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Introduction

This document summarizes the discussion for eMIMO email thread #6:

[106-e-NR-eMIMO-06] MT.3 (alignment of PDSCH BWP and SCS for mDCI) by August 20 – Li (OPPO)

Discussion

As explained in R1-2107202 [1], the proposed CR is related with one issue in the following text specification in Section 5.1 of 38.214. Specifically, the issue is related with the “non-overlapped PDSCHs” in the highlight sentence.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1 UE procedure for receiving the physical downlink shared channel  …  If a UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE may expect to receive multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain. The UE may expect the reception of full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time, only when PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex*. For a *ControlResourceSet* without *coresetPoolIndex*, the UE may assume that the *ControlResourceSet* is assigned with *coresetPoolIndex* as 0. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the UE can be scheduled with at most two codewords simultaneously. When PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex,* the following operations are allowed:  … |

Regarding the BWP operation in M-DCI based M-TRP system, the following agreement was made in RAN1#96:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For a UE supporting multiple-PDCCH based multi-TRP/panel transmission and each PDCCH schedules one PDSCH, at least for eMBB with non-ideal backhaul, support following restrictions:   * The UE may be scheduled with fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs at time and frequency domain by multiple PDCCHs with following restrictions:   + …   + The UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP bandwidth and the same SCS if the UE is expected to receive multiple PDSCHs simultaneously at given symbols.   + The number of active BWPs for a UE is 1 per CC   + … |

As pointed in [1], the text in current 38.214 “When the UE is scheduled with.. non-overlapped PDSCHs…, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS” seems to suggest that any two non-overlapped PDSCH need to be scheduled in the same active BWP and with same SCS. The consequence is BWP switching for single-TRP transmission is not allowed because non-overlapped PDSCHs in single TRP must be in same active BWP and with same SCS according to this specification.

To assist the discussion, let us consider following two different cases which are illustrated in Figure 1:

* Different PDSCHs are scheduled in single-TRP system or by the same TRP in a m-DCI mTRP system
* Two different PDSCHs are scheduled by two different TRP in m-DCI mTRP system.



**Figure 1: examples of non-overlapped PDSCHs**

Case#1:

**Case #1**: PDSCH 0 and PDSCH 1 in Fig.1 are associated with **same value** of *CORESETPoolindex* (i.e., same TRP in mTRP system) or not associated with any *CORESETPoolindex* (i.e., single-TRP system). As shown in Figure 1, PDSCH 0 and PDSCH 1 are not overlapped, and they are in different BWP.

**Question 1**: Can PDSCH0 and PDSCH1 described in case #1 (i.e., single-TRP or same TRP in m-DCI mTRP system) be scheduled in different BWP?

* If the answer to Question 1 is yes, then the following CR draft proposed in [1] seems to be needed since the current spec seem to not allow that.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1 UE procedure for receiving the physical downlink shared channel  <Unchanged parts are omitted>  If a UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE may expect to receive multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain. The UE may expect the reception of full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time, only when PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex*. For a *ControlResourceSet* without *coresetPoolIndex*, the UE may assume that the *ControlResourceSet* is assigned with *coresetPoolIndex* as 0. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain by PDCCHs associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex*, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, and the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS. When the UE is scheduled with full/partially-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the UE can be scheduled with at most two codewords simultaneously. When PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different *ControlResourceSets* having different values of *coresetPoolIndex,* the following operations are allowed:  <Unchanged parts are omitted> |

Please provide your views on question 1 and any comments for the CR draft in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Apple | We are fine with the CR. But it seems the possibility of misunderstanding is low, since the whole paragraph is talking about the mDCI operation. |
| QC | The CR is not needed. The answer to the question 1 is yes (through legacy active BWP switching), and this is allowed by specification. In our understanding, this part of the spec is not related to BWP switching. BWP switching is allowed within and across CORESETPoolIndex values as there is no such restriction in 38.213 Section 12. This part of the spec just clarifies that BWP and SCS remains same as Rel. 15 and not changed because of mTRP. Hence, it seems change is not needed.  To be clear, we do not think active BWP switching for multi-DCI is any different than Rel. 15. Active BWP can be switched by a DCI from any CORESETPoolIndex. Network needs to ensure that we do not have more than one active BWP as a result of mTRP (e.g. due to non-ideal backhaul). In the specification text above, it says “UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP” which is correct. |
| OPPO | We have different understanding with QC.  The current spec says: When the UE is scheduled with full/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS.  There is no condition for the value of *CORESETpoolindex*. Also, there is no “simultaneously” restriction for the sentence. For two non-overlapped PDSCHs associated with the same value of *CORESETPoolindex*, the restriction of the same BWP is unnecessary. You can see the next sentence: “When PDCCHs that schedule two PDSCHs are associated to different ControlResourceSets having different values of coresetPoolIndex, the following operations are allowed…”, there is also a condition there.  As another alternative, we can simply delete “non-overlapped” or add “simultaneously” at the end to make the description clear and consistent with previous agreement. |
| Samsung | We are supportive on the proposal which can make the spec. clearer. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not needed.  It seems that concerns are raised on the following reading of the sentence,  “When the UE is scheduled with ~~full/partially/~~non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain, the full scheduling information for receiving a PDSCH is indicated and carried only by the corresponding PDCCH, the UE is expected to be scheduled with the same active BWP and the same SCS.”  It is not clear how the above text is related to BWP switching when full paragraph we consider here is about multi-DCI multi-TRP. Also, it is not feasible (as the above text is not sufficient for that) to interpret any BWP switching details.  “If a UE is configured by higher layer parameter *PDCCH-Config* that contains two different values of *coresetPoolIndex* in *ControlResourceSet*, the UE may expect to receive multiple PDCCHs scheduling fully/partially/non-overlapped PDSCHs in time and frequency domain. ….. |

Case#2:

**Case #2**: The UE is configured with m-DCI mTRP transmission. PDSCH0 and PDSCH1 are associated with CORESETPoolindex=0, while PDSCH2 is associated with CORESETPoolindex=1. These three PDSCHs are non-overlapped in time domain. PDSCH0 is in BWP0. But PDSCH1 and PDSCH2 are in BWP1.

**Question 2**: Can the case#2 be supported in m-DCI based mTRP system of rel16?

* If the answer to Question 2 is No, Can we conclude that BWP switching is fully forbidden when different values of CORESETPoolindex are configured for a UE (i.e., m-DCI mTRP is configured)?
* If the answer to Question 2 is YES, we may need to modify the current specification because the current specification does not allow it. What is your suggested change if you think modifing the specification for case#2 is needed?

Please provide your views on the question 2 in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **comments** |
| Apple | We failed to see why this question is relevant to the CR. But in our view, BWP switching is allowed, but gNB should make sure the PDSCHs scheduled by different CORESETPoolIndex should be with the same BWP, as specified. So it seems no spec change is needed. |
| QC | Why current specification does not allow Case 2? Where in the specification differentiation between Case 1 and Case 2 is explained? We are confused about this question. |
| OPPO | Please see our comment for Case 1.  For non-overlapped PDSCHs, the UE should be able to be scheduled with different active BWPs and different SCSs.  As an alternative, we can simply delete “non-overlapped” or add “simultaneously” at the end to make the description clear and consistent with previous agreement. |
| Samsung | Our answer is Yes, but we cannot understand why this case is not supported without revising specification. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not fully sure that question is relevant to the CR as the CR text is not discussing BWP switching. |

Conclusion

…
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