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# 1 Introduction

Based on the outcome of the e-meeting preparation phase (See section 3 in [9]), the following email discussion has been kicked-off:

[100b-e-NR- LTE\_NR\_DC\_CA-ULPC-01] Email discussion/approval of issues 1/2/3/4/5 in [R1-2002346](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_100b\Docs\R1-2002346.zip) till 4/24, with potential TPs for approval till 4/29 (Apple, Hong)

# 2. Discussion

Table 1 summaries the identified issues in accordance to the contributions submitted and more details for each issue were provided in the following sections.

**Table 1: Issues scoping based on contributions**
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## 2.1 Issue-1: RAN2 LS reply on T\_offset determination WA

One working assumption was made in ran1 #100-eMeeting related to T\_offset determination and corresponding UE capability signaling. According to LS [12], MN is required to process the SCG configuration to identify the T\_offset used by the UE; Otherwise, possible largest value of T\_offset has to be assumed by MN for dynamic power sharing operation.

The LS reply from RAN2 [13] was received in this meeting and it states the following:

|  |
| --- |
| “*RAN2 would like to thank RAN1 for the LS on uplink power control for NR-NR Dual-Connectivity.*  *RAN2 is still discussing the reply to RAN1 but has no consensus yet on introducing new inter-node signalling for T\_offset.*  *However, RAN2 would like to remind that it was agreed in Rel-15 that MN and SN are not required to comprehend each other’s UE configuration for MR-DC. Therefore, RAN1 making assumption that such comprehension is possible is not correct in RAN2 view.”* |

In addition, RAN2 is still discussing new functionality to improve the efficiency of DPS by introducing inter-gNB signal and hence avoid assuming the worst T\_offset value, even RAN1 did not ask for this.

Several companies [1][3][6][7][8][11] discussed the impact of RAN2 reply LS with following summarized proposal

* Opt.1: No impact and confirm the WA with removing from second capability (i.e. Alt.2 in [11]) for T\_offset determination [6][11].
* Opt.2: Revising the WA and defining the T\_offset values in RAN1 without the need of MN/SN interaction [1][7][10]:
  + Option 2-1: <1, 0.5> ms [1]
    - Introducing one RRC parameter to configure the T\_offset value for UEs on a per FR basis [1].
  + Option 2-2: <4, 1.5> ms [10]
  + Reasoning:
* Opt.3: NOT support “look-ahead” with T\_offset [8]
* Opt.4: Wait from RAN2 further progress on email discussion [3]

The reasons for these options were summarized in the Table 2 below based on papers:

**Table 2:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | No. of companies | Companies | Reasoning |
| Opt.1 | 2 | Samsung [6], Qualcomm [11] | * No impact was seen on the RAN1 spec as the situation that “MN and SN do not comprehend each other’s UE configuration for MR-DC” was recognized already when making this agreement. [11] * No impact was seen on the RAN1 spec. When the MN can comprehend the UE configurations of SCG, it helps MN to select a suitable and optimal value for T\_offset. If not, MN just set the T\_offset based on the possible largest value. [6] * Current WA is better than specifying “absolute value” [11] |
| Opt.2 | 3 | Nokia [7], ZTE [1] (Opt.2-1), Ericsson [10] (Opt.2-2) | * Considering the late stage of the WI discussions (RAN4 is already waiting for RAN1 specs to stabilize to specify performance requirements), our preference is to fix this issue in RAN1 in this meeting rather than wait and rely on other WGs to find a solution. This removes the linking of T\_offset with RRC configurations of MCG and SCG and is fully aligned with RAN2 MR-DC framework and also current UE capability framework for dynamic power sharing [10]. |
| Opt.3 | 1 | OPPO [8] | * The current framework for look-ahead operation doesn't work based on RAN2 LS [8] |
| Opt.4 | 1 | Huawei [3] | * RAN2 email thread discussion is still ongoing about how to accommodate the RAN1 WA and, then MN scheduler could be aware of the and take the restriction introduced by the into consideration [3]. |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with Opt.4. Once RAN2 formally make a conclusion, we can further discuss this. |
| Samsung | OK to revisit the WA as needed after the LS from RAN2. |
| OPPO | Due to so many issues led by the look-head operation and the uncerntain solution of RAN2, we prefer not to support look-head operation. If majoirity companies still support look-head based mechanis, we can compromise to support Option 2 with the aim to finish the feature as soon as possbile. |
| Ericsson | Our preference is Option 2 as explained in our tdoc. We are open to discussing exact capability indication values. |
| ZTE | Our preference is to let the UE report the Toffset value via UE capability, which is a clean solution from our perspective. The exact values of Toffset can be further discussed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support option 2. We do not need to design detailed equation for T\_offset calculation which would not be understood by network so not to be utilized. |
| vivo | We prefer to support Option 4. In our understanding, the ongoing disscussion in RAN2 is to support the working assumption in RAN1, but not revise it. |
| MTK | Under current status, we think Option 4 is more viable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4. Given an ongoing RAN2 discussion in parallel, it is better to avoid confliting solutions between two WGs. |

## 2.2 Issue-2: TPC Commands in DCI format 2\_2 and 2\_3

**DCI format 2\_2**

NR supports different timeline of group-common TPC in DCI format 2\_2 for dynamic PUSCH (DG-PUSCH) and CG-PUSCH. More specifically, for DG-PUSCH, the k2 value in scheduling DCI format is used to limit the last applicable DCI 2\_2. While, for CG-PUSCH, minimum K2 value configured in PUSCH-ConfigCommon (i.e. cell-specific) is used to determine the last applicable DCI format 2\_2. It is FFS regarding how to handle the case when DCI format 2\_2 or 2\_3 is received after T0-T\_offset, as shown in FIG.1 copied from [11].



Figure 1: Group-TPC commands in DCI 2\_2 received after T0 – T\_offset.

This issue was extensively discussed in RAN1 #100 bis e-meeting, but no consensus was reached. Ten companies [1][2][3][4][5][6][8][9][10][11] shared views on this open issue and can be generally summarized as follows:

**Table 3:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies |
| Opt.1 | The NW ensures that the group TPC command in the DCI format 2\_2 received after T0 – T\_offset that is applied to the semi-static MCG UL transmission that overlaps with the SCG UL transmission starting at time T0 does not indicate transmission power increase for the MCG UL transmission. The UE can determine the sum power for the MCG UL transmission based on the information available at time T0 – T\_offset. | Qualcomm [11] |
| Opt.2 | When UE has an SCG UL transmission and an overlapping MCG UL transmission, then for adjusting the power of the MCG UL transmission   * the UE shall only consider TPC commands that are provided by DCI format 2-2 in PDCCH receptions with a last symbol that is earlier by less than or equal to from the first symbol of the transmission occasion on the SCG | Ericsson [10]  ZTE [1]  Apple [9]  Intel [5] |
| Opt.3 | Leave it to UE implementation | VIVO [2] |
| Opt.4 | *When UE has an SCG UL transmission and an overlapping MCG UL transmission, the UE is not expected to receive the PDCCH with a last symbol that is earlier by less than or equal to from the first symbol of the transmission occasion on the SCG for below cases:*   * *DCI format 2\_2 indicated transmission power adjustment for a PUSCH/PUCCH transmission on MCG, or* | HW [3]  MTK [4] |
| Opt.5 | * When a UE is configured with NR-DC with dynamic power-sharing, for the semi-static MCG UL transmission starting at time T1, regardless of whether it overlaps with a SCG UL transmission, the UE does not apply TPC commands in DCI fomat 2\_2 received after T1 – {minimum *k2* value configured in *PUSCH-Config*}. * NW ensures that minimum *k2* value configured in the *PUSCH-Config*  such that non-ignored DCI format 2\_2 is not present after T0 – T\_offset if there is an overlapping SCG transmission starting at time T0. |  |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | For Opt.2, the problem is that a UE cannot determine whether to ignore or apply a TPC command in DCI 2\_2 on a MCG serving cell. The behavior depends on whether or not the MCG transmission is overlapped with the SCG transmission starting at time T0. The overall principle of the NR-DC dynamic power-sharing is that the UE can determine the MCG sum power without being impacted by SCG power determination, and can determine SCG sum power by using the DCIs received in MCG before T0 – T\_offset. Opt.2 is against this principle.  The only way of letting UE to ignore TPC commands in DCI format 2\_2s on a MCG serving cell is to let UE to determine whether to ignore or apply TPC commands according to the MCG configurations, such as Opt.5. However, this UE behavior (ignoring TPC commands in a certain condition) is quite new and would create more open issues. The benefit compared to Opt.1/4 is not much clear as well. Hence, it is not preferable to be introduced at this late stage of Rel.16.  For Opt.3, a UE may not be able to resolve a transmission power problem that violates per-UE limit if we do not have any standard. Therefore, we think it cannot be said everything is up to UE implementation.  Now, the remaining is Opt.1 vs Opt.4. According to the outcome of the discussion in the last meeting, we are proposing Opt.1. However, Opt.4 is acceptable as well. |
| Samsung | Our view is not captured. It is similar to Option 1 with the additional aspect that there is no need to assume that the network does not indicate power increase.  In any case, this will probably not be visible in the specifications. |
| OPPO | In our understanding, the intention of Option 1 and Option 4 are similar, but with different wording. We can support Option 1 and Option 4  For the case where a TPC command received after T-T\_offset but still have enough time to be applied to MCG transmission, Option 2 may lead to less powe transmission for MCG if the TPC command is to indicate power increase. MCG should always be prioritized for power sharing. Thus Option 2 is attracting  Option 5 addresses the issue by introducing more restrictions on gNB configuration/scheduling. In order to make look-ahead based machanism workalbe, we introudce more and more restrictions on configuration /scheduling at gNB side, but we never evalue its impact on the system performance. Thus Option 5 is not a good choice |
| Ericsson | We prefer Option 2. If no consensus we are OK with Option 3. From NW perspective, MN is not aware of UE transmission activity on SCG, and due to the the agreed T\_offset restriction, MCG scheduling has to be delayed for UE with NR-DC DPS. There is however no need to delay MCG scheduling for UEs that don’t need the restriction (e.g. UEs that are not configured with NR-DC DPS). Then, since the group DCI formats are for multiple UEs, it is not appropriate to enforce the Toffset restrcition also for UEs in the group that don’t require it. From UE persepctive, Option 2, enables NR-DC UE with DPS to ignore TPC commands received within Toffset, so there should be no extra complexity. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option2.  As DCI format 2\_2 and 2\_3 are group common DCIs, from implementation point of view, it may be difficult to consider the Toffset restriction for all the UEs within one group. Option2 offers a way for the network to still send the commands, but UE could ignore them if the Toffset restriction is not satisfied. |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 2. Adding scheduling restriction for group DCI is not a practical approach. So option 5 should be rejected first. Option 1/4 are not preferred due to similar reason. But we can be open for rather flexible UE operation. Option 3 is our 2nd choice. |
| vivo | We prefer Option 3.  The value may be unknown to MCG, which means the UE may be scheduled by DCI format 2\_2 after -. Even if MCG can acquire the value, the UE can still receive DCI format 2\_2, since group common DCI is for a group of UEs. Therefore, for Option 1, 4 and 5, it does not make sense to prevent network transmit DCI format 2\_2 during that period.  Regarding Option 2, the UE still can adjust transmission power after -in some case as Option 1 mentioned. |
| MTK | We prefer Option 4. As QC mentioned, UE cannot determine whether to ignore or apply a TPC command in DCI 2\_2 on a MCG serving cell in Option 2. |
|  |  |

**DCI 2\_3**

As discussed in RAN1 #101bis e-meeting, it should that the DCI format 2\_3 is used to trigger SRS carrier switching along with TPC commands for the SRS transmission. One point raised during email discussion of preparation phase is whether or not the DCI format 2\_3 itself has time restriction, instead of TPC command only. In other words, since DCI format 2\_3 is also used to trigger SRS carrier switching, it should not be allowed to transmit after T\_offset, same as scheduling DCI format,

Companies views on this issue was summarized in the following Table 4:

**Table 4:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies |
| Opt.1 | When UE has an SCG UL transmission and an overlapping MCG UL transmission, then for adjusting the power of the MCG UL transmission, the UE does not expect to receive DCI format 2-3 in PDCCH receptions with a last symbol that is not earlier by less than or equal to from the first symbol of the transmission occasion on the SCG | HW [3]  Intel [5]  ~~Samsung [6]~~ |
| Opt.2 | For SRS triggering, DCI format 2\_3 can be viewed as a DCI format scheduling PUSCH transmission. For SRS power control without triggering, DCI format 2\_3 can be viewed as for DCI format 2\_2. No impact due to DCI format 2\_3 | Samsung [6] |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | DCI format 2\_3 should be treated in the same manner as an UL grant if the SRS request is present in the DCI format 2\_3, and as a DCI format 2\_2 if the SRS request is not present. No special handling is necessary. |
| Samsung | Our view is misunderstood and is now included as “Opt. 2“. I think that is same as what Qualcomm mentions. |
| OPPO | A common solution as Issue-2. Thus Option 1 is ok. |
| Ericsson | Prefer to use same apprach as agreed for DCI 2-2. Specifying different approaches for similar cases should be avoided. |
| ZTE | Same handling for DCI format 2\_2 is preferred. If different approaches are specified, it could be even more difficult for implementation to accommondate restrictions for all UEs in one group. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer the same solution with issue 2-2. |
| vivo | Same solution as DCI format 2\_2 is preferred. |
| MTK | We prefer Option 1, which is aligned with our preference for DCI format 2\_2. |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | Opt.1 is prefered. We can live with that DCI format 2\_3 |

## 2.3 Issue-3: Handling UL Transmission Cancelation on MCG

Another open issue discussed in last RAN1 meeting is how to handle UL transmission cancelation on MCG for MCG dynamic grant PUSCH/configured grant PUSCH due to 5.4.3.1.3 of TS38.321 or by DCI format 2\_4. Although DCI 2-4 does not schedule uplink transmissions, it would impact on the value of due to UL cancelation. Similarly, for CG-PUSCH transmission, the UE may or may not transmit the PUSCH. For dynamic grant PUSCH, the UE may skip the transmission if some conditions are met which are specified in 5.4.3.1.3 of TS38.321.

For different cancelation cases, companies’ views can be categorized using following table:

**Case 1: DCI format 2\_0/2\_4**

**Table 5:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies |
| Opt.1 | For power determination of UL transmission in SCG starting at , UE is not required to take into account the skipped MCG UL transmission due to either DCI format 2\_0/2\_4 or according to the *section 5.4.3.1.3 of TS 38.321 received after*  for determination for the UL transmission in MCG overlapping with the concerned SCG transmission | ZTE [1]  HW [3]  Samsung [6]  Apple [9]  Qualcomm [11] |
| Opt.2 | For power determination of UL transmission in SCG starting at , UE does not expect to receive DCI format 2\_0/2\_4 that is received in a PDCCH with last symbol that is earlier by less than T\_offset from a first symbol of a transmission occasion on the SCG | MTK [4] |
| Opt.3: | left for UE implementation | VIVO [2] |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| OPPO | Support Option.1 |
| Ericsson | Prefer Option 1, but as indicated above same approach as used for DCI 2\_2 should be used here as well. If no consensus OK with Option 3. |
| ZTE | Support Option1.  However, some clarification is needed for UL skipping in Option1.  Based on the current wording, it is not clear whether the restriction is applied if the scheduling DCI is received after T-Toffset or if the scheduled PUSCH is after T-Toffset. The following update is proposed.  *For power determination of UL transmission in SCG starting at , UE is not required to take into account the skipped MCG UL transmission due to either DCI format 2\_0/2\_4 or DCI format scheduling the skipped UL transmission according to the section 5.4.3.1.3 of TS 38.321 received after for determination for the UL transmission in MCG overlapping with the concerned SCG transmission* |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 1. |
| vivo | We don’t see the difference between Option1 and 3. No need to capture it in specification. |
| MTK | We are fine to go with the majority to adopt Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with Option 1 if Option 1 is revised by removing the MAC part „according to ... of TS 38.321“ because a MAC action is harder to be bound to a physical layer timing. Please clarify what it means that a MAC action received by a phsycial layer time in the proposal. |

**Case 2: CG-PUSCH (different with Case 1 as the cancelation is not associated with DCI format)**

**Table 6**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies |
| Opt.1 | UE assumes that actual CG-PUSCH transmission exists in every transmission occasion. | ZTE [1] |
| Opt.2 | If the time instance {T1 – Tproc,2} is earlier than {T0 – Toffset}, this CG-PUSCH is considered into the power calculation. Otherwise, if the time instance {T1 – Tproc,2} is later than {T0 – Toffset}, this CG-PUSCH is not considered into the power calculation | ZTE [1] |
| Opt.3: | left for UE implementation | VIVO [2]  MTK [4]  Intel [5]  Qualcomm [11]  Samsung [6] |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | Opt.3 of Case 2 can be merged to Opt.1 of Case 1. |
| OPPO | A common solution for case 1 and case 2 is prefered. |
| Ericsson | OK with Option 3 or Option 2. |
| ZTE | Ok with Option1 or Option2. |
| vivo | Opt 3 is preferred. |
| MTK | We do not have strong view on this issue. |

## 2.4 Issue-4: Power Determination for PUCCH and SRS Transmission

Another issue is how to determine the power of periodic PUCCH (e.g. SR, P-/SP-CSI) and P/SP-SRS. Views on this issue was summarized as follows:

**Table 7:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Description | Companies |
| Opt.1 | * UE assumes there is always UL transmission in the periodic PUCCH (e.g. P-/SP-CSI) resource and P-/SP-SRS resource for determination. |  |
| Opt.2 | * UE is not required to take into account the cancellation of MCG UL transmissions for dynamic power sharing   + i.e. it is up to UE implementation whether to take into account for power determination |  |

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | Opt.2 is same as Opt.1 of Case 1 in Issue 3. |
| Samsung | Agree with Qualcomm |
| OPPO | Share the same view as QC and Support Option 2 |
| Ericsson | The issue description is not clear. Since UE is aware of periodic MCG transmissions ahead of time, not clear why special handling is needed for them. Following behaviour should directly apply without need for additional spec change?  the UE determines a maximum transmission power on the SCG at the beginning of the transmission occasion on the SCG as  - , if the UE determines transmissions on the MCG with a total power  - , if the UE does not determine any transmissions on the MCG |
| vivo | Option 2 is preferred. No need to capture it in specification. |
| MTK | We prefer Option 1. For Option 2, we are open to consider it but being confused that there is not a timeline defined for the mentioned cancellation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Opt.1 is OK. Option2 is not clear enough about the definition and range of cancellation of MCG UL transmission. |

## 2.5 Issue 5: Removal of earlier text on DPS

This issue was brought up in [11] to remove the following text in TS 38.213, taking into account the agreed WA context and lack of agreements made for supporting the following context:

“

*- if UE transmission(s) in slot of the MCG overlap in time with UE transmission(s) in slot of the SCG and if in any portion of slot of the SCG, the UE reduces transmission power in any portion of slot of the SCG so that in all portions of slot , where and are the UE transmission powers in slot of the MCG and in slot of the SCG, respectively, that the UE determines according to Clauses 7.1 through 7.5 using and , respectively, as the maximum transmission powers on the MCG and the SCG and is the linear value of a configured maximum transmission power for NR-DC operation in FR1 as defined in [8-3, TS 38.101-3]*

*- if UE transmission(s) in slot of the MCG or in slot of the SCG do not overlap in time with any UE transmission(s) on the SCG or the MCG, respectively, the UE determines a transmission power in slot of the MCG or in slot of the SCG as described in [8-3, TS 38.101-3] and in Clauses 7.1 through 7.5 without considering or , respectively*

This issue was discussed in last RAN1 #100 bis e-meeting and no conclusion was made due to concern raised on the potential impact on PRACH transmission on MCG. More specifically, one company wants to clarify how to handle the PRACH transmission first and then to decide whether or not to remove this paragraph.

Companies views can be provided in the following Table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | This part is no longer aligned with the other part of the specs for NR-DC dynamic power-sharing. Proponent can clarify why this cannot be removed and how it should be resolved. |
| Samsung | Same opinion with Qualcomm. Can revisit after LS from RAN2. |
| OPPO | After futher thinking, we are ok to remove the above text from the current spec |
| Ericsson | Prefer to fix this part as other WGs rely on current 213 spec for their work in this area. The TP provided in our tdoc is based on v16.1.0. The changes made in April should be taken into account when applying the TP (if agreed). |
| ZTE | Ok to remove the above text from the current spec. |
| Nokia/NSB | O.K. to remove |
| vivo | Ok to remove it. |
| MTK | OK to remove it. If there is a proper TP to fix current text to better align with RAN1’s previous discussions, we are also open to keep it. |

# 3 Conclusion on the scope of the RAN1#101

To be completed
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