacy configuration, this configuration doesn’t add anything extra compared to legacy configuration of 36 RBs or 40RBs in terms of coverage/capacity gains. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | Similar view as Docomo. We prefer to support both cases with a single UE feature. |
| Samsung | Okay with FL proposal 4-1. If a new UE feature of RPFS for non-FH case, then should we define a corresponding RRC parameter? |
| vivo | We don’t support the proposal.  The use case of configuring RPFS is to quickly sweep the whole bandwidth hence larger subband configuration with shorter FH cycle is the most practical scenario. For the wideband SRS configuration which RRC configured and on top of it RRC configuration of RPFS doesn’t provide much value. |
| Intel | Don’t agree with FL proposal 4-1.  There is consensus on frequency hopping case, but companies have different view on non-frequency hopping case.  Suggest the following proposal:  *Proposal:*  *RPFS is applicable for frequency hopping case. No consensus on the application of RPFS for non-frequency hopping case.* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | RPFS should be applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases. As a compromise, we could accept FL’s proposal.  Regarding QC’s comments, the benefit of RPFS are both for multiplexing capacity and coverage enhancement, which show no difference under FH and non-FH case. RB configurations are the same for FH and non-FH cases, we do not see there is any problem for RB configurations for partial sounding as we support FH case already.  Then, 38RBs configuration is only an example, there are many bandwidth could be for partial sounding but not for legacy configurations, e.g., 18RBs, 22RBs, 26RBs, etc. Even for 38RBs configuration, we also disagree that RPFS doesn’t add anything extra compared to legacy configuration of 36 RBs or 40RBs in terms of coverage/capacity gains. |
| LGE | We don’t think separate UE feature is needed for non-frequency hopping case.  We are fine with either supporting of RPFS for both cases or supporting of RPFS only for frequency hopping case. |
| *FL* | Based on several meetings’ discussion so far, proposal 4-1 is the only way I can come up to solve this issue. I’d like to remind the group that we have to solve this issue as we have an editor’s note in the current spec. I hope companies can be more open-minded considering this. Please feel free to share your further views considering both proposal 4-1 and Intel’s proposal (labelled as proposal 4-1A).  ***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases, where support of RPFS for non-FH case is an optional UE feature for UEs supporting RPFS.*  ***FL Proposal 4-1A:***  *RPFS is applicable for frequency hopping case. No consensus on the application of RPFS for non-frequency hopping case.* |
| *Ericsson* | Support 4-1 |
| vivo | Given the current situation there is no consensus it is naturally 4-1A or we don’t need these proposals |
| NEC | If we have no consensus on Issue 4.3, we are very concerned on the usability of RPFS, no matter frequency hopping or non- frequency hopping case. We’d rather propose  ***Proposal 4-1B:***  *No consensus on the application of RPFS in Rel-17.* |
| Lenovo | Prefer 4-1, but we can also accept 4-1A. |
| CATT | Support RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases as a single UE feature. There is no agreement constrain that RPFS can’t be applicable for non-frequency hopping case. Therefore if we don’t have any consensus, RPFS should be applicable for both cases. |
| Xiaomi | we support 4-1A as in the first round, RPFS for non-frequency hopping case has no benefits. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | We support FL Proposal 4-1. As we clarified before, there are a lot of SRS bandwidth for non-FH case can be configured with partial sounding, but can NOT be configured with legacy SRS configuration, such as 18RBs, 22RBs, 26RBs…  From multiplexing capability enhancements and coverage enhancement, partial sounding is beneficial for both hopping and non-hopping cases. Using UE optional feature is a good compromise to go forward. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support 4-1 |
| Futurewei | Support 4-1. Also open to NEC’s 4-1B. |
| Ericsson | Support 4-1 |
| Samsung | Support 4-1 which seems a possible middle ground. |
| CMCC | No strong views between 4-1 and 4-1A. But 4-1B is not acceptable to us. |
| Qualcomm2 | For sake of progress, we are okay with Proposal 4-1. |
| DOCOMO2 | Support 4-1 |
| Xiaomi | If majority companies support 4-1,we can live with that for the sake of progress. |
| *FL* | Looks like are begin to converge on FL proposal 4-1. The current status so far is  ***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases, where support of RPFS for non-FH case is an optional UE feature for UEs supporting RPFS.*  Supported by Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung, Ericsson, Futurewei, Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotM, Futurewei, ZTE  FL thinks it is a good common ground for both camps. Now we see companies from both camps move toward this direction. This is an issue we have to address. Hence FL urges companies to consider the majority view and show constructiveness. If you have any concern or questions on proposal 4-1, please raise them a.s.a.p.. |
| Intel | We still prefer FL Proposal 4-1A. |
| vivo | We still prefer FL Proposal 4-1A. |
| LGE | We don’t support FL proposal 4-1. It seems there is no need to introduce separate UE feature for a single UE behavior.  I think there is no harm when RPFS is applicable to non-frequency hopping case except RRC overhead, either 4-1A or 4-1B(i.e., there is no restriction) is fine for us. |
| CATT | Don’t support proposal 4-1A and 4-1B. Proposal 4-1 is acceptable. |
| *FL* | Update the status:  ***FL Proposal 4-1:*** *RPFS is applicable for both frequency hopping and non-frequency hopping cases, where support of RPFS for non-FH case is an optional UE feature for UEs supporting RPFS.*  Supported by Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Samsung, Ericsson, Futurewei, Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/MotM, Futurewei, ZTE, CATT  Not preferred by: Intel, vivo, LGE  It is clear there is clear majority to support this proposal. Given we have gone through painful discussion since last year, and there is an editor’s note in the spec on this issue, it is definitely needed to put a closure for it. After lengthy discussion, proposal 4-1 seems to be the only way we can proceed. Hence I sincerely hope companies to be more constructive. |

## Issue 4.3: Maximum number of CSs for RPFS

Table 4-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue 4.3: To address the issue of Max CS for RPFS** | |
| Views | Companies |
| Alt 1: Clarify in TS 38.211 that for comb-2 and comb-4 if the length of SRS sequence is 6. | ZTE |
| Alt 2: If is configured to be 2 or 4, the maximum number of cyclic shifts should be based on the SRS sequence length, for example, a function of and , and when and , , otherwise . | NEC |

***FL Proposal 4-3:*** *When P\_F = 2 or 4,*

* *if P\_F is 2 and K\_TC = 2, otherwise .*

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | On the technical need to address this issue, based on FL’s understanding, there are at least the following issues to support 4 ports   * When the sequence length is 6, and comb 2 or comb 4 is configured, or 12 based on the current specification. In this case, one comb offset cannot accommodate 4 ports. If we set in these cases, which is natural given the sequence length is 6, two comb offsets are used for all the configured CSs. Then there would be no issue to carry 4 ports. * (copied from NEC’s comment in round 1) When and sequence length is 6 (actually the issue exists not only for sequence length is 6, but also when sequence length is a multiple of 6 but not a multiple of 8, e.g. 12, 36,…), based on current determination rule, is determined to be 8, so there is no way to allocate CS0/4 on comb 1 and CS 2/6 on comb 2 for 4-port SRS based on following formula, the condition for the first row can not be satisfied, as is determined to be 8, and for the second row, as we discussed in our contribution, there are always 3 ports on same REs, so orthogonality cannot be achieved.   FL would like to ask companies to think about this technical issue seriously and feed back your comments/understanding with technical arguments, rather than just stating that more discussion is needed. |
| Futurewei | We slightly prefer not to introduce new max CS numbers just for RPFS. This may be done by adding UE assumption that a PF value leading to a sequence length incompatible with the existing max CS number is not expected. We are also open to other simple solutions, preferably compatible with existing mechanisms. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the FL proposal 4-3. |
| Qualcomm | There is a way to solve this issue by gNB implementation. For , the 4 ports are multiplexed over two combs. Taking the example by NEC ( = 20, =4, = 2) and following 38.211 CS and port-mapping when the 4 ports will be assigned CS4/CS6/CS0/CS2. Then, P0/P2 will be assigned CS4/CS0 on comb0 and P1/P3 will be assigned CS6/CS2 on comb1. These are still orthogonal ports.  The only drawback is that other CSs in each comb can’t be used otherwise sequence orthogonality is lost (In this example, the sequence length 30 which is not multiple integer of  We have concern on the suggested solution as it overrides the maxCS based on whether RPFS is configured or not. In addition, multiplexing with legacy UE is not straightforward as legacy UEs will use different maxCS. |
| NEC | With some restriction, 4-port SRS can be supported (sorry for some inaccurate description in first round), while we think the restriction is quite limited, and as discussed in our contribution, most configurations for frequency hopping case will be impacted.  And as QC mentioned, even 4-port can be mapped on REs with two comb offsets, other CS values can not be used by other UEs, we think this is a quite severe issue.  @QC. Regarding QC’s concern on multiplexing with legacy UE, in our understanding, multiplexing between RPFS UEs has higher priority, and even with current maxCS value, RPFS UE can not multiplex with legacy UE either, as the prerequisite for orthogonality with different CS values should be the sequence length is same. In other words, if sequence length for RPFS UE and legacy UE is same, then the values of for RPFS UE and legacy UE are certainly different. Still taking the example, if the sequence length is 30, the cases leading to 30-length sequence for legacy UE (the band for SRS is a multiple of 4) can only be 8, and maxCS for legacy UE in this case is also 6. But for RPFS UE, will also lead to 30-length sequence, if no update of maxCS, for RPFS UE, , then multiplexing between RPFS UEs or between RPFS UE and legacy UE are impossible. Actually multiplexing between RPFS UE and legacy UE based on a same root sequence with different CS values is impossible.  The issue will significantly reduce the usability of RPFS. We hope RPFS can be applied without so much restriction of configuration and capacity reduction. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We understand the technical issue raised by NEC. From our preference, a simpler solution is preferred as below  *When P\_F = 2 or 4,*   * *~~if P\_F is 2 and K\_TC = 2, otherwise~~ .*   We are also open to solve this issue by gNB implementation although it is not perfect solution |
| Samsung | We are fine either FL proposal or OPPO’s suggestion. |
| vivo | Not support.  Main use case of partial sounding is to quickly sweep the whole frequency band with larger subband and shorter hopping cycle. Configuring small subband with RPFS doesn’t make sense. Thus, we suggest,  ***FL Proposal 4-3-B: The number of minimal sequence length for comb 2/4 is 12.*** |
| Intel | Question for clarification, does this proposal apply to all the sequence length?  We prefer to address this issue by implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we commented in the previous round, the issue mentioned above could be addressed by gNB implementation. |
| *FL* | Based on companies’ input, now we have three alternative proposals on table, although my understanding on vivo’s proposal is that it contradicts a bit with the conclusion of having no restriction on the number of RBs for RPFS. OPPO’s proposal may overkill a bit as in some cases we can have 12 CSs to increase the overall capacity.  I’d like to check companies’ further views on the alternative proposals from OPPO and vivo.  ***FL Proposal 4-3:*** *When P\_F = 2 or 4,*   * *if P\_F is 2 and K\_TC = 2, otherwise .*   ***FL Proposal 4-3A:*** *When P\_F = 2 or 4, .*  ***FL Proposal 4-3-B:*** *The number of minimal sequence length for comb 2/4 is 12.*  If we cannot achieve consensus on these three proposals, the only thing we can do is to leave this to implementation. |
| NEC | The key issue exists when K\_TC = 2 (with current TS,), while with PF configured, the sequence length is not always a multiple of 8, then **only 2 orthogonal ports can be supported based on CS**, **which significantly reduce the usability for RPFS**, and as discussed in our contribution, this is not a corner case, especially in case of frequency hopping, which companies think the typical use case for RPFS, we copied the table (K\_TC=2 and PF=4) below, the highlighted elements are cases with this issue.   |  |  | |  | |  | |  | | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Sequence length |  | Sequence length |  | Sequence length |  | Sequence length | | 0 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 1 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 2 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 3 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 4 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 5 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 6 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 7 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 8 | 28/4=7 | 42 | 4/4=2 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 9 | 32/4=8 | 48 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 10 | 36/4=9 | 54 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 11 | 40/4=10 | 60 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 12 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 13 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 14 | 52/4=13 | 78 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 15 | 56/4=14 | 84 | 28/4=7 | 42 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 16 | 60/4=15 | 90 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 17 | 64/4=16 | 96 | 32/4=8 | 48 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 18 | 72/4=18 | 108 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 19 | 72/4=18 | 108 | 36/4=9 | 54 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 20 | 76/4=19 | 114 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 21 | 80/4=20 | 120 | 40/4=10 | 60 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 22 | 88/4=22 | 132 | 44/4=11 | 66 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 23 | 96/4=24 | 144 | 32/4=8 | 48 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 24 | 96/4=24 | 144 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 25 | 104/4=26 | 156 | 52/4=13 | 78 | 4/4=2 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 26 | 112/4=28 | 168 | 56/4=14 | 84 | 28/4=7 | 42 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 27 | 120/4=30 | 180 | 60/4=30 | 90 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 28 | 120/4=30 | 180 | 40/4=10 | 60 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 29 | 120/4=30 | 180 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 30 | 128/4=32 | 192 | 64/4=16 | 96 | 32/4=8 | 48 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 31 | 128/4=32 | 192 | 64/4=16 | 96 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 32 | 128/4=32 | 192 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 33 | 132/4=33 | 198 | 44/4=11 | 66 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 34 | 136/4=34 | 204 | 68/4=17 | 102 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 35 | 144/4=36 | 216 | 72/4=18 | 108 | 36/4=9 | 54 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 36 | 144/4=36 | 216 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | | 37 | 144/4=36 | 216 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 38 | 144/4=36 | 216 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 39 | 152/4=38 | 228 | 76/4=19 | 114 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 40 | 160/4=40 | 240 | 80/4=20 | 120 | 40/4=10 | 60 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 41 | 160/4=40 | 240 | 80/4=20 | 120 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 42 | 160/4=40 | 240 | 32/4=4 | 48 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 43 | 168/4=42 | 252 | 84/4=21 | 126 | 28/4=7 | 42 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 44 | 176/4=44 | 264 | 88/4=22 | 132 | 44/4=11 | 66 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 45 | 184/4=46 | 276 | 92/4=23 | 138 | 4/4=1 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 46 | 192/4=48 | 288 | 96/4=24 | 144 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 47 | 192/4=48 | 288 | 96/4=24 | 144 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 48 | 192/4=48 | 288 | 64/4=16 | 96 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 49 | 192/4=48 | 288 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 50 | 208/4=52 | 312 | 104/4=26 | 156 | 52/4=13 | 78 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 51 | 216/4=54 | 274 | 108/4=27 | 162 | 36/4=9 | 54 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 52 | 224/4=56 | 336 | 112/4=28 | 168 | 56/4=14 | 84 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 53 | 240/4=60 | 360 | 120/4=30 | 180 | 60/4=15 | 90 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 54 | 240/4=60 | 360 | 80/4=20 | 120 | 20/4=5 | 30 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 55 | 240/4=60 | 360 | 48/4=12 | 72 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | | 56 | 240/4=60 | 360 | 24/4=6 | 36 | 12/4=3 | 18 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 57 | 256/4=64 | 384 | 128/4=32 | 192 | 64/4=16 | 96 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 58 | 256/4=64 | 384 | 128/4=32 | 192 | 32/4=8 | 48 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 59 | 256/4=64 | 384 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 60 | 264/4=66 | 396 | 132/4=33 | 198 | 44/4=22 | 66 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 61 | 272/4=68 | 408 | 136/4=34 | 204 | 68/4=34 | 102 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 62 | 272/4=68 | 408 | 68/4=17 | 102 | 4/4=2 | 6 | 4/4=1 | 6 | | 63 | 272/4=68 | 408 | 16/4=4 | 24 | 8/4=2 | 12 | 4/4=1 | 6 |   We don’t think proposal 4-3-B can solve the issue, with sequence length 12 (not a multiple of 8), with current determination , still only 2 orthogonal ports can be supported based on CS.  Actually, in case of PF is configured, the SRS sequence mapping to REs is actually changed, still taking the discussed example, ( = 20, =4, = 2), the sequence length is 30, and the sequence is mapped to REs with comb 2, while for legacy UE, if SRS sequence length is 30, the configuration is actually = 20, and = 8, i.e. the 30-length sequence is mapped to REs with comb 8, which is totally different mapping structure. So we are wondering with the new SRS sequence mapping structure, why sticking to legacy rules and reducing the usability?  If based on implementation to use non impacted configurations (i.e. the configurations not highlighted in above table), our concern is that these can be achieved with legacy configurations already, which also leading to RPFS useless.  In our understanding, the key issue exists when K\_TC = 2 (i.e. , needing sequence length a multiple of 8, not like 6 is a divisor of 12), so we are fine to compromise to focus on the severe issue only, Otherwise, we are very concerned on the usability of RPFS, even worse than not supporting RPFS at all.  ***Proposal 4-3C-1:*** *When P\_F = 2 or 4, and K\_TC = 2, .*  ***Proposal 4-3C-2:*** *Not supporting**K\_TC = 2 if P\_F = 2 or 4.* |
| Lenovo | We agree with vivo that configure small subband with RPFS doesn’t make sense, and this issue can be addressed by gNB implementation.  We can support 4-3-B. |
| CATT | Leave this to implementation is acceptable. |
| Xiaomi | We think this can be left to gNB implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Not support FL Proposal 4-3/4-3A/4-3B.  It is a gNB implementation issue. |
| Futurewei | Ok with 4-3B, gNB implementation, or 4-3C-2. |
| Ericsson | FL Proposal 4-3 increases the max number of cyclic shifts for comb 2 from 8 to 12 when RPFS is configured, which makes it difficult to schedule RPFS with legacy non-FH/FH SRS (for which the max number of cyclic shifts is 8).  We share the FL view that FL Proposal 4-3B contradicts the agreement to not restrict the number of RBs for RPFS. Furthermore, it does not solve the comb-2 issue for sequence lengths that are not a multiple of 8 (e.g., 12, 36, …).  FL Proposal 4-3A solves the issue but decreases SRS capacity also for cases where the sequence length is not problematic. This can, however, easily be remedied by modifying FL Proposal 4-3A as follows:  ***FL Proposal 4-3A:*** *When P\_F = 2 or 4 and is not an integer, .*  Here, is the SRS sequence length after RPFS. This solution will ensure that the cyclic-shift issue is resolved not only when the sequence length 6, but also for all problematic sequence lengths that are not a multiple of 8 for comb 2. |
| NEC2 | We share similar view with Ericsson. And as discussed in our previous comment, we think the severe issue exists in case of KTC=2, and the red highlighted configurations, which will lead to sequence length not a multiple of 8, then only 2 orthogonal ports can be supported based on CS. And for other non-highlighted configurations, the sequence length is still a multiple of 8, maybe some companies have concern that update to be 6 or 12 will impact the capacity on these non-highlighted configurations, and will cause multiplexing issue with legacy UE.  There is no big issue between =6 and , as if is configured as even values, it’s same between =6 and , i.e. maximum number of orthogonal ports are not reduced.  If so, we think Ericsson’s proposal can address the concerns, i.e. only update for the configurations with issue, and as discussed in our previous comment, in case of KTC=2, the highlighted configurations (sequence length not a multiple of 8) are actually with values of subband not a multiple of 4 (different from legacy), in other words, even keeping to be 8, the RPFS UE can not be orthogonal with legacy UE based on CS, as same sequence can not be fully overlapped between RPFS UE and legacy UE, and actually the non-highlighted configurations can be achieved with legacy configuration, that’s why we have concern on the usability of RPFS.  To address other companies’ concern, we make an update based on Ericsson’s version:  ***Proposal 4-3D: When P\_F = 2 or 4 and K\_TC = 2, if is not an integer, , otherwise, .***   * ***This is UE optional.***   We show our concerns on the significantly reduced capacity and restricted configurations, and we think the updated proposal can address companies concern (impact on sequences still to be a multiple of 8),  then we’d like to request opponents to elaborate what’s the critical issue on the updated proposal 4-3D technically? |
| Qualcomm2 | We think this issue can be addressed by gNB implementation to some extent.  In a way, the suggested proposals are enhancements to some cases while still the RPFS functionality is not broken. We don’t support any of the suggested proposals as this leads to different configuration of max-CSs. |
| Lenovo | We support 4-3B or up to gNB implementation. |

# Text proposals

## TP 2-1 – Part 2

***TP 2-1 – Part 2 (from Futurewei):*** *For the text in clause 6.2.1, TS 38.214 v17.0.0 on AP SRS triggering*

|  |
| --- |
| **<**Unchanged text is omitted>  - If the UE receives the DCI triggering aperiodic SRS in slot *n* and at least one resource set is configured with parameter *availableSlotOffset* across all configured BWPs in a component carrier for the triggered aperiodic SRS transmission except when SRS is configured with the higher layer parameter *SRS-PosResource*, …  **<**Unchanged text is omitted> |

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Supported by OPPO, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon  Concern: NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Qualcomm, InterDigital  @Futurewei, FL’s understanding is that for cross-carrier scheduling/triggering, the current spec has somehow specified DCI signaling should be applied on the scheduled CC as clause 7.3.1 of TS 38.212 has clearly stated the size of the DCI field depends on the scheduled CC. With this, it would be nice if you can further elaborate why this TP is additionally needed. |
| Futurewei | Thank you for the discussion. The 212 clause only specifies how to determine the SOI bit width, but it does not describe the UE behavior of following R15/16 or R17 for the slot offset determination. Note that the SOI bit width cannot determine whether the UE should follow R15/16 or not, as 0 bit may be for zero available slot offset (then use R15/16) or max 1 available slot offset (then use R17). Thus the UE cannot decide the correct behavior only based on 212. The UE cannot infer the correct behavior from 214 as well, as “in a component carrier” uses the indefinite article “a” without any additional limitation, so in the case of multiple component carrier, it is unclear which CC it is referring to. The text in 214 also uses the term “the triggered cell” or “the triggering cell”, so we are also fine with changing to “across all configured BWPs in a component carrier of the triggered cell” or the like.  The agreement and current spec texts are provided below. The agreement clearly says “in a CC for SRS transmission” but the red part is missing from 214. All we ask is to accurately reflect the agreement. If we missed anything please let us know.  **Agreement**  For a CC with t value configured, SOI bit width depends on the maximum number of t values configured for all the resource sets across all configured BWPs in a CC for SRS transmission.   * For the CCs without any t value configured, follow Rel-15/16 mechanism to determine the SRS slot offset, where SOI bit width is 0   212:  - SRS offset indicator – 0, 1 or 2 bits.  - 0 bit if higher layer parameter *AvailableSlotOffset* is not configured or any aperiodic SRS resource set in the scheduled cell, or if higher layer parameter *AvailableSlotOffset* is configured for at least one aperodic SRS resource set in the scheduled cell and the maximum number of entries of *AvailableSlotOffset* configured for all aperiodic SRS resource set(s) is 1;  - otherwise, bits are used to indicate available slot offset according to Table 7.3.1.1.2-37 and Clause 6.2.1 of [6, TS 38.214], where K is the maximum number of entries of *AvailableSlotOffset* configured for all aperiodic SRS resource set(s) in the scheduled cell;  214:  - If the UE receives the DCI triggering aperiodic SRS in slot *n* and at least one resource set is configured with parameter *availableSlotOffset* across all configured BWPs in a component carrier except when SRS is configured with the higher layer parameter *SRS-PosResource*, the UE transmits aperiodic SRS in each of the triggered SRS resource set(s) in the (*t* + 1)-th available slot counting from slot if ca-SlotOffset is configured, otherwise the UE transmits aperiodic SRS in each of the triggered SRS resource set(s) in the (t + 1)-th available slot counting from slot , where  …  *- t* is configured via higher layer parameter *availableSlotOffset* with up to four different valuesfor each triggered SRS resources set and is based on the subcarrier spacing of the triggered SRS transmission. When one or more SRS resource sets across all configured BWPs in a component carrier are configured, and at least one resource set is configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter of more than one values, the indicated value of *availableSlotOffset* is indicated by SOI field in DCI scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH and DCI 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request described in [5, TS 38.212]. The UE shall apply indicated value of *availableSlotOffset* set specificallyfor those sets with configured *availableSlotOffset* parameter. When one or more SRS resource sets across all configured BWPs in a component carrier are configured and at least one resource set is configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter, and the *availableSlotOffset* parameter for each SRS resource set has only one value, the UE shall apply the configured value of *availableSlotOffset* specificallyfor those sets with configured *availableSlotOffset* parameter. For SRS resource set configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter, each of resource set is configured with *K* values of *availableSlotOffset* parameter. For SRS resource set configured without *availableSlotOffset* parameter, *t* = 0 is applied for each of resource set.  - If the UE receives the DCI triggering aperiodic SRS in slot *n* and none of the resource sets is configured with parameter *availableSlotOffset* across all configured BWPs in a component carrier, and if the UE is configured with ca-SlotOffset for at least one of the triggered and triggering cell, except when SRS is configured with the higher layer parameter *SRS-PosResource*, the UE transmits aperiodic SRS in each of the triggered SRS resource set(s) in slot , otherwise, the UE transmits aperiodic SRS in each of the triggered resource set(s) in slot , if the UE is configured with the higher layer parameter *CellSpecific\_Koffset*, *Ks* =, otherwise, and where  … |
| DOCOMO | Seems we showed our position not clearly. We are actually fine with the TP2-1. |
| Qualcomm | We think the UE behavior is clear.  The rest of the text in 38.214 describes that PDCCH is received in a cell and  SRS is triggered another cell. Then, the SRS configuration with availableSlotOffset refers to the cell where SRS is transmitted.   |  | | --- | | *- k* is configured via higher layer parameter *slotOffset* for each triggered SRS resources set and is based on the subcarrier spacing of the triggered SRS transmission, *µSRS* and *µPDCCH* are the subcarrier spacing configurations for triggered SRS and PDCCH carrying the triggering command, respectively;  *-*  and are the  and the, respectively, which are determined by higher-layer configured ca-SlotOffset for the cell receiving the PDCCH,  and  are the  and the, respectively, which are determined by higher-layer configured ca-SlotOffset for the cell transmitting the SRS, as defined in [4, TS 38.211] clause 4.5. | |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view as QC. |
| OPPO | We support the TP since it is friendlier to readers. |
| CATT | The TP is acceptable if the majority think it is helpful for reading. |
| Samsung | Since it seems that current spec is already clear, we think that the proposed TP is not needed. |
| vivo | It seems spec is not broken, we are fine with majority views |
| Intel | Agree with FL and Qualcomm’s view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the TP. |
| LGE | Agree with FL’s assessment and Qualcomm’s view. |
| *FL* | The status so far is:  Supported by OPPO, Lenovo/MotM, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon, NTT DOCOMO  Concern:, Qualcomm, InterDigital, Nokia/NSB, Intel, LGE, Samsung  More companies can be OK, but some companies still think the TP is not needed. Let’s continue the discussion to see whether companies may change their views. |
| Lenovo | Fine with the TP. |
| Futurewei | If you check the spec, “a component carrier” or “a cell” used without any additional description means “any component carrier” or “any cell”, which is the correct way of using the indefinite article. So for this particular spec excerpt, when the reader literally interprets the text, the correct understanding is the same as “at least one resource set is configured with parameter availableSlotOffset across all configured BWPs in any component carrier”, which is clearly wrong when some of the CCs are configured with t and other CCs are not configured with t. |

## TP 2-3

***TP 2-3 (from CATT):*** *Adopt the following TP for TS38.214 on AP-SRS*

|  |
| --- |
| ----------------Start of TP for TS38.214---------------------  6.2.1 UE sounding procedure  ……  - Slot level periodicity and slot level offset as defined by the higher layer parameters *periodicityAndOffset-p* or *periodicityAndOffset-sp* for an SRS resource of type periodic or semi-persistent. The UE is not expected to be configured with SRS resources in the same SRS resource set *SRS-ResourceSet* or *SRS-PosResourceSet* with different slot level periodicities. For an *SRS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *resourceType* set to ‘aperiodic’, a slot level offset is defined by the higher layer parameter *slotOffset.* For an *SRS-ResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter *resourceType* set to ‘aperiodic’, a list of zero up to four available slot offset values from the reference slot *n* + *k* to the slot where the aperiodic SRS resource set is transmitted where *n* is the slot with triggering DCI and *k* is *SlotOffset* is defined by the higher layer parameter *AvailableSlotOffset.* The parameter *AvailableSlotOffset* can be configured up to 4 values*.* For an *SRS-PosResourceSet* configured with higher layer parameter r*esourceType* set to ‘aperiodic’, the slot level offset is defined by the higher layer parameter *slotOffset* for each SRS resource.  ……  *- t* is configured via higher layer parameter *availableSlotOffset* with up to four valuesfor each triggered SRS resources set and is based on the subcarrier spacing of the triggered SRS transmission. When one or more SRS resource sets across all configured BWPs in a component carrier are configured, and at least one resource set is configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter of more than one values, the indicated value of *availableSlotOffset* is indicated by SOI field in DCI scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH and DCI 0\_1/0\_2 without data and without CSI request described in [5, TS 38.212]. The UE shall apply indicated value of *availableSlotOffset* set specificallyfor those sets with configured *availableSlotOffset* parameter. When one or more SRS resource sets across all configured BWPs in a component carrier are configured and at least one resource set is configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter, and the *availableSlotOffset* parameter for each SRS resource set has only one value, the UE shall apply the configured value of *availableSlotOffset* specificallyfor those sets with configured *availableSlotOffset* parameter. For SRS resource set configured with *availableSlotOffset* parameter, each of resource set is configured with *K* values of *availableSlotOffset* parameter. For SRS resource set configured without *availableSlotOffset* parameter, *t* = 0 is applied for each of resource set.  ……  ----------------End of TP for TS38.214--------------------- |

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Status of the first round:  Supported by CATT, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, InterDigital  Concern: Qualcomm, LGE, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi  FL would like to ask companies to provide more technical argument on why this TP is needed or not needed. |
| Futurewei | We are generally flexible in this. As the agreement does not specify “different”, we slightly prefer to remove “different”. |
| DOCOMO | We are open to discuss, but have the following questions:   * Without this TP, would it be possible for RRC parameter “availableSlotOffset” to have multiple entries which indicate the same value? * If the answer to above is yes, and if RAN1 does not prefer such case, could another possible way be to indicate RAN2 via RRC parameter list that “availableSlotOffset” can configure multiple values, which have to be different each other? Since the parameter seems RAN2 matter, could the approach be more straightforward? |
| Qualcomm | We think that if *availableSlotOffset* list is larger than one, then different values should be configured. |
| Nokia/NSB | It remains unclear for us why network would like to configure multiple entries in availableSlotOffset with same value. Hence, we agree with QC. |
| OPPO | Could some proponent(s) like to clarify what the use case or motivation to configure multiple same values is? |
| CATT | Support the TP. Multiple entries with same value should be allowed. Since ‘t’ values for each SRS resource sets are configured separately, even if 2 ‘t’ values configured for a SRS resource set are the same, the sets of ‘t’ values for the SRS resource sets that triggered simultaneously can be different. For example, if SRS resource set 1 and SRS resource set 2 are triggered simultaneously, and the ‘t’ values configured for SRS resource set 1 and SRS resource set 2 are {2, 2} and {1,3} respectively. Then the set of ‘t’ values for the two SRS sets are{ 2 for SRS set 1, 1 for SRS set 2} when SRS offset indicator indicates “0”, and the set of ‘t’ values for the two SRS sets are{ 2 for SRS set 1, 3 for SRS set 2} when SRS offset indicator indicates “1”. |
| Samsung | We think that configuring different offset values is a natural way from gNB side. |
| Intel | Fine with the TP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the TP. Since no agreement constrain that the values of t must be different and the scenario mentioned by CATT seems reasonable. |
| LGE | We are also open to discuss, but the same values of available slot offset for a single SRS resource set is valid only for when multiple sets are triggered simultaneously with ‘usage’ of antenna switching. It seems not essential at this stage. |
| *FL* | Status so far:  Supported by CATT, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, InterDigital, Futurewei,  Concern: Qualcomm, LGE, Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Samsung  A number of companies still think the TP is not needed. Let’s continue the discussion to see whether companies may change their views. |
| Lenovo | We also fail to see the motivation to configure multiple same values in a list. |
| CATT | As our explanation in last round, the TP is needed. |
| Xiaomi | Same view with QC and Samsung. TP is not needed. |

## TP 3-1

***TP 3-1 (from CMCC):*** *For the enhancement on antenna switching up to 8Rx, the TP suggestion for TS 38.214 in Section 6.2 is as the following*

|  |
| --- |
| **<**Unchanged text is omitted>  - For 1T8R, zero or one or two SRS resource sets configured with a different value for the higher layer parameter *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to ‘periodic ‘or ‘semi-persistent’ if the UE is not indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], or up to two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ and up to one SRS resource set configured with ‘periodic’ if the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], where the two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ are not activated at the same time. Each SRS resource set with eight SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, and where the SRS port of each SRS resource in each set is associated with a different UE antenna port. And  **<**Unchanged text is omitted> |

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Status of the first round:  Supported by OPPO, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, Lenovo/MotM, LGE, CMCC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Apple, Ericsson  Concern: Intel, Samsung  @Intel, Samsung, FL’s understanding on the intention of this TP is to clarify when [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets] is not supported, two configured SRS resource sets has to be one periodic set and one semi-persistent set. Configurations like two periodic sets cannot be used in this case. This text is aligned with legacy description of <=4Rx. With this, can you accept this TP? |
| DOCOMO | Support as captured by FL. |
| Qualcomm | We think it is better to algin the specification description of 1T8R with same language used for other SRS switching configuration (1T6R, 2T8R, 2T6R) and use two different bullets for periodic and semi-persistent sets configuration.   |  | | --- | | * For 1T8R, zero or one SRS resource set configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘periodic’, where in the case of one resource set has eight SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, each SRS resource in a given set consisting of a single SRS port, and the SRS port of the resource in the set is associated with a different UE antenna port, and * For 1T8R, zero or one SRS resource sets configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘semi-persistent’ if the UE is not indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], or up to two SRS resource sets configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘semi-persistent’ if the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], where the two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ are not activated at the same time. Each SRS resource set has eight SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, each SRS resource in a given set consisting of a single SRS port, and the SRS port of the resource in the set is associated with a different UE antenna port, and | |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL proposal. |
| OPPO | We are general fine with the TP. But a better on is QC’s suggest (we also suggest the same thing in the first round). |
| CATT | Fine with the TP. |
| Samsung | We can live with either FL proposal or Qualcomm’s suggested TP. |
| vivo | Either above TP or modification from QC is fine |
| Intel | Thanks FL for the explanation. We think Qualcomm’s suggestion is better. |
| CMCC | Thanks for FL’s clarification. That exactly is our intention.  We are open for discussion. If the group think the description with more sections, as QC proposed above, is more clear, we have no problem. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the TP or Qualcomm’s suggestion. |
| LGE | Fine with the TP, and QC’s version is more preferred for the consistency. |
| *FL* | Happy to see we start to converge to QC’s suggestion. I put forward a new TP based on this.  ***TP 3-1A:*** *Endorse the following TP to section 6.2.1.2 of TS 38.214, to be included in editor’s CR*   |  | | --- | | 6.2.1.2 UE sounding procedure for DL CSI acquisition  <Unchanged parts are omitted>  - For 1T6R, zero or one or two or three SRS resource sets configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to 'aperiodic', where in the case of one resource set a total of six SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, each SRS resource in a given set consisting of a single SRS port, and the SRS port of each resource in the set is associated with a different UE antenna port. In the case of two resource sets a total of six SRS resources transmitted in different symbols of two different slots, and where the SRS port of each SRS resource in the given two sets is associated with a different UE antenna port. In the case of three resource sets a total of six SRS resources transmitted in different symbols of three different slots, and where the SRS port of each SRS resource in the given three sets is associated with a different UE antenna port, or  - For 1T8R, zero or one SRS resource set configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘periodic’, where in the case of one resource set has eight SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, each SRS resource in a given set consisting of a single SRS port, and the SRS port of the resource in the set is associated with a different UE antenna port, and  - For 1T8R, zero or one SRS resource sets configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘semi-persistent’ if the UE is not indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], or up to two SRS resource sets configured with resourceType in SRS-ResourceSet set to ‘semi-persistent’ if the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], where the two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ are not activated at the same time. Each SRS resource set has eight SRS resources transmitted in different symbols, each SRS resource in a given set consisting of a single SRS port, and the SRS port of the resource in the set is associated with a different UE antenna port, and  <Unchanged parts are omitted> |   Let’s see whether companies have concern on TP 3-1A. |
| CATT | OK |
| Xiaomi | Fine with FL’s proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with FL’s TP 3-1A |
| *FL* | It seems no company has concern on TP 3-1A. We can close the discussion for this TP. |

## TP 3-2

***TP 3-2 (From Huawei/HiSilicon):*** *We have the following text proposal for TS 38.214 V17.0.0*

|  |
| --- |
| < Start of the text proposal >  6.2.1.2 UE sounding procedure for DL CSI acquisition  < Unchanged parts are omitted >  - For 1T=1R, or 2T=2R, or 4T=4R, up to two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4. If the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets],two SRS resource sets configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to ‘*semi-persistent*’ and one SRS resource set configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to ‘*periodic*’ also can be configured, where each SRS resource set has one SRS resource, the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4, and the two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ are not activated at the same time, or  < End of the text proposal > |

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Status of the first round:  Supported by NTT DOCOMO, LGE, Xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon  Concern: OPPO, CATT  CATT’s alternative TP:  - For 1T=1R, or 2T=2R, or 4T=4R, up to two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4. If the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], up to two SRS resource sets configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to ‘*semi-persistent*’ and up to one SRS resource set configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to ‘*periodic*’, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4 and the two SRS resource sets configured with ‘semi-persistent’ are not activated at the same time, or up to two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4. Or  Huawei/HiSilicon’s further clarification/response:   * The wording in current spec is misleading that Rel-17 UE with the new capability even cannot support 1 Aperiodic SRS! It is incorrect. * @ CATT: we appreciate the configuration combinations you listed and that’s why this TP is introduced. In terms of the INCORRECT situation “*the UE can be configured with up to 5 SRS resource sets*” you mentioned, this cannot happen, since the word “*also*” here doesn’t mean and cannot be interpreted as “additional”, it only guarantees that both “2SP + 1P” configuration and legacy configurations mentioned above are configurable when [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets] is supported.   Based on the above discussion, please indicate whether you can accept this TP 3-2 or the alternative TP from CATT, or suggest a better way to make the spec clearer. |
| DOCOMO | Support as captured by FL. |
| Qualcomm | Agree that the current spec needs further editorial clarification for nTnR. For the TP suggested by Huawei, the wording ‘up to’ should not be removed. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | The TP cannot address the issue from Huawei’s further clarification. First sentence indicates up to 2 sets (without mentioning time domain behavior) and the second sentences indicates up to 2 sets for SP and up to 1 set for P. Thus, if gNB configures 2 sets for SP, then it is still confusing whether an additional set for AP can be configured or not.  Thus, we suggest the following modification:  For 1T=1R, or 2T=2R, or 4T=4R, up to two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4 if the UE is not indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], or up to one SRS resource set configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to '*aperiodic*' and up to two SRS resource sets configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to '*semi-persistent*' and up to one SRS resource set configured with *resourceType* in *SRS-ResourceSet* set to '*periodic*' if the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets], where each SRS resource set has one SRS resource with the same number of SRS port(s), the number of SRS port(s) for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4, and the two SRS resource sets configured with 'semi-persistent' are not activated at the same time |
| CATT | Thanks for Huawei’s explanation. Huawei’s TP is acceptable.  In order to address the issues raised by OPPO, one alternative is to change “For 1T=1R, or 2T=2R, or 4T=4R, up to two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4.” to “For 1T=1R, or 2T=2R, or 4T=4R, ~~up to~~one or two SRS resource sets each with one SRS resource, where the number of SRS ports for each resource is equal to 1, 2, or 4.” |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal with not removing ‘up to’ as Qualcomm suggested. |
| Intel | We are open on this. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @QC: The reason why the wording “up to” is removed is to make sure the configurations before and after “*If the UE is indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets]*” are mutually exclusive with each other.  @ OPPO: The relationship between the first sentence and second sentence is “or” as we’ve explained. By the way, by your modification, a UE indicating a capability for [maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets] even cannot support 2AP.  @CATT: Thanks for understanding. Generally modifying behavior of legacy UE is not preferable. |
| *FL* | Based on the elaboration above from Huawei,  @QC, Samsung, is it okay for you to remove “up to”?  @OPPO, is it okay for you to accept this TP as Huawei suggeusted? |
| Lenovo | Support FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Thanks for the further clarification. We are general ok with the TP but with a minor modification as below (Highlighted by Yellow)  each SRS resource set has one SRS resource with the same number of SRS port(s)  The yellow part is to void the potential misunderstanding that for 4T4R, gNB can configure 1 single-port SRS and 1 four-port SRS. |
| Intel | Actually, we got a bit confused after reading the discussion.  Following the current TP, when the UE indicates the capability of “maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets”, what would be the configuration for aperiodic SRS? What would be the configuration for aperiodic SRS, semi-persistent SRS and periodic SRS? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | We have the following reply for the comments:  @OPPO: Thank for understanding. Adding the wording of “with the same number of SRS” seems a separate issue, since in many places of legacy description also without such wording. Actually, in our understanding, the current spec (legacy description) is clear, each resource set ONLY with ONE resource, then the only one resource is with 4 SRS ports for 4T4R case.  @Intel: As we clarified before, when UE indicates the capability of “maximum 2 semi-persistent and maximum 1 periodic SRS resource sets”, the R15 and R16 configurations supported by legacy UE are still supported, such as 2P, 2SP, 2AP, 1P+1SP, 1P+1AP, 1SP+1AP and so on; 2SP+1P which is newly introduced can also be configured. However, as we mentioned above, **legacy configuration and newly introduced 2SP+1P cannot be configured at the same time**. |
| Samsung | Thanks Huawei for further clarification. Now we understand it is okay to delete ”up to” since 2SP+1P ‘also can be configured’ and other legacy configuration (2P, 2SP, 2AP, …) is already supported by “up to two SRS resource sets” in the first line. We support TP 3-2. |
| Qualcomm2 | Thanks much for the clarification and discussion!  To make the TP clear, can we suggest replacing “also can be configured” with “or can be configured” |
| OPPO | Reply to Huawei:  The intention of add “with the same number of SRS port(s)” is ensure that the SRS resources in different SRS resource sets for “xT=xR” should be the same, rather than for the single SRS resource within a set. If without this part, the 2nd modification in the TP may allow a UE be configured with a 2-port SP SRS resource, a 4-port SP SRS resource and 1-port P SRS resource. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon3 | We have the following reply for the comments:  @QC: Thanks for polishing the wording. We know your intention is to avoid the ambiguity, however, “or can be configured” seems a bit weird to us considering the context. If most companies consider “or can be configured” make sense to them we can be flexible.  @OPPO: Thank for further clarification. However, as we discussed before, similar wording as “with the same number of SRS port(s)” doesn’t appear in current spec either. If companies really consider this to be necessary it can be treated as a separate issue. Just sharing our opinion, we believe current spec is clear enough implying that all the resource sets configured for a xT=xR UE should only contain one resource with x ports. |
| OPPO | Not support the TP since the current TP leads to more issues:  1. The current TP allows a UE be configured with a 2-port SP SRS resource, a 4-port SP SRS resource and 1-port P SRS resource. Obviously, it is not the intension and this issue is led by this TP, rather than legacy spec. If Huawei cannot accept our previous suggestion, how about other ways, e.g., to add a sentence like “The SRS resources from different SRS resource sets are configured with the same number of SRS port(s)” at the end of the TP. We are also open to other modification that can address the issue  2. From Rel15, the maximum number of antenna switching configurations is the same for different antenna switching types. According to TS 38.214-h00, for other antenna switching type (e.g., 1T2R), a UE can be configured up to 4 configurations (1 AP, 2 SP, 1 P). However, this TP indicates that a UE can be configured up to 5 configurations (2 AP, 2SP, 1P) for 2T2R, which is not consistent with other types. We don’t have such agreement to allow more configurations for 1T1R/2T2R/4T4R.  In summary, the TP is not aligned with RAN1 agreements unless the above issues are be addressed. |

## TP 4-2

***TP 4-2 (from CATT):*** *The repetition factor R for Rel-17 SRS coverage and capacity enhancement and SRS transmission with frequency hopping when > 4, R > 2 need to be captured in current specification and the following TP for TS38.214 is adopted.*

|  |
| --- |
| ----------------Start of TP for TS38.214---------------------  6.2.1.1 UE SRS frequency hopping procedure  For a given SRS resource, the UE is configured with repetition factor R∈{1,2,4} or R∈{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,12,14} by higher layer parameter *resourceMapping* in *SRS-Resource* where *R*≤*Ns*. When frequency hopping within an SRS resource in each slot is not configured (*R=Ns*), each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource in each slot is mapped in all the  symbols to the same set of subcarriers in the same set of PRBs. When frequency hopping within an SRS resource in each slot is configured without repetition (*R=1*), according to the SRS hopping parameters , and defined in clause 6.4.1.4 of [4, TS 38.211], each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource in each slot is mapped to different sets of subcarriers in each OFDM symbol, where the same transmission comb value is assumed for different sets of subcarriers. When both frequency hopping and repetition within an SRS resource in each slot are configured (*Ns*>=*4, R* >= *2*), each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource in each slot is mapped to the same set of subcarriers within each pair of R adjacent OFDM symbols, and frequency hopping across the pairs is according to the SRS hopping parameters , and ,where should be divisible by .  For operation with shared spectrum channel access, the UE does not expect that multiple hops of an SRS resource transmission are in different RB sets.  A UE may be configured adjacent symbol aperiodic SRS resource with intra-slot frequency hopping within a bandwidth part, where the full hopping bandwidth is sounded with an equal-size subband across  symbols when frequency hopping is configured with *R=1*. A UE may be configured adjacent symbols aperiodic SRS resource with intra-slot frequency hopping within a bandwidth part, where the full hopping bandwidth is sounded with an equal-size subband across pairs of *R* adjacent OFDM symbols, when frequency hopping is configured with *R2,* and should be divisible by . Each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource is mapped to the same set of subcarriers within each pair of R adjacent OFDM symbols of the resource.  A UE may be configured symbol periodic or semi-persistent SRS resource with inter-slot hopping within a bandwidth part, where the SRS resource occupies the same symbol location in each slot. A UE may be configured symbol periodic or semi-persistent SRS resource with intra-slot and inter-slot hopping within a bandwidth part, where the N-symbol SRS resource occupies the same symbol location(s) in each slot. For , when frequency hopping is configured with *R2*, intra-slot and inter-slot hopping is supported with each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource mapped to different sets of subcarriers across pairs of *R* adjacent OFDM symbol(s) of the resource in each slot, where should be divisible by *R*. Each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource is mapped to the same set of subcarriers within each pair of *R* adjacent OFDM symbols of the resource in each slot. For *Ns= R*, when frequency hopping is configured, inter-slot frequency hopping is supported with each of the antenna ports of the SRS resource mapped to the same set of subcarriers in *R* adjacent OFDM symbol(s) of the resource in each slot.  ----------------End of TP for TS38.214--------------------- |

Companies’ further views are collected as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Views |
| *FL* | Based on comments from OPPO and Huawei in the first round, three changes are made on top of the original TP from CATT, which are marked as yellow.  Please indicate whether the updated TP is acceptable for you or you have other suggestions. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with TP4-2 with FL’s update. |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s updated TP. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| vivo | support |
| Intel | Fine with the TP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the TP with FL’s update. |
| LGE | OK |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Lenovo | OK |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| *FL* | It seems all companies are okay with TP 4-2. We can close the discussion for this TP. |

# Conclusion for the third round discussion