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# Introduction

This document is created to facilitate the email discussion of “[106-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-09] Issue#14: Correction on invalid symbol determination for PUSCH repetition Type B”. This email thread is triggered by the following draft CR.

[R1-2106932](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP%20documents\RAN1\TSGR1_106-e\Docs\R1-2106932.zip) Correction on invalid symbol determination for PUSCH repetition Type B CATT

# Company views

The only proposed change to TS 38.214 Clause 6.1 in R1-2106932 is the correction of RRC parameter of “*resourceAllocationType1GranularityDCI-0-2*”.

**Q1: Do you agree with the text proposal to TS 38.214 Clause 6.1 in R1-2106932? If not, please provide your comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

In Clause 6.1.2.1 in R1-2106932, the invalid symbol determination for PUSCH repetition type B for half-duplex operation in CA with unpaired spectrum are corrected following the agreed CRs in R1-2104010 and R1-2106346 and the indention is also modified.

**Q2: Do you agree with the intention of the text proposals for TS 38.214 Clause 6.1.2.1 in R1-2106932? If not, why?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | The CR implements similar changes as the agreed CRs in R1-2104010 and R1-2106346. |
| DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q3: Do you agree with the text proposals for TS 38.214 Clause 6.1.2.1 in R1-2106932? If not, please provide your comments.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Partly | One question on the TP in R1-2106932:  What’s the reason to add “within a cell group” when it’s not about NR-DC? In the CR of R1-2104010, there is no “within a cell group” in the corresponding place. |
| Qualcomm |  | Same view as Ericsson. Not sure why “within a cell group” in included in the CR, when the other two CRs agreed in previous meetings do not include such qualifiers. |
| DOCOMO | Partly | Same question as Ericsson and Qualcomm. Would appreciate it if CATT could clarify the reason to add “within a cell group”. |
| vivo |  | Same view as Ericsson. It should be clarified for adding “within a cell group”. |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

To be added after the discussion.