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# Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-17 work item (WI) for support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1]. Earlier RAN1 agreements for this WI are summarized in [2].

This document summarizes contributions [3] – [27] submitted to agenda item 8.6.1.2 and captures this email discussion on duplex operation for RedCap:

|  |
| --- |
| [106bis-e-NR-R17-RedCap-02] Email discussion regarding aspects related to duplex operation – Chao (Qualcomm)* 1st check point: October 14
* Final check point: October 19
 |

The following have been endorsed in the email thread of [106bis-e-NR-R17-RedCap-02].

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** For HD-FDD switching time, reuse existing switching times for UE not capable of full duplex in TS 38.211, Table 4.3.2-3.

**Conclusion:*** No consensus on defining a guard time in symbol units for HD-FDD Type A operation in Rel-17

 **Agreement**Revise the RAN1#104bis-e agreement for Case 3 as the following* For Case 3, semi-statically configured DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and cell specific higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
		- Cell-specifically configured DL reception refers to PDCCH in Type-0/0A/1/2 CSS set
	+ ~~A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both cell specific higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot~~
	+ ~~FFS on cell-specifically configured DL reception vs. cell-specifically configured UL transmission~~
	+ FFS: whether or not there are conditions that need to be considered

 **Agreement*** For Type-A HD-FDD, no additional UE behaviour for UL/DL collision handling based on a priority indicator is specified as compared to the existing specification

 **Conclusion*** Whether or not to account for the Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols can be further discussed under Case 9

**Agreement*** For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH

**Agreement*** The same validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasions and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules for FDD can be reused for HD-FDD
 |

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The issues that are in the focus of this round of discussion in this meeting are furthermore tagged FL5.

# Whether to define the guard times in symbol units

RAN1#104e made the following agreements related to switching time [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* (Working assumption) For HD-FDD switching time, reuse existing switching times for UE not capable of full duplex in TS 38.211, Table 4.3.2-3.
	+ FFS: whether to define the guard times in symbol units
	+ FFS: the switching positions
* Sending an LS to RAN4 to inform the above working assumption, and to ask for feedback if any
	+ The LS will not include the two FFS bullets

Draft LS in [R1-2102094](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/R1-2102094.zip) is approved. Final LS to be uploaded/updated depending on whether or not there are additional agreements for RedCap related to RAN4. Final LS in [R1-2102146](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/R1-2102146.zip) |

In [28], RAN4 has replied the LS confirming the working assumption for the HD-FDD switching time for RedCap UE.

For the second FFS in the WA, the following working assumption was made in RAN1#104bis-e [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:* For HD-FDD, no additional UE behavior for switching position determination is specified as compared to the existing specification.
 |

For the first FFS in the WA, [Ericsson04, vivo06, Nokia11, LG21] express view that there is no need to define guard time in symbol units and the working assumption can be confirmed by removing the two FFSs.

In contribution [QC25], it is discussed that at least one guard symbol needs to be configured for Rx-to-Tx switching in Type-A HD-FDD operation to account for RF returning and timing advance.

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

Based on the input, the following FL proposal is proposed for consideration.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-1:**

Confirm the WA with the following modification:

* For HD-FDD switching time, reuse existing switching times for UE not capable of full duplex in TS 38.211, Table 4.3.2-3.
	+ ~~FFS: whether to define the guard times in symbol units~~
	+ ~~FFS: the switching positions~~
* For HD-FDD, no additional UE behaviour for switching position determination is specified as compared to the existing specification
* Note: RAN1 understands there is at least one symbol gap between DL and UL when HD-FDD UE switches from DL reception to UL transmission

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Partially | Only remove the FFSs should be fine. The Note should not be included. Please noted the HD-FDD working in FDD band and the UL / DL time offset could be in a range. The required Ntx-rx and Nrx-tx could be less than a symbol.  |
| Qualcomm | Y partially | Similar to NR TDD:* For UL-to-DL switching, no guard symbol is needed for Type-A HD-FDD UE;
* For DL-to-UL switching, at least one guard symbol is needed for Type-A HD-FDD UE.
 |
| vivo | Y in general | We have a preference to remove the Note, as it is sufficient to say no additional UE behaviour is specified.  |
| CATT | Y in general | We think the note is not needed. |
| Sharp | Y  | The gap mentioned in note can be considered in conjunction with case 9  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Yes in general, we prefer to remove the note in red. |
| Intel | Partially | The note may be not accurate. In general, for HD-FDD operation, there must exist a gap between a DL reception (or UL transmission) and a UL transmission (or DL reception) after applying UL TA. The gap is normally not integer of symbols.We are fine with adding some clarification on the non-integer symbol(s) of switching gap. Removing the not is also fine assuming such interpretation is already reflected by other bullets.  |
| Ericsson | Y partially | Removing FFS points should be sufficient.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y in general | Remove the two FFSs and no need to add the Note. The switching time between DL and UL can be solved by Case 9. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Also fine to remove the note |
| Nokia, NSB | Y in general | Agree with comments that removing the FFSs should be enough and there is no need to add the note. |
| Mediatek | Y  | Removing FFS items should be sufficient. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y partially | OK to remove FFS points for the first bullet.For the second bullet, the additional UE behaviour for switching position determination is related to the discussion of case9. We can revisit it after we have the conclusion for case9.As for the note, it can be removed. |
| Nordic | N | Note is contradicting first bullet. To restate my comment from online, our understanding is that * Switching gap is absolut time, which includes also TA
* TDD configuration and slot formats are in logical time, not including TA

Therefore, in practice gNB has to leave enough flexible symbols between DL and UL to cover switching gap and TA in TDD.  |
| Samsung | Y w/o the note | We are fine with removing the FFS. But, it is unclear to have such a note in this agreement. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We also prefer to remove the note. |
| China Telecom | Y | We have the same view that the note in red can be removed. |
| CMCC | Y | Fine to remove the note |
| LGE | Y (w/o Note) | The Note in red seems to add confusion rather than clarification. Either removing the FFS or discuss further as part of the collision Case 9 would be fine for us. |
| Xiaomi | Y partially  | The note part should be removed  |
| FL2 | Following the discussion on Monday 10/11 GTW session and suggestion from Chairman, the FL proposoal is updated as following.**FL2 High Priority Proposal 2-1:** Confirm the WA from RAN1#104e with removed FFS:* For HD-FDD switching time, reuse existing switching times for UE not capable of full duplex in TS 38.211, Table 4.3.2-3.
	+ ~~FFS: whether to define the guard times in symbol units~~
	+ ~~FFS: the switching positions~~

Confirm the WA from RAN1#104bis-e:* For HD-FDD, no additional UE behaviour for switching position determination is specified as compared to the existing specification

Conclusion:* No consensus on defining a guard time in symbol units for HD-FDD Type A operation in Rel-17
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y generally | We are fine with the first WA and also OK to remove FFS points for the first bullet.For the second WA, if new UE behavior in case 9 is specified, then it would conflict with this WA. We can revisit it after we have the conclusion for case9. For the conclusion from FL, we are OK. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL3 | Although it is not clear to the moderator why the second WA is dependent on the discussion in Case 9, it is fine to postpone confirmation of the second WA. **The following proposals seem quite stable, and ready for endorsement.** **FL3 High Priority Proposal 2-1:** Confirm the WA from RAN1#104e with removed FFS:* For HD-FDD switching time, reuse existing switching times for UE not capable of full duplex in TS 38.211, Table 4.3.2-3.
	+ ~~FFS: whether to define the guard times in symbol units~~
	+ ~~FFS: the switching positions~~

**FL3 High Priority Proposed Conclusion 2-2:** Conclusion:* No consensus on defining a guard time in symbol units for HD-FDD Type A operation in Rel-17
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

# Case 1: Dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission

For Case 1, it was agreed to reuse the existing collision handling principles in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier/single cell in unpaired spectrum:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission), reuse the existing collision handling principles in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum.
	+ FFS whether the timeline is extended to include the RX/TX switching time for HD-FDD
 |

The remaining FFS is regarding whether the timeline in the above rule should be extended to include the Tx/Rx switching time for HD-FDD.

Contributions [Ericsson04, SPRD05, vivo06, CT09, Nokia11, Xiaomi13, Samsung15, Intel17, LG21, WILUS27] express views that there is no need to extend the timeline to include the Tx/Rx switching time and Gnb would take into account the switching time when scheduling dynamic DL to avoid collision with the switching time.

Contribution [Ericsson04] also points out that if there are still colliding symbols with the switching time after partial cancellation, then the UE ehaviour to be clarified under Case 9 can be applied.



Figure 1 from [4]: In case of UE capable of partial cancellation, gNB can take into account the switching time when scheduling dynamic DL, e.g., schedule a PDSCH after T\_{proc,2} + switching time, to avoid collision with the switching time



Figure 2 from [4]: After partial cancellation of CG PUSCH based on the timeline, there may still be symbols colliding with the switching time. In this case, a UE behavior to be clarified under Case 9 can be applied to ensure that UE does not receive or transmit during the switching time

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

Since no contribution proposes to extend the timeline to include the Tx/Rx switching time for HD-FDD, the following FL proposal can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3-1:**

* For Case 1, the existing timeline in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum is reused for HD-FDD

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| XIAOMI | Y |  |

The following RAN1 agreements were made in an online (GTW) session on Monday 11th October:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* For Case 1, the existing timeline in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum is reused for HD-FDD
 |

# Case 3: Semi-statically configured DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission

RAN1#104bis-e reached the following agreements [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For Case 3, semi-statically configured DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and cell specific higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both cell specific higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ FFS on cell-specifically configured DL reception vs. cell-specifically configured UL transmission
	+ FFS: whether or not there are conditions that need to be considered
 |

Some contributions [Ericsson04, vivo06, Intel17] indicate that there is mismatch between the RAN1#106-e meeting agreement for Case 8 and the 3rd sub-bullet in the above agreement since valid RO should be cell specific configured UL transmission. Therefore, it would be good to clarify that the agreement made in RAN1#106-e meeting should supersede the earlier RAN1#104bis-e meeting agreement.

In contributions [Nokia11, Xiaomi13], it is also indicated that the first FFS has been treated under Case 5 (collision with SSB) and Case 8 (collision with RO), and therefore can be removed from the agreement.

Contribution [Xiaomi13, Intel17] propose to clarify that SSB are not considered in the 2nd sub-bullet in the above agreement since the UL/DL collision involving SSB has been categorized as case 5.

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

**FL1 Medium Priority Proposal 4-1: Revise the RAN1#104bis-e agreement for Case 3 as the following**

* For Case 3, semi-statically configured DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and cell specific higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
		- Cell-specifically configured DL reception refers to PDCCH in Type-0/0A/1/2 CSS set
	+ ~~A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both cell specific higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot~~
	+ ~~FFS on cell-specifically configured DL reception vs. cell-specifically configured UL transmission~~
	+ FFS: whether or not there are conditions that need to be considered

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y | Fine for adding clarification bullet and removing the duplicated bullets. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Clarification is needed for the CSS associated with R17 PEI and RA-SDT, which are also cell-specifically configured DL reception |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| FL3 | **@Qualcomm:** For Case 8, the same wording of PDCCH in Type-0/0A/1/2 CSS set is used. We can clarify later including other CSS for collision handling if there is such need. At this moment, it may be good to align with the previous agreement. **The moderator suggests the same proposal can be considered for endorsement.** **FL3 Medium Priority Proposal 4-1: Revise the RAN1#104bis-e agreement for Case 3 as the following*** For Case 3, semi-statically configured DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
	+ A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both dedicated higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and cell specific higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot
		- Cell-specifically configured DL reception refers to PDCCH in Type-0/0A/1/2 CSS set
	+ ~~A HD-FDD UE does not expect to receive both cell specific higher layer parameters configuring transmission from the UE in the set of symbols of the slot and dedicated higher layer parameters configuring reception in the set of symbols of the slot~~
	+ ~~FFS on cell-specifically configured DL reception vs. cell-specifically configured UL transmission~~
	+ FFS: whether or not there are conditions that need to be considered
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Thanks FL for the update.  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| sSamsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

Another remaining aspect is whether or not there are conditions that need to be considered. Contribution [Samsung15] presents two conditions can be further considered as following.

|  |
| --- |
| *Proposal 2: For Case 3, SFI can be used to cancel one of the directions whether the semi-statically configured DL is received or the semi-statically configured UL is transmitted.* *Proposal 3: When a priority is configured with semi-static UL and DL, HD-FDD RedCap UE can solve the conflict between semi-static UL and DL based on the associated priority indication. Details are FFS* |

The first above proposal from [Samsung15] is related to the question on whether or not SFI can be optionally supported for HD-FDD Ues. It can be discussed further in section 8.1. For the second proposal, companies are welcome to provide comments if they wish.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 4-2:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether a priority indicator can be configured for semi-statically configured DL or UL and used for collision handling?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | N | We do not see the issue to be solved by that indicator. Not prefer to have that in the RRC list. |
| Qualcomm |  | Is there such a priority indicator for NR TDD/non-RedCap UE ? If not, why consider it for RedCap UE ? |
| vivo | N | The concerned collision case were agreed to be error case by the current agreement, there is no need to introduce additional behaviour.  |
| CATT | N | Considering the limited TU left, the group does not have enough time to come up with a flawless priority list. |
| Intel | N | We prefer to avoid introduction of new RRC signalling and procedure.  |
| Ericsson | N | The proposal was raised during the collision handling discussion earlier but was not included for down-selection. Given the stage of the discussion, we think there is no need to bring it up again.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Open |  |
| DOCOMO | N | We don’t think such optimization is necessary |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We do not prefer to introduce priority. We think the predefined rules are enough. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | We do not see any necessity to introduce the priority indicator. |
| Samsung | Y | As we explained our intention in a previous meeting, there may exist CG for UL with a small periodicity (e.g., 2 symbols). With such small periodicity of CG, there is no way for a gNB to configure a search space for PDCCH without a collision with the CG and then the gNB cannot avoid the collision of semi-static UL and semi-static DL. In addition, similar collision may happen between CG UL and CSS configured in a cell-specific way.To address the issue, the priority indication can be considered to solve the conflict between semi-static UL and DL.  |
| China Telecom |  | We are open to such priority indicator. We do not want to have any contradictions or different understanding on the specifications when dealing with UL/DL collision. |
| CMCC | N | We don’t think priority indicator is necessary |
| LGE | N | This proposal may be considered as an enhancement to the existing collision handling rules for which we don’t see a clear motivation to handle it at this stage.  |
| Xiaomi | N | We don’t see much benefits to support such indicator and on the other hand, it will complicate the processing  |
| FL2 | Based on the received response, there is a clear majority view (12 vs. 3) not to support or consider collision handling based on an additional priority indicator for HD-FDD. Moderator suggests to consider the following proposal to conclude the discussion.**FL2 Medium Priority Proposal 4-2:** * For HD-FDD, no additional UE ehaviour for collision handling based on a priority indicator is specified as compared to the existing specification
 |
| vivo |  | Suggest a minor revision to make it clear that the collision handling between DL and UL is meant here, since there are other types of collision handling for example the collision handling between UL channels with different priorities which are not affected by this proposalUpdated proposal* For HD-FDD, no additional UE ehaviour for collision handling between DL and UL based on a priority indicator is specified as compared to the existing specification
 |
| DOCOMO | Y | Support vivo’s update |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Support vivo’s update |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Minor suggestion to the FL proposal (note: “directional collision” is a terminology used in NR R16) :* For Type-A HD-FDD, no additional UE ehaviour for directional collision handling based on a priority indicator is specified as compared to the existing specification
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Support vivo’s update |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL3 | Seems all are OK with the proposal in principle, while it may be necessary to finetune the wording. **The moderator suggests the following updated proposal for endorsement.** **FL3 Medium Priority Proposal 4-2:** * For Type-A HD-FDD, no additional UE behaviour for UL/DL collision handling based on a priority indicator is specified as compared to the existing specification
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

# Case 5: Configured SSB vs. dynamically scheduled or configured UL transmission

## SSB overlaps with dynamically scheduled UL transmission

For Case 5, it has been agreed to re-use the existing collision handling principles (i.e., SSB is prioritized over configured UL transmission) for configured UL transmission which includes CG-PUSCH, SRS, and PUCCH.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For Case 5 of SSB overlaps with in configured UL transmission, re-use the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over configured UL transmission
	+ The configured UL transmission includes CG-PUSCH, or SRS
	+ FFS: Confirm that PUCCH is included

Agreements:* For Case 5 of SSB overlaps with configured UL transmission, the configured UL transmission includes PUCCH transmission configured by higher layers
* Note: The UL transmission indicated by DCI is supposed to be dynamic UL transmission.
 |

The remaining issue in Case 5 is collision handling for the case of SSB overlapping with dynamically scheduled UL transmission. According to RAN1#106-e agreement below, one or both of the following two options should be determined.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, one or both of the following options to be determined till next meeting:
	+ Option 1: Dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized over SSB
	+ Option 2: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over dynamically scheduled UL transmission
 |

Table 5.1-1 summarizes companies’ views on the two options.

**Table 5.1-1: Views on collision handling for SSB overlapping with dynamically scheduled UL transmission**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description  | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized over SSB | Huawei, Ericsson, vivo, China Telecom, CMCC, Nokia, WILUS | 7 |
| Option 2 | SSB is prioritized over dynamic scheduled UL transmission | Spreadtrum, OPPO, Xiaomi, Potevio, Samsung, Intel, DoCoMo, IDCC, LG, Sharp, Apple, Qualcomm, NordicSemi | 13 |

Specific comments regarding benefits, advantages, drawbacks, concerns and impacts for each of the two options are summarized below.

**Option 1: dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized over SSB**

 Justifications/benefits/advantages:

* gNB can transmit and receive simultaneously on paired spectrum
* More flexibility and consistent with principle of dynamic scheduling
* Same handling as Case 2 by treating SSB as semi-static DL reception

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Significant impact on UE implementation for SSB measurement
* UE may not be able to monitor the overlapped SSB and RAN4 RRM timeline may be violated
* Rules for determining the available slots for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition will be different for CG- and DG-PUSCH for HD-FDD making the UE behaviour unnecessarily complicated

**Option 2: SSB is prioritized over dynamically scheduled UL transmission**

 Justifications/benefits/advantages:

* A unified solution for dynamic and semi-static UL transmission
* Same UE implementation for SSB measurement
* Optimization for UL throughput and/or latency is not in scope of this WID
* gNB has the full control on the timing of dynamically scheduled UL channel/signal to avoid collision

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Increased scheduling complexity for FDD gNB
* Lack of flexibility and resource utilization is sacrificed

In addition, some contributions also express view on the possibility to consider both options for the case of SSB overlapping with dynamically scheduled UL transmission.

* Support both options based on UE’s capability and gNB configuration [vivo06, Apple23]
* Option 1 for Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for Msg4 overlap with SSB transmission and Option 2 for other dynamically scheduled UL transmission [ZTE12]
* Option 1 is taken if SSB transmission is not mandated in RedCap specific DL BWP and Option 2 is used if SSB transmission is mandated in RedCap specific DL BWP [Panasonic19]

Contribution [CATT08] notes that uncertainty has been introduced to dynamically scheduled DL or UL due to unspecified UE behaviour for PDCCH monitoring when colliding with valid RO and thinks it is derisible to leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit UL when collision happens.

Specially, contribution [Ericsson04] indicates that PRACH triggered by PDCCH order which is considered as dynamically scheduled UL in view of the previous agreement for Case 2 should be prioritized over SSB if Option 1 is supported.

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

From the above, it seems companies’ positions have not changed as compared to last RAN1 meeting. Considering the discussion in the last RAN1 meeting, it seems difficult to make down-selection between option 1 and 2. Therefore, one possible solution to make process is to support both options, e.g., with separate UE capabilities.

**FL1 High Priority Question 5.1-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether both of option 1 and 2 can be supported considering the possible solutions proposed in [vivo06, Apple23, ZTE12, Panasonic19].**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | N | We should not further complicate RedCap UE by 2 options. Go with the Option 2 with more supporting companies have no issue. |
| Qualcomm | N | Option 2 is supported. Unified solution should be supported for dynamic UL and semi-static UL. |
| Vivo |  | As compromise, we would be fine to support both options as separate UE capabilities |
| CATT |  | As proposed in our contribution, ‘Up to UE implementation’ can be regarded as a combination of Option 1 and 2. If this is not acceptable, we can live with up to separate UE capabilities. |
| Sharp |  | We still think option2 should be selected. The schemes combining option1 and option2 will add additional complexity to redcap |
| Spreadtrum | N | Option 2 only is preferred, it is unnecessary to specify two options for this case. |
| Intel | N | Option 2 is preferredDefining UE capabilities doesn’t help for the overlap handling between SSB and Msg3 PUSCH, since UE doesn’t report its UE capability yet in initial access.  |
| Ericsson | N | Supporting both options with capability signalling is not preferred as it increases complexity. We prefer Option 1 but can be open to option 2 if it helps the group to move forward.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N |  |
| DOCOMO | N | We shared the view with Intel that supporting both options with capability signalling doesn’t help for the overlap handling between SSB and Msg3 PUSCH or PUCCH for Msg4/B HARQ-ACK. |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We prefer not to support both options as this increases complexity. Our preference is option 1. |
| Mediatek | N | A unified solution (i.e., Option 2) is necessary for all collision cases in Case 5 to minimize UE complexity. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Since HD-FDD UE is not identified by msg1, msg3 PUSCH/PUCCH for msg4 is different with the PUSCH/PUCCH in connected mode. It is nature to define separate UE behavior for msg3 PUSCH/PUCCH for msg4 and PUSCH/PUCCH in connected mode. Similar with the defined UE behavior for other cases, we do not see the obvious complexity increasing.Additionally, for msg3 PUSCH/PUCCH for msg4, prioritizing UL has the benefits of reducing impacts on the FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE; in the connected mode, prioritizing SSB has the benefits of deriving updated MIB, RRM measurement and T/F tracking loop even though no updated MIB is carried on the SSB.Moreover, if option 1 and option2 can not converge to the consensus, support both of them is also a kind of compromise solution and should be considered.  |
| Nordic  | Y | We would be fine with UE supporting only 6-1 -> Option 2UE supporting also 6-1A -> Option 1 |
| Samsung | N | We suggest to simply go with majority because it is not a big issue that both options should be adopted based on the UE capability. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | N | We prefer only one option to reduce complexity.  |
| Apple  |  | We still prefer Opt.2 and are open to compromise with UE capability. To be honest, we can not understand the motivation to prioritize the DG-PUSCH for increasing scheduling flexibility, peak data rate optiomization or reduced latency as we are talking about HD-FDD UE, instead of FD-FDD UE. Regarding the Msg3 or PUCCH of Msg4 vs. SSB, one possible WF is to priorize them but limiting within initial access phase, e.g. before RRC Connection Setup completion. This is dorable as UE would not perform SSB-based RLM/RRM during this procedure. In summary, Opt.2 for RRC\_CONNECTED State and Opt.1 for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE State.  |
| China Telecom | N | Supporting both options with capability signalling is not accepted with increasing network and UE complexity. We prefer Option 1 with the same handling principles in Case 2. |
| CMCC | N | Support both options may increase UE complexity. Option 1 is preferred. |
| Panasonic |  | Our view is it depends on the agreement in the AI 8.6.1.1. If SSB is mandatory or not mandatory for any BWP, either one of option 1 or 2 should be supported. If SSB can be mandatory/optional depending on the BWP configuration, a RedCap UE should support both option 1 and 2. |
| LGE | N | We would not be okay to support both. Among the two options, Option 2 is preferred.  |
| Xiaomi | N | We share similar view with intel and DOCOMO |
| FL2 | **Moderator observation:*** 15 companies are not okay to support both options with capability signalling. It is viewed that both options will increase both network and UE complexity, and cannot help for the overlap handling between SSB and Msg3 PUSCH
* 3 companies (vivo, CATT, Apple) can leave with both options with capability signalling for sake of compromise and progress
* 3 companies (ZTE, Nordic, Panasonic) support both options but not with capability signaling.

Since companies’ position has not changed, the moderator suggession is to make a down-selection during the GTW session.**FL2 High Priority Proposal 5.1-1:*** For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, decision on one or both of the following options during GTW session:
	+ Option 1: Dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized over SSB
	+ Option 2: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over dynamically scheduled UL transmission
 |
| vivo |  | OK to decide online.  |
| DOCOMO |  | We prefer to down-select to only one of the above options during GTW session.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Support both of them has the benefits of mitigating the impacts on FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE, also can be a compromise method. We are OK to decide online. |
| Intel |  | We share DOCOMO’s view that a single option is preferred |
| Ericsson |  | OK to make a down-selection |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Ok to make down selection. We can support Opt 1 for the reason that the gNB knows about the collision, and if it decides to schedule, the gNB will want the transmission prioritized. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | OK to discuss and down-select in GTW |
| Nordic |  | What happens if nothing is agreed? Would this be an error-case, i.e. gNB better not to schedule UL on SSB?  |
| Qualcomm |  | Ok to decide during GTW. We think Option 2 should be supported, since the SSB transmission is known to NW and the dynamic UL transmission is scheduled by NW. The potential collisions could be avoided by gNB/scheduler with minimum spec impacts in RAN1 and RAN4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | OK for down selection in GTW.  |
| CATT |  | OK |
| Sharp |  | OK to make a down-selection |
| Xiaomi |  | OK to down-select one option in GTW |
| CMCC |  | OK to make a down-selection |
| LGE |  | Okay. |

## Whether to account for Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols

An FFS identified in RAN1#104bis-e for Case 5 is whether the Tx/Rx switching time should be accounted before and after the set of SSB symbols.

* Contribution [Ericsson04, vivo06, Samsung15] express view that the UL transmissions in case 5 is either dynamically scheduled or configured by dedicated higher layer parameters and gNB should ensure the sufficient Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols for the most cases
* In contribution [Ericsson04], it is further clarified that for the case of SSB immediately followed by an UL transmission or SSB immediately following the last symbol of UL transmission, if the UE behavior for Case 9 is clarified to ensure that Tx/Rx switching time is fulfilled, there is no need to further account for the Tx/Rx switching time under Case 5
* Contribution [Samsung15] also indicates that the TX/RX switching time for the case of SRS overlapping with SSB can be further discussed in Case 9
* Contribution [LG21] proposed that the Rx-to-Tx switching time should be accounted for HD-FDD operation in FDD bands after the set of SSB symbol and UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than the Rx-to-Tx switching time after the end of the last received downlink symbol for SSB

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

From the above, only one company supports that the Tx/Rx switching is accounted after the set of SSB symbols. Other companies view that gNB should ensure the sufficient Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols but seems okay to further discuss it under Case 9.

**FL1 Medium Priority Conclusion 5.2-1:**

* **Whether or not to account for the Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols can be further discussed under Case 9**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Rules similar to NR TDD are re-used by Type-A HD-FDD RedCap UE. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| LGE | Okay |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| FL3 | Seem all are okay with the proposal; the moderator suggests the same proposal can be considered for endorsement. **FL3 Medium Priority Conclusion 5.2-1:*** Whether or not to account for the Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols can be further discussed under Case 9
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

# Case 8: Dynamic or semi-static DL vs. valid RO

## valid RO overlaps with dynamically scheduled DL reception

For Case 8, the remaining collision scenario to be resolved is the case of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception. According to RAN1#106-e agreement below, one option among Option 2, 3, and 4 should be down selected.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, down select one of following options in next meeting
	+ Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH
	+ Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission)
	+ Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception
 |

Table 6.1-1 summarizes the companies view for the three options in RAN1#106-e agreement.

**Table 6.1-1: Views on collision handling for valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description  | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 2 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH | Spreadtrum (1st), vivo (2nd), CATT, Nokia, Xiaomi, Samsung, MTK, Panasonic, Apple, Qualcomm, NordicSemi | 11 |
| Option 3 | Follow the handling of Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission) | Huawei, vivo (1st), China Telecom, Sharp, ASUSTeK | 5 |
| Option 4 | Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception | Ericsson, Spreadtrum (2nd), OPPO, CMCC, Potevio, Intel, DoCoMo, IDCC, LG  | 9 |

Specific comments regarding benefits, advantages, drawbacks, concerns and impacts for each of the three options are summarized below.

**Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH**

 Justifications/benefits/advantages:

* A unified solution for dynamic and semi-static DL reception
* PRACH transmission is not so frequent for UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state
* No preclusion for gNB to schedule DL transmission overlapping with the valid RO
* No specification impact and UE can transmit NACK to trigger a retransmission for the failed PDSCH reception

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Degrade resource utilization if the scheduled DL transmission is not received by the UE

**Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1**

 Justifications/benefits/advantages:

* Same handling as Case 1 by treating valid RO as semi-statically configured UL transmission

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Limit RACH configuration and performance in case of dynamically scheduled PDSCH with K0=0
* Deprioritizing RO in case of out-of-sync in UL leads to a waste of DL resources and increased RA latency
* UE may decode PDCCH but not be allowed to receive the scheduled PDSCH with K0=0

**Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception**

 Justifications/benefits/advantages:

* Relatively simpler compared to other options

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Increased scheduling complexity for FDD gNB
* Too restrictive to drop DL reception regardless of UE’s intention to transmit PRACH
* UE may decode PDCCH but not be allowed to receive the scheduled PDSCH with K0=0

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

Option 2 has a slight majority support. The concern on Option 2 is gNB cannot know when the UE will transmit PRACH, thus leading to resource utilization inefficiency if the scheduled DL transmission is not received by the UE [4]. However, it is well known that PRACH transmission is not so frequent for UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state and therefore the probability for UE not receiving the dynamically scheduled DL transmission is expected to be low.

For Option 3, the concern is that dropping PRACH may lead to serious system performance degradation, e.g., in case of out-of-sync in UL [23]. Also, there is a common issue for both Option 3 and 4 that UE may decode PDCCH but not be able to receive the scheduled PDSCH with K0=0 thus degrading PDSCH performance [11, 25].

From the above analysis, each option has its pros and cons. Option 2 seems to be a considerable trade-off.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 6.1-1:**

* For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | N | Making clear UE behaviour is more important. The issue is different to SSB collision with RO, which could be delayed too long in the initial access. The DL overriding should not be introduced as very small optimization for RedCap. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | Although our preference was Option3, we understand the FL proposal may be the most feasible way to move forward.  |
| CATT | Y | We reconsider our position a bit from the last meeting and can live with Option 2. Just remind that LTE did not introduce any rule like ‘prioritizing RO over DL eception’ when supporting HD-FDD eMTC UE. Similarly, we do not see Option 4 is needed in NR. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We can compromise to Option 2 though our first preference is still Option 4.  |
| Ericsson |  | We prefer Option 4 but can accept the proposal if it helps the group to move forward. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Option 3 is preferred while Option 2 is acceptable. |
| DOCOMO |  | We can live with the proposal for the sake of progress |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Mediatek | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We prefer option4, and we can also compromise to option2 for progress. |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | Also, Option 4 is acceptable to us as the second priority. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Apple  | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y | We can live to Option 2 for progress. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y | Seeing the companies view, we accept Option 2 (while our first preference is “valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception when UE transmit PRACH. Otherwise, dynamic DL reception is prioritized.”) |
| LGE |  | Clearly defining the UE behaviour is preferred. Option 4 is our first preference and the Option 3 is the next. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| FL2 | **Moderator observation:*** 15 companies support the FL proposal
* 8 companies (vivo, Intel, Ericsson, Huawei, DOCOMO, ZTE, China Telecom, Panasonic) can compromise to Option 2 for progress
* 2 companies (OPPO, LG) still have concens on Option 2 and prefer a clearly defined UE hehaviour (i.e. Option 4)

**@OPPO and @LG**, for the sake of progress, could you compromise to Option 2? In moderator’s view, with Option2, gNB still has the flexibility not to schedule dynamic DL transmission overlapping with valid RO thus acehiving the same result as Option 4. **Moderator recommendation: The same proposal can be considered again****FL2 High Priority Proposal 6.1-1:*** For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | OK for the sake of progress |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Our preference is option 4 but we are OK with compromise to option 2 |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | For the sake of progress |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We can compromise to Option 2 for the sake of progress. |
| FL3 | Seem all are okay with the proposal; the moderator suggests the same proposal can be considered for endorsement.  **FL3 High Priority Proposal 6.1-1:*** For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

## Whether or not Ngap symbols before the valid RO is included

**FFS: whether or not the set of symbols overlapping with dynamic DL reception includes also Ngap symbols before the valid RO and whether the same value for Ngap in current spec is reused for HD-FDD**

* Contributions [Ericsson04, CATT08, Nokia11] express view the same principle as in TDD rule can be reused where the set of symbols overlapping with DL reception includes Ngap symbols before the valid RO, and the same value for Ngap in the current specification is reused for HD-FDD
* In contribution [vivo06], it is discussed that for the collision cases of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set or SSB, including Ngap symbols before the valid RO may be beneficial to account for the DL-to-UL switching time, but for collision case of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured or dynamically scheduled DL reception, including Ngap symbols before the valid RO is not necessary
* In contribution [Samsung15], it is proposed that Ngap symbols can be specified for HD-FDD as in TDD and in case of Ngap equals to 0, the Tx/Rx switching time is considered.
* Contribution [LG21] indicates that the Rx-to-Tx switching time before the valid RO needs to be accounted for HD-FDD at least for the case that Ngap is zero
* Contribution [Intel17] has a different view on the benefit of applying Ngap symbols to HD-FDD operation and perfers to consider a unified solution for handling the gap for Tx-Rx or Rx-Tx switching time

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

From the above, a majority view is that the same principle as in TDD rule can be reused for HD-FDD. The only concern is whether the Rx-to-Tx switching time before the valid RO needs to be additionally accounted for HD-FDD when Ngap is zero. From the FL’s understanding, there are benefits to include Ngap symbols before the valid RO for HD-FDD. Also, considering the target to support HD-FDD is to have the minimum spec change, it would be desirable to reuse the same principle as in TDD as much as possible.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 6.2-1:**

* For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO, and the same values for Ngap in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 is reused for HD-FDD
* FFS: whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time when Ngap is zero

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y | We agree FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We can live with this proposal |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Sharp | Depend on | If collisions handling between RO and other channels are all up to UE implementation, the Ngap make no sense. And the gap for the Rx-to-Tx switching can be considered in case9. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Intel | N | We have a concern on the proposal since it is still not clear what is the real technical benefit of using the ‘Ngap symbols’.On the other hand, we prefer to make decision on ‘FL1 High Priority Proposal 6.1-1’ first. If all overlap handling related to valid RO is up to UE implementation, we may not need to specify ‘Ngap symbols’ at all. Above all, we prefer to define all switching gap related behaviour in Case 9. A unified solution is preferred  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok to further discussion as Intel commented |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We prefer to discuss further |
| Mediatek | Y | If RO handling is left to UE implementation then specifying an Ngap is not neded.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Similar comment with Intel. It is suggested to be discussed in case 9. |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE |  | Okay to further discuss. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |

## Whether or not the same principle is applied to PUSCH occasion of MsgA in 2-step RACH, if supported

In contribution [Huawei03], it is proposed that the validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasions and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules of HD-FDD Ues follow the rules of FDD’s definition.

Contribution [Ericsson04, CATT08] expresses view that PUSCH occasion of MsgA in the 2-step RACH can be treated in the same way as either configured PUSCH or valid RO.

Contribution [Nokia11, MTK16] proposes to reuse the the same handling principle for MsgA PUSCH occasion and leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit MsgA when collision happens.

In contribution [Intel17], there is a different proposal considering whether DL reception is semi-statically configured or dynamically scheduled. More specially, when a MsgA PUSCH is overlapped with a dynamically scheduled DL reception, the MsgA PUSCH is cancelled if the cancellation time for MsgA PUSCH is met (follow the handling of Case 1); and when a MsgA PUSCH is overlapped with a configured DL reception, the MsgA PUSCH is cancelled.

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

From the above, two issues are discussed. One is the validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasion and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules for HD-FDD Ues. The other is how to handle the collision between MsgA PUSCH and a DL reception, e.g., reusing the same handling principle for valid RO or configured PUSCH.

The second issue may be dependent on the discussion in section 6.1 for collision handling between valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL. The FL suggestion is to deprioritize it until there is any outcome in section 6.1. For the first issue, companies are welcome to provide comments if they wish.

**FL1 High Priority Question 6.3-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether or not the validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasions and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules of HD-FDD Ues can follow the rules of FDD’s definition**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y | It can be supported seems share same scheme as Type1 PRACH. |
| Qualcomm |  | We can live with re-using FD-FDD rule for validation of msgA PO. However, whether or not UE can transmit on the “valid” RO/PO depends on the size of DL-to-UL switching gap needed by Type-A HD-FDD UE. |
| Vivo |  | We are fine to reuse the existing validation rule in FDD.  |
| CATT | Y | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | We prefer to follow the rules of FDD’s definition |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | The same validation rule of Msg A PUSCH occasions for FDD can be reused for HD-FDD. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | The same validation rule of Msg A PUSCH occasions for FDD can be reused for HD-FDD |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Mediatek | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE |  | Following FDD rule is preferred. |
| FL2 | Based on the received response, seem all companies are okay with re-using FD-FDD rule for validation of msgA PO for HD-FDD. Therefore, the following proposal can be considered.**FL2 High Priority Question 6.3-1:*** The same validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasions and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules for FDD can be reused for HD-FDD
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL3 | Seem all are okay with the proposal; the moderator suggests the same proposal can be considered for endorsement. **FL3 High Priority Question 6.3-1:*** The same validation rules of MsgA PUSCH occasions and RO/Preamble-to-PRU mapping rules for FDD can be reused for HD-FDD
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| LGE | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |

**FL1 Medium Priority Proposal 6.3-2:**

* For MsgA PUSCH occasion overlapping with a DL reception, the following alternatives are considered
	+ Alt.1: MsgA PUSCH follows the same handling of valid RO.
	+ Alt.2: MsgA PUSCH follows the same handling of configured UL transmission.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y | Alt2 |
| Qualcomm |  | Alt 2 is preferred |
| vivo |  | Alt 2 may be too restrictive as MSGA PUSCH occasions are configured in cell specific manner therefore a bit difficult to completely avoid the collision with configured DL reception.  |
| CATT | Y | Fine with the proposal. Given the fact that all (or most, depends on outcome of 6.1) of collision handling case when valid RO is involved will be ‘up to UE implementation’, we slightly prefer Alt.1, i.e. transmission of MsgA PUSCH will be up to UE implementation. |
| Intel |  | Alt 1 is not fine since MsgA PUSCH is not as important as PRACH preambleAlt 2 is not good since the overlap between MsgA PUSCH and configured DL is treated as error case. Since NR supports that 2-step RACH falls back to 4-step RACH if MsgA PUSCH cannot be transmitted, the proper way should be drop MsgA PUSCH if it is overlapped with configured DL. Therefore, our preference is* If overlapped with a dynamically scheduled DL receptions, the MsgA PUSCH is cancelled if the cancellation time for MsgA PUSCH is met (overlap handling Case 1)
* If overlapped with a configured DL reception, the MsgA PUSCH is cancelled
 |
| Ericsson | Y | We are open to the discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Open |  |
| DOCOMO |  | This proposal can be discussed after further progress is made on the collision handling for valid RO.Alt 2 is not preferred since it is difficult to avoid collision with configured DL. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Our preference is Alt 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Alt.1 is preferred. For Alt.2 we do not see much benefits for gNB detection, since the HD-FDD UE can not be identified by the gNB. |
| Nordic  | Y | But again, it should be left up to implementation that UE prioritize MSGA if only if needs to transmit MSGA |
| Apple | Y | Our preference is Alt.1. In our view, prioritize MsgA PUSCH is important to achieve the benefit of 2-step RACH to reduce the cell access latency, which is clearly more important compared to DL throughput optimization.  |
| CMCC | Y | We slightly prefer Alt.1 |
| LGE |  | Not okay with the Alt.2. Since Alt.1 is under discussion. We can come back to this later. |

# Case 9: Collision due to direction switching

RAN1#104bis-e reached the following working assumptions [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:* For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than [*NRX-TX Tc*] after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than [*NTX-RX Tc*] after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ FFS NTX-RX and NRX-TX
	+ FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases
 |

The further question is whether the back-to-back UL/DL without sufficient gap is allowed or not for HD-FDD UEs, and what is the assumed UE behaviour if happens.

Contributions [CATT08, CT09, Nokia11] express view that the gNB should take care to schedule the back-to-back UL/DL with the necessary gap and if there is no sufficient switching time, it is an error case same as in TDD.

Contribution [vivo06] indicates that gNB may avoid such collision for all cases except for the collision cases of valid RO vs. SSB and valid RO vs. configured PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set(s). If including Ngap symbols before the valid RO is supported for HD-FDD, no additional rule/solution is needed.

A similar view is provided in contribution [Apple23] that the case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap is NOT allowed except the collision case involving a valid RO. In such case, it can be up to UE to ensure the switching time is satisfied

Contributions [Ericsson04, OPPO07, Xiaomi13, DoCoMo18] express a different view that it may be difficult in general for the network to guarantee the switching time is always enough, especially for semi-statically configured DL/UL due to the co-existence with full-duplex UE.

Contributions [ZTE12, Samsung15, Intel17] further discuss the following two subcases identified in email discussion in RAN1#106-e for collision due to direction switching.

* Subcase 1: Non-overlapping DL/UL but with no sufficient gap
* Subcase 2: Overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling

Contribution [Samsung15] indicates that the first subcase can be handled by UE implementation to ensure the switching gap or as error case where UE is not expected to handle, and the second sub-case can be handled by UE implementation or clear UE behaviour to ensure the switching gap.

Contributions [ZTE12, Intel17, LG21, Sharp22] also indicates both subcases may happen for HD-FDD Ues and thus it is preferred to define a clear UE behaviour to guarantee sufficient gap for switching.

It is also indicated in contribution [vivo06] that the similar issue had been discussed for TDD but without consensus. The following agreement was made in RAN1#93. But after that, no additional UE behavior was agreed for TDD.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements (RAN1#93)**:*** **UE is not required to** receive on a downlink symbol and then transmit on a uplink symbol if those two symbols are not separated by at least Rx2Tx us on unpaired spectrum for a given serving cell, from the UE perspective
	+ **Discuss further whether it’s an error case or to specify a UE behavior**
	+ Note that the exact value of Rx2Tx has been specified in RAN4 [R4-1805766]
 |

**Moderator observation/suggestion**:

Based on the FL understanding, the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap may happen also for the collision cases of MsgA PUSCH overlapping with SSB or configured PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set(s) in addition to the collision cases involving a valid RO. Considering the coexistence with FD-FDD Ues, it is quite restrictive for network configuration if the back-to-back UL/DL is treated as error case. Differentiation from TDD should be considered.

For the above subcase 2 of the overlapping DL/UL with no sufficient gap after collision handling, the FL understanding it may happen only for Case 1 of SRS overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception overlapping or if UE is capable of partial cancellation of PUCCH or PUSCH or PRACH. Since these may also happen for TDD, no additional rule is thus needed for HD-FDD.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 7-1: Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:**

* For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as NR TDD operation in FR1
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD Ues.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Y | We see the spec. will have different descriptions to be discussed. |
| Qualcomm | N | We agree with the first bullet on re-using the same principle of NR Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication.We don’t agree with the second bullet on allowing “back-to-back” DL-to-UL switching without a sufficient gap for RX-to-TX switching, which is not consistent with the rule specified for NR TDD.• Based on TS 38.133, the fixed TA offset between DL and UL carriers in SA deployment (on TDD and FDD bands) can be used to compensate for the UL-to-DL switching time, but not the DL-to-UL switching time.• All the TDD slot formats specified in TS 38.213 have at least one flexible symbol for DL-to-UL switching.• For NR TDD, R15/16 spec does not mandate back-to-back DL-to-UL switching for non-RedCap UE. By the same token, NR R17 should not mandate Type-A HD-FDD UE to support back-to-back DL-to-UL switching without a sufficient switching gap.• Whether or not to support back-to-back DL-to-UL switching in Type-A HD-FDD can be specified as a UE capability for RedCap devices. |
| Vivo | Y for the 1st bullet only.  | We are fine with the 1st bullet (and the sub-bullets) but suggest to treat the 2nd bullet (and the sub-bullets) separately.For the 2nd bullet, we see there are following possible cases* Case A: Back-to-back semi-statically configured transmission/reception vs. dynamically scheduled reception/transmission
* Case B: Back-to-back transmission/reception configured by dedicated higher layer parameters vs. reception/transmission configured by dedicated or cell specific higher layer parameters
* Case C: back-to-back transmission/reception configured by cell-specific higher layer parameters and reception/transmission configured by cell-specific higher layer parameters

For Case A and Case B, sine dedicated configuration/scheduling are involved, we think it should be always possible for gNB to avoid the back-to-back transmission and reception without sufficient gap. Case C may be difficult to avoid from gNB perspective, and we think the existing agreement can be extended to relax the gNB configuration restriction, as followingProposal: **At least for the collision cases of valid RO vs. PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set(s) or SSB, the set of symbols overlapping with PDCCH in CSS set or SS includes also Ngap symbols before the valid RO.** |
| CATT | Y  | From the 1st bullet, it is clear that A HD-FDD UE is not expected to ‘handle’ the case when gap is not sufficient. So, for the 2nd bullet, when a case of “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap happens, HD-FDD UE is not required to handle it (leave it up to UE implementation).  |
| Sharp | Y partially | The first bullet is fine. But for the second bullet, we think a clear UE behaviour should be defined.The situation is different with TDD where the DL-UL gap (at least one flexible symbol) and non-zero TA\_offset are configured. But it will confuse a UE on how to do back-to-back switching in a FDD cell when these two lengths are zero. |
| Intel |  | We prefer to define the two subcases first, then discuss the handling for each subcase. Clarification on whether each subcase is error case should be done first. Then, if a subcase is allowed, a solution is to be discussed later.In our understanding, the first bullet in FL proposal is for the 2nd subcase. Does it imply that it is error case if there is no enough switching gap after overlap handling case 1/2/3/4/5/8? The second bullet is related to 1st subcase, we share the view 1st subcase is allowed  |
| Ericsson | Y | The first bullet is similar to the principle for NR Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication. The second bullet is to clarify that for HD-FDD UE, the scenario of “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap can happen, i.e., allowed, and whether a clear UE behaviour to handle the witching time is defined or not is to be discussed further.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Open |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y for 1st bullet | We are fine with the 1st bullet. For the second bullet, we prefer to have further discussion. |
| MediaTek | Y | The first bullet specifies the assumption on the UE behaviour. We are fine leaving the back-to-back scheduling case to UE implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with modification | For the case of partial overlapping, no sufficient gap after collision handling may also happen. So it is suggested to discuss whether to specify a clear UE behavior to ensure the sufficient gap for the switching time for the partial overlapping case and back-to-back case.For the first bullet of reusing the same principle, from our understanding, it is trying to use the *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* to provide the sufficient gap. However, for the second bullet, it means the sufficient gap is not provided. Therefore, these two bullets are conflicting with each other.The following modification is suggested:**FL1 High Priority Proposal 7-1: Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:*** For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication except the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL case and partial overlapping UL/DL case.
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as NR TDD operation in FR1
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap and partial overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD Ues.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
 |
| Nordic | Y, partially | We do not agree with second sub-bullet. gNB shall take into accoung UEs gap and TA in its scheduling same as in TDD. Therefore, overlap shall not happen and it is error case, except of when we left handling up to UE implementation, i.e. when transmitting MSG1/MSGA/RO |
| Samsung | Y | We are OK with the FL proposal. We think a case for “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap should be allowed and then possibly clear UE behaviour should be defined. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y for the first bullet | FFS for the 2nd bullet |
| Apple  | Y for the 1st bullet | On 2nd bullet, our preference is to allow back-back UL/DL with smaller gap for cell-specific signal/channel only, which are difficult for gNB to manage or would cause performance degradation for FD-FDD if defining some restriction.  |
| China Telecom | Y for the first bullet | FFS for the 2nd bullet |
| LGE | Y | For the second bullet, defining clear UE behaviour is preferred. |
| Xiaomi | Y, partially  | We are OK with 1st bulletFor the second bullet, we also understand that it may be difficult for avoid to avoid this situation in the cell-specific DL/UL Tx. Hence, we can accept the 2nd bullet is only apllied for the cell-sjpecific DL/UL Tx. As for the handling of overlapping, we are OK with vivo’s proposal or leave it to UE implementation  |
| FL2 | **Moderator observation:*** For the first bullet,
	+ 16 companies are okay with the proposal
	+ 2 companies (Intel, ZTE) prefer further discussion
* For the second bullet,
	+ 7 comapnies are okay with the proposal where 2 companies (CATT, MTK) are fine leaving the back-to-back scheduling case to UE implementation and 2 companies (Samsung, LG) prefer defining clear UE behaviour
	+ 3 companies (vivo, Apple, Xiaomi) suggests to make it applied only to the cell-specific DL/UL configuration.
	+ One company (Qualcomm) indicates whether it is required for HD-FDD UE to support the back-to-back DL-to-UL switching without sufficient gap?

**@ZTE and @Intel**: For the first bullet, it specifies the assumption on the UE behaviour for HD-FDD Ues to be same as TDD Ues, including the case of “overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling”. Optimization for HD-FDD seems not necessary and agreed to all according to discussion till now. For the second bullet, the intention is to address the coexistence issue with FD-FDD Ues sharing the same cell-specific UL/DL configuration. To moderator’s understanding, it may be difficult to avoid from gNB perspective. Additonal rule for HD-FDD is beneficial to relax NW configuration restriction. Also, if the “case” in the second bullet is changed to “configuration”, the moderator understands there would be no confliction between the 1st and 2nd bullet since the first bullet is about the actual transmission or reception not the configuration. **Moderator recommendation: Consider the following updated proposal.****FL2 High Priority Proposal 7-1: Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:*** For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as NR TDD operation in FR1
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The cell-specific configuration of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD Ues.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
	+ Note: This does not mean a HD-FDD UE is required to support the back-to-back UL/DL switching without sufficient gap
 |
| vivo | Y with revisions | We suggest some revision to the 2nd bullet trying to make the proposal more clear. * The ~~cell-specific configuration of the~~ “back-to-back” non-overlapping ~~UL/DL~~ without sufficient gap between cell-specific configured UL and DL may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD Ues.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
	+ Note: This does not mean a HD-FDD UE is required to support the back-to-back UL/DL switching without sufficient gap
 |
| DOCOMO | Y | Support vivo’s revision |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are wondering if the first bullet is agreed, whether UE-dedicated DL overlapping with UE-dedicated UL is allowed or not? From our understanding, when the collision happens or overlapping happens, then the sufficient gap can not be provided. When the *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are provided, then no collision or overlapping case happens. |
| Intel | Y | Just try to understand the relation between the two main bullets in the FL proposal. Does it mean* For the case covered by 2nd bullet, further discussion is needed to clarify the UE behavior
* For all other cases except the case of 2nd bullet, the 1st bullet applies, i.e. to define them as error cases.

For the 2nd bullet, we don’t think it should be limited to cell specific DL/UL. For other DL/UL with short periodicity, it is hard for gNB to always guarantee non-overlap with sufficient gap too. Therefore, such design can generally applies to all cases of “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap. Assuming a scheme for 2nd bullet is defined, it can be easily applies to “overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling” too. However, we can accept majority view if majority companies consider it as error case for “overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling”.  |
| Ericsson | Y | Support in principle. Perhaps it is clearer to update the third subbullet to“*NRX-TX ~~T~~~~c~~* and *NTX-RX ~~T~~~~c~~* are the same as ~~NR TDD operation in FR1~~ the transition time for FR1 in Table 4.3.2-3, TS 38.211 for a UE not capable of full-duplex communication” |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are also fine with the suggested changes from vivo and Ericsson. |
| Nordic  | N | It should be clarified that this is after “TA is taken into acoout”. For the case without TA, we already have rules for common RRC conflicts, right? |
| Qualcomm |  | We don’t think the 2nd bullet is needed.For the sake of progress, we can live with the FL proposal by including “cell-specific”configuration for the DL/UL switching pattern as well as the note for HD-FDD UE. The suggestions of Vivo and Ericsson are ok for us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | Fine with vivo’s version |
| CATT | Y | vivo and Ericsson’s update is also fine.  |
| Sharp | Y | We are fine with the suggested changes from Ericsson. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We are OK with vivo’s revision  |
| CMCC | Y | Fine with vivo’s version |
| LGE | Y |  |
| FL3 | **@ZTE**: To moderator’s understanding, the first bullet will not affect the previous agreement for the case of UE-dedicated DL overlapping with UE-dedicated UL. As commented in the 2nd round discussion, the first bullet targets to specify the same UE behavior for TDD reused for HD-FDD UEs. For your example, if it is not allowed for TDD, then it will not be allowed for HD-FDD.**@Nordic**: Moderator understands it has been discussed in the previous meeting that the collision is from UE perspective and TA is considered for UL transmission. However, there is no consensus on whether the switching time is also included (as discussed in section 5.2 and 6.2). The rules agreed for common RRC conflicting are for the case of overlapping DL/UL, but the second bullet is for the case of non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap. **Moderator recommendation: Consider the following updated proposal with changes suggested from vivo and Ericsson.****FL3 High Priority Proposal 7-1: Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:*** For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as the transition time for FR1 in Table 4.3.2-3, TS 38.211 for a UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The ~~cell-specific configuration of the~~ “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between cell-specific configured UL and DL may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD Ues.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
	+ Note: This does not mean a HD-FDD UE is required to support the back-to-back UL/DL switching without sufficient gap
 |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | Ok in principle. Please see below some suggestion for update of the second bullet. For the second bullet, we think it does not need to be limited to cell-specific DL and cell-specific UL. For example, overlapping between cell-specific configured DL (e.g., SSB) and dedicated configured UL (e.g., CG PUSCH) are allowed and the collision handling is defined to ensure HD-FDD UE has sufficient switching time. Thus, it should be reasonable to also allow e.g., non-overlapping without sufficient gap between SSB and CG PUSCH occasion and define the handling to ensure sufficient gap. One of the reasons is that some configured UL/DL are with periodic occasions, and it is not always possible to ensure that the condition is met for all occasions. The same goes for cell-specific UL and dedicated DL. Therefore, we think it is reasonable to extend the second bullet to cover configured UL and DL in general. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | We disagree with Ericsson since RRC-configured UL transmission happens after UE capability signalling. After receiving the capability report of HD-FDD RedCap UE, NW is able to avoid the occurrence of “insufficient switching gap”, which helps improve the SE of system. Otherwise, if HD-FDD UE needs to prioritize the cell-specifically DL (e.g. SSB) over configured UL (e.g. CG-PUSCH), the UL resources are wasted. The same goes for cell-specific UL and dedicated DL. Therefore, we don’t think it is reasonable to extend the second bullet to cover configured UL/DL. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | OK with Ericsson’s suggestion and maybe, more discussion is needed. Even though RRC configured UL happens after UE capability signalling, SSB is confined within 5ms half frame and also can be sent with longer periodicity than CG PUSCH. In this case, NW may want to allow a collision with SSB within 5ms half frame duration by configuring CG PUSCH with a short periodicity such that CG PUSCH can be utilized more well in remaining slots where SSB is not sent. With this reason, we agree with Ericsson that the second bullet can be extended to cover configured UL and DL in general. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine to further discuss whether “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between cell-specific configured DL/UL and UE-dedicated configured UL/DL are allowed for HD-FDD UEs. |
| Intel |  | Assuming FL3 Medium Priority Conclusion 5.2-1 will be agreed, Case 9 now needs to cover both of* Subcase 1: overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling
* Subcase 2: “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap

It is still not clear for us what is the relation on the relation of the two main bullets in the proposal.* Does first main bullet covers subcase 2? If so, it defines subcase 2 as error case. Then it conflicts with the seond main bullet (a subset of subcase 2 is allowed).
* Or, does first main bullet only covers subcase 1? Consequently, lack of switching time between SSB and UL is defined as error case

Focusing on the second main bullet, we share the view from E// and SS, it may not be limited to cell specific DL/UL. We are open for discussion.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For the first bullet, further clarification is needed. Take collision case 1 for example as shown in Figure 1, Figure 1From Figure 1, DG PDSCH is prioritized in case 1, based on the collision handle rule of case 1, part A of CG PUSCH in the overlapped range are punctured/skipped. For the part B of CG PUSCH, If part B of CG PUSCH can be punctured/skipped by the UE and used as switching time , we are OK with the first bullet.If UE regard case1 as the error case, this would quite limit the gNB scheduling. Moreover, gNB scheduling is already used to ensure a sufficient gap between DG PDSCH and CG PUSCH. The DG PDSCH and CG PUSCH would not overlap and thus the collision case 1 does not exist. Then it is meaningless to define the collision rule for case1. In this case, the first bullet should not be supported.For the second bullet, we agree with the Ericsson’s suggestion |
| LGE |  | For the second bullet, we share the same view from Ericsson and Samsung.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| FL4 | **@Intel**: In moderator’s view, the first main bullet is a general rule for collision due to direction switching, and the second is to define a collision handling rule for the case the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap. Therefore, if the second main bullet is not agreed, then following the first main bullet, the case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap will be treated as error case since it requires HD-FDD UE to transmit and receive during the switching time. If the second main bullet is agreed, based on the rule defined in the second bullet (e.g., either a clear UE behavior or leave it to UE implementation), the collision due to directional switching will not happen for the case of “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap, and the first bullet will not be applied. In summary, as seen by moderator there is no conflict between the 1st and 2nd main bullet. The second bullet just introduces an additional rule for the case of “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between cell-specific configured UL and DL, similar to the rules defined for Case 1~8.**@ZTE**: The two examples of Case 1 are confusing. To moderator’s understanding, for Case 1, if UE is capable of partial cancellation, the cancellation of UL transmission is applied for all the symbols after T\_{proc,2}. For your example A, it is not possible to cancel part A but not part B if both are after T\_{proc,2}. Similarly, in example B, if part B is after T\_{proc,2} it will be cancelled (together with part A). In the section 3 of the FLS, there are two figures copied from [4] to explain how partial cancellation is applied for Case 1. As illustrated in the figures, gNB can take into account the switching time when scheduling dynamic DL. In case of collision with switching time after partial cancellation, as long as a UE behaviour is clarified according to the first bullet then there would be no issue. Regarding your concern on gNB scheduling restriction, it is not a specific issue only for HD-FDD and is applied also to TDD. Further optimization for HD-FDD seems unnecessary.**@All**, Seems a couple of companies want to extend the second bullet to cover also RRC configured UL. The proposal is updated as following adding a new FFS under the second main bullet.(according to guidance from Chairman, in case of modification of the context of the working assumption, it is good to make a new proposal instead of “confirm the WA”)**FL4 High Priority Proposal 7-1: ~~Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:~~*** For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as the transition time for FR1 in Table 4.3.2-3, TS 38.211 for a UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between cell-specific configured UL and DL may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD UEs.
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
	+ Note: This does not mean a HD-FDD UE is required to support the back-to-back UL/DL switching without sufficient gap
	+ FFS on whether to extend to cover also RRC configured DL/UL
 |
| vivo |  | We are open to discuss the potential extension of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping betweenCell-specific configured UL and RRC configured DLCell-specific configured DL and RRC configured ULHowever, we think the “back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC configured DL and RRC configured UL shall not be allowed, i.e. treat it as error cases. This is to following the principle of existing agreement of case 3. The FFS bullet should be revised to excluded this case.  |
| Ericsson |  | There seem to be multiple companies agreeing with the view of extending to cover configured UL/DL in general. So, if possible, it would be preferred to update the main text of the second bullet instead, i.e., replacing “cell-specific” by “RRC”. Then potentially the FFS point can be about possible limitation, e.g., based on Vivo’s comment instead.Regarding Vivo’s comment, in our view the existing agreement of Case 3 does not need to mean that “back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC configured DL and RRC configured UL shall not be allowed. Case 3 only deals with the overlapping case. |
| MediaTek |  | We agree with Vivo that the same assumptions and principle apply here as in the Case 3 agreement. Therefore, we believe the FFS on RRC configured DL/UL is not necessary.  |
| Qualcomm | Y in general | Regarding the last “FFS”, we think the following cases should not be allowed for HD-FDD UE:1. cell-specific DL is immediately before RRC configured UL and there is no sufficient switching gap between the cell-specific DL and the RRC configured UL
2. RRC configured DL is immediately before cell-specific UL and there is no sufficient switching gap between the RRC configured DL and the cell-specific UL
3. RRC configured DL is immediately before RRC configured UL and there is no sufficient switching gap between the RRC configured DL and the RRC configured UL
 |
| Intel |  | Thanks for Moderator’s clarification on the relation of the two bullets, especially the subcase 2.* Subcase 1: overlapping DL/UL and no sufficient gap after collision handling
* Subcase 2: “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap

Our understanding the FL proposal is * The subcase 1 is handled by the first main bullet, i.e., it is defined as error case for all Case 1/2/3/4/5/8, if there is an issue of switching gap
* The subcase 2 has identified two options. The first option is per the first main bullet, i.e., error case. The second option is per the second main bullet that is to allow gNB scheduling of at least certain combinations of subcase 2.

If the understanding is correct, it is preferred to capture the solution(s) for each subcase clearly. Regarding the second main bullet, we prefer to not limit it to cell specific DL/UL.  |
| CMCC | Y | We agree “back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC configured DL/UL shall be treated as error case. |
| CATT |  | We think at least the RRC-configured DL vs. RRC-configured UL is not needed in the last FFS. Furthermore, for the error case (configuration is not allowed), eventually the transmission/reception is ‘up to UE implementation’. Also even if such configuration is allowed, it can still be handled by ‘up to UE implementation’ as well. This requires less standard impact in any angle. |
| OPPO | Y | The RRC configured DL/UL collision should be treated as an error case an covered by CASE3.We think the specification should not use text like “A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit/receive”. This will means an error case too, similar as TDD. Would be better to say A HD-FDD UE is may not transmit/receive in the gap. This covered by FFS is OK for us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | Thanks for Moderator’s clarification on our example of case 1 for the first bullet. Based on the FL clarification and the description of first bullet, we understand UE would drop or skip the transmission for providing sufficient switching time when T\_{proc,2} is guaranteed. If it is the consensus for all the companies, we would be fine with the first bullet.For the second bullet, except case 3, all the other cases also should be considered and discussed, e.g., dynamic DL and dynamic UL, dynamic DL and RRC configured UL, RO related. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Assuming the last FFS will be discussed further, we are fine with current proposal as is. |
| Samsung |  | We prefer the suggestion from Ericsson for the further discussion possibly in the next meeting.  |
| LGE | Y (but …) | We support the suggestion from Ericsson. But, we can live with the latest update from the FL as long as it does not preclude the “back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC configured DL and RRC configured UL.For the vivo’s comment on the Case 3, we have the same understanding as Ericsson. The Case 3 only deals with the overlapping case, not necessarily the back-to-back non-overlapping case. |
| Xiaomi |  | We share similar view with vivo that the back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC configured DL and RRC configured UL shall not be allowed, i.e. treat it as error cases |
| vivo |  | @Ericsson, @LGE,Our intention was to reuse the agreement for case 3, and extend the error case to cover also the “back-to-back” non-overlapping between RRC-D and RRC-U.  |
| FL5 | Based on the received response, some companies have concern on the last FFS added to the second bullet since it is viewed that RRC configured DL/UL can be covered by the agreement for Case 3.Considering RRC may include also SIB configuring cell-specific DL/UL, RRC configured DL/UL in the last FFS may thus conflict the cell-specific configured DL/UL in the second main bullet. Therefore, it may be better to replace the “cell-specific” by “RRC” in the main bullet and clarify “RRC configured DL/UL” includes at least the cell specific higher layer parameters configured DL/UL in a sub-bullet.Also, regarding the difference b/w “error case” and “up to UE implementation”, in moderator’s view, for error case, UE behaviour is not specified, including the possibility of neither transmission nor reception. But for “up to UE implementation”, following the agreement for Case 8, UE may perform either transmission or reception but not both when collision happens**FL5 High Priority Proposal 7-1: ~~Confirm the working assumption with the following modifications:~~*** For HD-FDD, reuse the same principle as Rel-15/16 UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than ~~[~~*NRX-TX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell
	+ A HD-FDD UE is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than ~~[~~*NTX-RX Tc*~~]~~ after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell
	+ ~~FFS N~~~~TX-RX~~ ~~and N~~~~RX-TX~~ *NRX-TX Tc* and *NTX-RX Tc* are the same as the transition time for FR1 in Table 4.3.2-3, TS 38.211 for a UE not capable of full-duplex communication
	+ ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~
* The “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between RRC ~~cell-specific~~ configured UL and DL may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD UEs.
	+ RRC configured DL/UL includes at least cell specific higher layer parameters configured DL/UL
	+ Discuss further whether to specify a clear UE behavior, or leave it to UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied
	+ Note: This does not mean a HD-FDD UE is required to support the back-to-back UL/DL switching without sufficient gap
	+ ~~FFS on whether to extend to cover also RRC configured DL/UL~~
 |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSi |  | If I’m not missing, could you explain what does not it mean by agreeing on the proposal with highlights? Those are FFS? Also we think UE implementation cannot ensure that the switching time is satisfied, rather it just leave it unhandled.  |

# Other aspects

## Whether SFI can be optionally supported for HD-FDD UE

Currently, a FDD UE can optionally support SFI operation. The dynamic SFI provides a means for gNB to cancel the configured DL reception or UL transmission on flexible symbols in a slot. Regarding whether SFI can be optionally supported for HD-FDD UEs, the following are discussed in a few contributions:

* Contribution [Nokia11] indicates there is no need to support dynamic SFI for HD-FDD RedCap UE.
* Contribution [Intel17] raises one issue when SFI is supported for HD-FDD Ues. Currently, the DL SFI and UL SFI are separately processed in NR FDD, an if SFI is supported for HD-FDD Ues, the order to check SFI and to apply overlap handling of a DL reception and a UL transmission needs to be determined.

**FL1 Medium Priority Question 8.1-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether SFI can be optionally supported for HD-FDD Ues and the potential impact on collision handling if supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | N | It should not be supported by RedCap UE in FDD band. |
| Qualcomm | N | SFI should not be discussed in HD-FDD operation of RedCap UE. |
| vivo |  | We are fine to not support SFI by specification for HD-FDD RedCap Ues.  |
| CATT |  | We are fine to not supporting SFI for HD-FDD UE, since it leads to higher complexity/cost and more power consumption. |
| Intel | Y | We prefer to support SFI indication as an optional capability for HD-FDD UE (same as FD-FDD UE) |
| Ericsson |  | We do not see the need to support SFI for HD-FDD RedCap UE.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | There is overlapping discussion on support of DCI format 2\_0 in another thread. |
| DOCOMO |  | We are fine not to support SFI for HD-FDD RedCap UE |
| Nokia, NSB | N | We do not see the need to support SFI for HD-FDD UE |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | Not necessary. |
| Nordic  | N |  |
| Samsung | Y | First of all, SFI is an optional features for UE in FDD. Unless there is special reason, we think it can be supported by RedCap UE as well by default and then SFI can be optionally used to cancel one of the directions between DL and UL. |
| LGE | N |  |
|  |  |  |

## Definition and capability of HD-FDD UE

One contribution presents view on the UE capability reporting of HD-FDD. Contribution [OPPO07] proposes that UE capability of HD-FDD is explicitly defined and known by gNB.

Since this is related to UE feature discussion, the FL suggestion is to discuss it under the AI 8.6.2.

## Switching gap for neighbour cell SSB measurement

Contribution [LG21] proposes to discuss the impact of switching gap for a HD-FDD UE on the measurement based on SSB, e.g., whether the switching gap need to be considered for determination of time duration of SSB reception for measurement.
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