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# Introduction

According to discussion at the preparation phase, the following email thread is allocated by Chairman for further discussion:

[101-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-IIoTenh-04] 6.1. Discussion on CG-CG/DG with same priorities and drafting reply LS for R1-2003259 by 5/29 and corresponding TP (if any) by 6/5 – Duckhyun (LGE)

To address the identified issues from companies’ contributions related to the above email thread, the suggestions for the issues are provided in Section 2. [In Section 3, a few open issues identified are listed up so companies are encouraged to provide your input/feedback in the next meeting in order to facilitate the discussion]. In section [4], the outcome from [101-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-IIoTenh-04] are provided including all the agreements and all the endorsed TPs.

# Email discussions

## Issue 6.1: Collision between CG and CG/DG with same priorities (including LS R1-2003259)

In this meeting, there is incoming LS from RAN2 (R1-2003259), regarding intra-UE prioritization cases with uplink grants overlapping in time. According to the LS, some undesirable behavior could occur due to inconsistent conflict handling between RAN1/RAN2. To resolve this inconsistency, two options which are specified by RAN2 as following.

1. RAN2 changes MAC specification to accommodate current PHY behaviour. With this option, MAC will avoid providing second MAC PDU with the same L1 priority to PHY, meaning that PHY would transmit the packet with lower LCH priority data.
2. RAN1 changes PHY specification to accommodate current MAC behaviour of prioritizing the second MAC PDU provided from MAC.

In [21-25], some companies provide drafts of reply LS.

In order to reply the LS, we would like to collect companies’ preference on those options.

* Option 1
	+ Support: ZTE[1,21], Ericsson[3], Samsung[8], LG[10], MTK[12], Qualcomm[16,20], vivo[17,22 ], Nokia[19,24](no change RAN1 spec.)
* Option 2
	+ Support: CATT[5,23] (only if no UCI multiplexing), Huawei[17], Sony[13] (for UE supporting or configured with L1 priority), oppo[25]

Main discussion point would be a feasibility of the cancellation via second MAC PDU. Here is companies’ view on the feasibility

* The reason of infeasibility
	+ Timeline won’t be guaranteed
	+ A moment when MAC PDU is delivered cannot be specified
	+ It needs to redesign entire UCI multiplexing/prioritization behavior at the very late CR phase.
		- Especially, it may potentially produce the unintended dropping of a high-priority HARQ multiplexed onto the deprioritized PUSCH.
	+ It will lead to unnecessary increase in gNB complexity, DL control load, reduced DL & UL system efficiency, and reduced inter-UE CG PUSCH multiplexing capabilities

As an additional discussion point, vivo[17] suggest to ask RAN2 how to handle the collision case in MAC layer if MAC layer intra-UE prioritization is not supported or not configured, i.e., LCH-based prioritization is not configured

## FL’s suggestions on the issue 6.1

In order to discuss the LS, R1-2003259, we need to conclude whether or how to support CG-DG/CG collision with same priority since we haven’t discussed these aspects. If there is no overlapping grant, the issue in the LS needs not to be discussed.

|  |
| --- |
| **In 38.214, Section 6.1:**A UE is not expected to be scheduled by a PDCCH ending in symbol 𝑖 to transmit a PUSCH on a given serving cell overlapping in time with a transmission occasion, where the UE is allowed to transmit a PUSCH with configured grant according to [10, TS38.321], starting in a symbol 𝑗 on the same serving cell if the end of symbol 𝑖 is not at least 𝑁2 symbols before the beginning of symbol 𝑗. The value 𝑁2 in symbols is determined according to the UE processing capability defined in Clause 6.4, and 𝑁2 and the symbol duration are based on the minimum of the subcarrier spacing corresponding to the PUSCH with configured grant and the subcarrier spacing of the PDCCH scheduling the PUSCH. |

Considering current specification above, it is already supported for dynamic grant to override configured grant if the timeline satisfies. With same priority, it would be common understanding to follow Rel-15 CG-DG behavior.

**Proposed Conclusion: For the collision between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with same priority, the DG PUSCH can be scheduled overlapping in time with CG PUSCH occasion if Rel-15 timeline satisfies.**

Companies are encouraged to provide your preference or editorial correction if any on above proposal.

**Comment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment if any |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the conclusion. The Rel-15 flexibility within the same priority should be retained.  |
| Apple | Support the conclusion. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

For the collision between two CG PUSCHs, it has been discussed how to utilize multiple configured grants in enhanced CG AI. Based on the previous agreement, one purpose of multiple configured grants is to enhance reliability and reduce latency by overlapped configuration with PUSCH repetitions.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Multiple active configured grant configurations for a given BWP of a serving cell should be supported at least for different services/traffic types and/or for enhancing reliability and reducing latency
	+ FFS details
	+ Note: it is understood that the above may be related to RAN2-led work on intra-UE multiplexing
 |

In this sense, it seems clear it is allowed to configure/schedule overlapped two configured grant PUSCHs. However, it is still necessary to discuss how-to. Based on the current MAC specification, MAC is already choosing one grant among overlapped configured grant according to LCH-based priorities. If priorities are equal, it is up to UE implementation how UE chooses one grant between two configured uplink grants.

|  |
| --- |
| **In 38.321, Section 5.4.1:**NOTE 6: If there is overlapping PUSCH duration of at least two configured uplink grants whose priorities are equal, the prioritized uplink grant is determined by UE implementation. |

Though this is only when the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, there is no reason to have different UE behavior when the MAC entity is not configured with lch-basedPrioritization. At least for this discussion, I would like to suggest to have common background assumption as below

**Proposed Conclusion**:

* **RAN1’s understanding is that the prioritized uplink grant is determined by UE implementation when the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, if there is overlapping PUSCH duration of at least two configured uplink grants whose priorities are equal.**
* **RAN1’s understanding is that the prioritized uplink grant is determined by UE implementation when the MAC entity is not configured with lch-basedPrioritization, if there is overlapping PUSCH duration of at least two configured uplink grants.**

Companies are encouraged to provide your preference or editorial correction if any on above proposal.

**Comment:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment if any |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the intention to treat this the same, but then it seems in the second bullet the ‘whose priority is equal’ is missing!?* **RAN1’s understanding is that the prioritized uplink grant is determined by UE implementation when the MAC entity is not configured with lch-basedPrioritization, if there is overlapping PUSCH duration of at least two configured uplink grants whose priorities are equal.**

If this is added – we support! |
| Apple | We support the proposed conclusion from FL. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

If above two are concluded, we can discuss on following two options in the LS.

1. RAN2 changes MAC specification to accommodate current PHY behaviour. With this option, MAC will avoid providing second MAC PDU with the same L1 priority to PHY, meaning that PHY would transmit the packet with lower LCH priority data.
2. RAN1 changes PHY specification to accommodate current MAC behaviour of prioritizing the second MAC PDU provided from MAC.

Following are collected companies’ preference on those options.

* Option 1
	+ Support(8): ZTE[1,21], Ericsson[3], Samsung[8], LG[10], MTK[12], Qualcomm[16,20], vivo[17,22 ], Nokia[19,24](no change RAN1 spec.), Apple
* Option 2
	+ Support(4): CATT[5,23] (only if no UCI multiplexing), Huawei[17], Sony[13] (for UE supporting or configured with L1 priority), oppo[25]

Main discussion point would be a feasibility of the cancellation via second MAC PDU. Here is companies’ view on the feasibility

* The reason of infeasibility of option 1
* The reason of infeasibility of option 2
	+ Timeline won’t be guaranteed
	+ A moment when MAC PDU is delivered cannot be specified
	+ It needs to redesign entire UCI multiplexing/prioritization behavior at the very late CR phase.
		- Especially, it may potentially produce the unintended dropping of a high-priority HARQ multiplexed onto the deprioritized PUSCH.
	+ It will lead to unnecessary increase in gNB complexity, DL control load, reduced DL & UL system efficiency, and reduced inter-UE CG PUSCH multiplexing capabilities

Since RAN2 asked RAN1 to provide feedback on **“which option is more feasible/appropriate”**, I would like to suggest to discuss which options is feasible or not, it would be a pre-condition to choose one of options, especially option 2 (Since option 1 has RAN2 impact and RAN2 proposed this). If someone think both are not feasible and has a solution not one of listed options, it is also appreciated to provide that.

**Q1: Which option is more feasible in the perspective of RAN1.**

Companies are encouraged to provide view on the feasibility. For a proponent of option 2, please also provide opinion on the listed reasons of infeasibility of option 2 above. If collected preference is wrongly captured, please let us know.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment, if any |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 1 is overall more feasible, as the negative side-effects (such as HARQ-Ack dropping, need for re-tx) as discussed in our contribution [R1-2003583](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003583.zip) need to be considered as well – not just the latency of a single UL-SCH packet.  |
| Apple | 1. It is too late to entertain the possibility of changing physical layer specification to align with the MAC behavior, 2) also as pointed by companies such as Nokia, the negative side effects with Option 2 are quite severe; so we support Option 1.
 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Open issues to be discussed

For section 3, it is recommended for companies to take into account the issues carefully and to come back with sufficiently specific options/preference/suggestions to the next meeting so that we can complete RAN1 works on the relevant functionalities with respect to specification.

# Final outcome from [101-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-IIoTenh-04]
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